

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, June 11, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 20 students Grade 5 and 6 standing of the Balmoral Hall School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Klymkiw and Mrs. Coyne. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

We also have 56 students Grade 6 standing of the Precious Blood School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Manaire and Miss Gauthier. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

On behalf of all the honourable members I'd like to welcome you here today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James) introduced Bill No. 77, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson)(on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs) introduced Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2). (Second reading Monday next)

MR. MACKLING introduced Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris) introduced Bill No. 79, An Act respecting the Town of Morris.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the very serious economic situation that the egg producers of Manitoba do find themselves in and have found themselves in for many months, I'm wondering if the Minister has any plans to assist them in this economic dilemma.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac Du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the member knows that the usual form of assistance that takes place firstly must take place at the federal level of government, being their responsibility. A form of assistance has been announced by the Government of Canada and wherever it's possible for us to add to that by way of support to their representations we are prepared to consider it at any time and always have been.

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

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the supplementary coverage be announced before June 30th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I was having a little chat with my friend, the Honourable Minister of Transportation, but I gather the question is Will supplementary coverage be announced - the rates - before June 30? Yes, I fully expect that the rates will be announced in advance of June 30th. In fact I was hoping to have been in a position to have had the rates, the exact precise rates for announcement even before today's date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. I wonder if he has received a letter from my leader with regard to the strike situation in Flin Flon and what course of action will he choose to take. I understand that the letter requests his visit to Flin Flon . . . attempt to solve . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question has been asked. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, as of 4:50 p.m. on Wednesday I had not received that letter. If it was transmitted yesterday I haven't had an opportunity yet to see all the mail from yesterday.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the First Minister not see any value in his visitation to Flin Flon with the attempt of solving this strike.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated several days ago when this matter was raised, the Minister of Labour here has had intensive dialogue with the parties to the dispute and I have had some discussion as well. We are making all efforts possible from the provincial jurisdictional perspective, but as my honourable friend knows, the authority, the jurisdictional authority for the matter lies with the Federal Department of Labour, the Government of Canada, and there has been constant communication between the Minister of Labour here and the Minister of Labour in Ottawa. I don't know that it's possible to say more.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister would take note of the request made by the leader of our party. These requests have been made with consultation and we have reason to believe . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating the question. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to see that the Honourable Member for Emerson has become the amanuensis for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address two questions to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The first one is: Has the cannery at Morden been able to meet the seeding program that he announced earlier in the House? Will they meet the acreage or is there going to be a cutback?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there are no problems in this area.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a further question, although that wasn't quite the answer I expected. Will he table the report of the McKenzie Seed Company of the last year?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the McKenzie Seed Company does provide an Annual Report. However, it is not a Crown corporation; it's a privately incorporated company but annual reports are available for scrutiny.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour and ask him if he's had an opportunity to search his files and his conscience concerning a letter that was sent to him on April 22nd by the aerospace workers in Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): In reply, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my honourable friend there is no necessity for me to search my conscience; it is pure and requires no searching.

In answer to the other part of my honourable friend's question I was so busy trying to solve the problems of CAE that I didn't have an opportunity since yesterday afternoon to make further searches.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Bill 36, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader caught me by surprise. I didn't think he was going to call this so early in the morning. I heard him just recently tell the Minister of Education they're going into Estimates so I sat and relaxed thinking that I had till Monday, but the Minister, I guess, had a second thought about it.

This very important bill, Bill 36 - and what's it going to do? What's it going to do? Amalgamation of the City of Winnipeg - all one big city - 50 members. Just about as many members as we have in this House. This is going to be the city that we in rural Manitoba are

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) going to have to look at for years to come; a city presently made up of 12 municipalities. I see many members in the front row who represent those various areas: the Minister of Education; the Attorney-General; the Minister of Labour. I guess there's one or two others, maybe that represent the area in the Metropolitan Winnipeg. They are the ones who were so proud of their cities when they sat on this side of the House. They'd get up and speak about Transcona and West Kildonan and what's going to happen to those very cities when this bill is passed? What's going to happen to them? I bet you anything that the Minister of Labour won't get up - I remember so well when the City of Transcona became a city. He was so proud of that effect and yet he's going to have the nerve to get up and say we don't want the City of Transcona any longer. That city's faded away; it's faded away; it's gone; it's just a dream, just a dream from now on. And the Minister of Labour will smile while he's voting to destroy the City of Transcona, I'm sure of that.

The Attorney-General, he'll laugh when he stands up in his seat, no more St. James, no more St. James, it's gone, finished; just a dream, just a dream -- (Interjection) -- Souris will be there for a long while to come, I tell you; Killarney, too.

And the Minister of Education, the former Mayor of the City of West Kildonan, he was so proud of the city he represented as Mayor for many years, and what's going to happen? What's going to happen? No more West Kildonan, no more West Kildonan. It's gone down the drain, gone down the drain. It's all Winnipeg. These will only be memories, only be memories to the Minister of Education, but I'm sure the people will remember this when they go to the ballot, when they go to the next ballot. They will remember the people that stood up and they voted to destroy these very cities, these very cities in Greater Winnipeg who they were so proud of, who they fought so hard to exclude from their powers when they were mayors or councillors or the former two mayors, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Education, and now we'll find, as I mentioned, they're only dreams, only dreams.

Let me tell you, this is not a dream to the people of rural Manitoba. This is not a dream. This is something that they are looking at with their eyes open and I'm sure when I stand up and vote on this very issue that I represent the people with their attitude towards this city. I only have to read this report, I only have to read this report. . . the place of Greater Winnipeg in the economy of Manitoba, I only have to. I don't know whether this is the reason why the government chose to bring in this One Big City or not, but if you read this report that's all the evidence you have I'm sure, on the government's file, and as for that very evidence of this report, I think it's only right and proper that we should study this report and study it fully because we can see what the Greater Winnipeg area thinks of rural Manitoba, how important we are in rural Manitoba to the City of Greater Winnipeg. I suggest to the Premier, I suggest to the Premier, while it's a long report, I think he should take time in the next couple of weeks because I know what this means.

And what do the rural parts of Manitoba mean to Greater Winnipeg? -- (Interjection) -- Certainly, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney is referring to that report of the role of Greater Winnipeg in the Manitoba economy. Is he aware that that report is not a provincial government document; it is a Metro document, and we do not accept responsibility for its contents nor do we necessarily endorse its contents. Is he aware of that?

MR. McKELLAR: I'm aware. I realize who the author is, but I realize that the same arguments exist on that side of the House that are used on this for the very same reason and this is what frightens me and frightens the people of rural Manitoba, that very reason. So what part do we play in the Province of Manitoba, the rural Manitoba? If the farmers of Manitoba and the rural areas, if the farmers stop producing food for the City of Winnipeg and the people in rural Manitoba stop visiting the City of Winnipeg, this city would last a very short time, it would last a very short time. We all know it. Each one in the Province of Manitoba has a part to play, have a very important part to play, a very important part to play, because I'm helping feed people in the City of Winnipeg right now. I'm helping pay taxes, every day I'm in the City of Winnipeg, helping pay taxes by living in the hotel. How many people do we get from the City of Winnipeg in my little village? I'll tell you that. Not very many.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'm getting to them. But this is the reason. I'll tell you what's going to happen: City Council - 50 members, 50 members, a City Council which will be controlled by political parties. And what will this mean? If you think now they are by-passing you when

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) the Mayor of Winnipeg goes to Ottawa direct, you can imagine what's going to happen in the future with a power base of around 525,000 people. They will be more powerful than the Province of Manitoba in their arguments to the Federal Government. I can assure you that right now. While they won't have to negotiate in tax laws - they won't be laws - they will be more powerful because of their influence in the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Manitoba. This is the thing that scares you, this is the thing that frightens us, that we in the rural parts of Manitoba with about 400,000 population will have a minor role as far as the Province of Manitoba will be concerned. Every one of us know right today - there's 27 seats in the Greater Winnipeg area right in this Legislature - every one of us know that Greater Winnipeg, they can control this House, and now we're setting up a council of 50 members. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without Portfolio)(Elmwood): Do you believe in representation by population?

MR. McKELLAR: Yes, I do but not on a 50-50 or vote for vote - no, no, no.

MR. DOERN: Then what do you believe in?

MR. McKELLAR: I believe that the people in the rural areas because of their scattered population need better representation in here than the people in Greater Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- and I want to answer you on that too. I want to answer you on that. Your Mayor of Winnipeg - does he ever come to you for advice? Never. Never. And I want to tell you that right now. Why doesn't he? Because he doesn't have to. I want to tell you that in the rural areas the Reeves and mayors always come to us for advice and the rural members have to realize that. They have a greater role to play. I represent seven rural municipalities, and five incorporated towns and villages; this is 12 municipalities that I represent in my constituency, 16,000 people, and I would consider that my role is a greater one because of the greater responsibility that I have to the 12 municipalities than you do have to the City of Winnipeg. Mayor Juba of Winnipeg wouldn't come to you to make an appointment with yourself or one of the Ministers, because he doesn't have to, he can go direct, and for that very reason I think that the votes should not be on one vote rural, one vote city.

Let's go back to the City of Winnipeg here, let's get back. We are remember - there's only a handful in here, too, when Metropolitan government came into existence, there's only a handful. The Member for Rhineland was here and a few others; the Member for Minnedosa, two or three others on our side and about just one member on your side, two members, the Premier included, the Minister of Labour. This was fought - argued - I think there's only one member that voted against Metropolitan Winnipeg. That was my friend here, the Member for Rhineland. And it was criticized, this Metro government was criticized and criticized greatly by all who thought this was a great position to talk against, and I can see the progress that went on in the City of Greater Winnipeg during that area, dealing with the 12 or 13 municipalities. You only have to be from the country to really notice this. And what happened under Metropolitan government? Growth took place in all areas surrounding Winnipeg, and while the Mayor of Winnipeg suggested it wasn't a good deal for Winnipeg, the end result will prove, the end result will prove that Metropolitan government was a good thing for Greater Winnipeg. And what will one city government do for the surrounding areas around Winnipeg? The direct opposite will take place, because everybody is going to be on a standard mill rate from now on, and the growth won't take place in Charleswood, the growth won't take place in Fort Garry or North Kildonan like it did in the past because they don't have that tax advantage like they had before. And why did they have a tax advantage? For a very good reason; because the government decides Fort Garry or Charleswood or St. James can run their affairs a lot cheaper than the City of Winnipeg or a city such as the one we're talking about right here. They can keep in direct contact with their employees. Their administration costs are a lot lower. I want to say to the people that I can tell in my own municipality out home, the Rural Municipality of Oakland, they have the cheapest mill rate, the cheapest mill rate in the Province of Manitoba and six township municipalities, 19 mills municipal, 19 mills education. I don't think the Minister of Education can find another municipality in the Province of Manitoba that has a lower mill rate. And they do this for a very good reason - because their administration costs are low.

So what happens after this bill is passed? I know it'll be passed because the votes on this side won't equal the votes on that side. It's quite simple, simple arithmetic, simple arithmetic. The assets, liabilities are poured into a common pot and all you have to do is read to know

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) what the debts of the City of Winnipeg is. What's the debt of the City of Winnipeg? I suppose the Minister without Portfolio knows that off by heart. \$110 million, the debt for the City of Winnipeg. What's the debt of Metro? 84 million. What are the debts of all the other municipalities surrounding? \$25 million, that's the debt. So it's simple arithmetic. The people in the Greater Winnipeg area are going to have to pick up the debt from the City of Winnipeg. They're obliged to pick up the debt of Metro. So 110 million against 25 million, the same amount of population in both the City of Winnipeg and the Greater Winnipeg area; and this is the reason why Mr. Juba and members of the government side are anxious. These people in the rural parts of Greater Winnipeg are having to go along with this very important decision that the government are bringing before us. It's natural. The City of Brandon are in the same boat as the City of Winnipeg. they're practically bankrupt, practically bankrupt. I know the City of Brandon are in that same stage so that's why they want to get their boundaries extended, too, to spread the debt over a larger area.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills that we've had before us in many a session, because in the past the policy of every government in the past has been when you change municipal boundaries, it's only done by agreement or resolution by both municipal governments. And today we're having a new change of direction, a new change of direction by our government. They're taking upon themselves to change the boundaries of municipalities. And are they going to do the same at Brandon too? Are they going to take the same action at Brandon? I tell you, the advice I have and the policy that I always take as an individual, no boundaries should be changed unless there's a resolution by all governments involved. And this is the resolution. I have a bill before this House, and while it hasn't been dealt with in second reading, I think it spells out this clearly. Killarney and Turtle Mountain Municipalities - Town of Killarney and the Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain, have a bill before this House to deal with changes in boundaries and there's resolutions by both governments endorsing this change; and that's the policy that should be respected and always has been respected in this House, because there's never been a bill go through this House before where there wasn't a resolution by both governments endorsing this change of boundary. This is where I disagree -- (Interjection) -- What?

A MEMBER: What about Metro?

MR. McKELLAR: Metro never changed any boundaries. Metro never changed any boundaries at all. You were still the Alderman in St. James after Metro came in, or were you an Alderman in St. James when Metro came in? I doubt it very much; but you were an alderman recently after Metro came in. And what did Metro do? What did Metro do? It looked after transportation, looked after planning, it looked after the responsibility of certain main arteries in the City of Winnipeg and the sewage and water - and there's nothing wrong with this, because who wants to stop a water line at the edge of Winnipeg; who wants to stop one at the edge of Winnipeg into East Kildonan? This is not right. This is the kind of government that I say should be brought in. And for those of the government who have travelled, for those of you who have travelled, where do you find where a similar bill has been brought in? You don't find it in Toronto; you don't find it in Minneapolis - St. Paul; you don't find it in Miami; you don't find it in New York, you don't find it in other cities. What they're trying to do is the municipalities work together with their joint problems, but leave the control, leave the control in the area where the responsibility lies, the local level. This is -- (Interjection) -- if you want me to answer that, I'll tell you something but I'll tell you in the hallway what I think of that question. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, this decision I hope will arrive after much thought and much debate both in the House and in Committee. I think the city members here, the City of Greater Winnipeg members have a responsibility to the Province of Manitoba, and I hope that after two or three years after this bill is brought in and passed, they won't regret it, because if they do there's no changing, there's no going back, you've made your decision, you've set the plans for the next 100 years in the Greater Winnipeg area. You've set the plans for the people of the Province of Manitoba and they are the ones that are going to have to live with it too. So let's not do the wrong thing for the people of Manitoba; let's have a little thought. Just don't think of the people of Greater Winnipeg because they're only going to be partly affected by this bill.

I would suggest to the members of the government that if they have to call a special

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) session this fall and delay this bill one year, there's nothing wrong with that because I think the worst thing they could do, the worst thing they could do is rush this thing in. I'm thinking about the City of St. Boniface over here which the honourable member represents. They're going to make many pleas to us as individual members. I know other municipalities will, individuals will, and it's for that very good reason that I don't think we should be in a rush, to rush this thing. After all, the City of Winnipeg and Greater Winnipeg municipalities have lived under the present situation for many years and have operated the municipalities effectively. So let's not do the wrong thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. McKELLAR: If the honourable member wants to ask me a question let him get up to his feet and I'll sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Has the honourable member been to St. Boniface at any time?

MR. McKELLAR: Has been in St. Boniface? Where? When? -- (Interjection) -- Lately? Oh heaven help us, you think I don't get around the world. My great goodness. If you want to ask me if I haven't been to New Orleans, I've been to New Orleans too. I've been to a number -- (Interjection) -- if you want to go into French quarters in New Orleans, you've seen something, that's really where the action is.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's the kind of question you'd expect from the Honourable Whip. He doesn't represent the Greater Winnipeg area and I suppose he's lived in here all his life, but I think he should have a second thought on this bill too. I think he should have a second thought.

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing else I can say. I know the government have made up their mind, but when the Minister of Labour gets up to vote on this bill, I'll betcha he hasn't got a smile on his face, I'll betcha he hasn't because he's washed out the very city that he was smiling and giving all credit to right in this very seat when he proposed this. And I'm going to enjoy it, I'm going to enjoy it when he gets up and votes, destroying the very city he was so proud of. And I'm going to enjoy it, too, when the Minister of Education - and I'll betcha he won't have a smile on his face either, he won't have a smile on his face either, he won't have a smile on his face either; or the Member for St. Boniface, he won't have a smile on his face because he's gotta vote for the government, he has to vote for the government. Sure, he's gotta vote for the government. The Attorney-General here, too, is going to have a second thought on this whole thing too. I know the responsibilities there, but I tell you my conscience is clear. When my bill comes before the House in Killarney and Turtle Mountain, I don't have a worry in the world, not a worry in the world, because there's a resolution from both municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I just kindly suggest to the members that they go back to the policies - it's always been the policy of every government that no boundaries be changed unless the resolution is entailed within the bill, signed by both the mayors or reeves or whatever they may be, and that is the only way to change boundaries in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable House Leader proceeds, I would like to introduce to the honourable members 80 students from the Beausejour Collegiate, Grade 11 standing, under the direction of Mr. Kowalchuk, Misses Galka and Marion. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

There are also 38 students of St. Jean Baptiste School of Grade 11 standing. These students are under the direction of Mr. Beaudry and Mr. Maharaj. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you here today.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter before the committee is Resolution 104 and an amendment thereto by the Member for Rhineland that the Minister's Compensation Salary Representation Allowance be reduced to \$1.00. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I rise not to support the motion but to say a few words on it -- (Interjection: How come?) -- because I think that there's been too much done in education lately. I think that we've reached a very important milestone since the last year and, of course, as you know I'm speaking about the legislation that was brought in last session of Bill 113 that placed French on a par with English as a teaching language.

I don't think that the simple fact that we have enacted legislation has completely solved the problem of French teaching, because important and far-reaching legislation such as this is certainly not always easy to administer; but if the intent of this House -- and I do say the intent of this House, because if you remember, Mr. Chairman, the bill at the time received unanimous support from all the members of this House and I feel that if the intent of the members of this House is to become a reality then we certainly need the goodwill of all Manitobans. I think that maybe it would be the time to ask ourselves together, to study this with the people of Manitoba, to ask ourselves what is Bill 113 all about. Bill 113 is both compulsory and permissive legislation. I say that it's permissive legislation because as far as the citizens of this province are concerned, the government will do nothing to shove the teaching of French, the learning of French, down anybody's throat. No one, be they Anglophone or Francophone need fear that they will be forced to learn French.

I say also that Bill 113 is compulsory legislation because if enough of our citizens wish to learn French or English - it's the same for both languages, as I said before - well then, the government and the different school divisions must make it possible for them to do so. This point should be made quite clear to our people, Mr. Chairman. There must also be dialogue between the Department of Education and the different school divisions but mostly between the school divisions and the people living in those divisions. We need a common sense approach, mutual trust and understanding if we're going to make this work.

The people that are non-French speaking and those that have no use for French, I think shouldn't face any problems at all. The difficulties of course will be between the French people themselves. Mr. Chairman, most French Manitobans are proud of their heritage and they wish to retain their language, but many are fearful that their children will not have sufficient knowledge of the English language, which after all is the working language here in Manitoba and the language of the big majority of our citizens and this is quite understandable. I don't think that these people, these French Manitobans who feel this way should be held in contempt by anyone and especially by their French-speaking neighbours.

I am convinced, personally, that their fears are groundless. English is compulsory in our schools and there are so many other influences with the radio, television, your neighbours, the newspapers, the movies, and the kids playing sports with their friends, and I might add also that I am sure that the Department of Education is well awake and is following the progress of the students quite carefully.

But if I don't agree with the thinking of these people, it doesn't mean that I should not respect their wishes. Now how to satisfy these people and how to satisfy those who would like to take full advantage of this new legislation that we have might be a difficult thing to do, but it certainly is not impossible. I think that the answer to this, and this has been established in certain districts, I think that we should have pilot projects, pilot projects where people will be shown that they should have no fear. Some schools, these pilot projects think that we should have some schools designated as French schools where the teaching would be done in French anywhere from 50 to 75 percent of the time, where the administration would be in French and where we would have this French ambience.

These schools of course would be situated in predominantly French-speaking districts or would be serving large areas - and I might give as an example, Sir, the secondary school St. Boniface College in St. Boniface, the existing French school in St. Vital, the Precious

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) Blood School in Norwood, the Sacred Heart School in Winnipeg, and maybe others in large centres, as I said, and if this is done we won't have any trouble at all. There will be a minimum of disturbance because these schools already exist. It's not going to disturb the people that are not interested and we could keep on, we could form a nucleus of students who could attend the French university - we might call it that - the St. Boniface College which of course is affiliated with the University, and I think that then we would have a guarantee of the survival of the French language. Certain other schools and districts would increase their French programs as required but without having people in panic. We would, as the necessity rises, we would have more French schools. As we see that we can make these pilot projects work, we would have also a better understanding with our people and there certainly would be more demand. I think that this would be the -- well, I think it's practically the only way to make this thing work.

We are certainly going through, the French Manitobans are certainly going through a very critical period. There is a real danger that we might have a split between our people, and if this was done the French community alone would be to blame and it would be the end of the French fact here in Manitoba, in Western Canada and maybe in all of Canada if this is the case, because you would not have a bilingual country. I think, therefore, it is now the responsibility of the French community to make this work. For close to a hundred years they have been fighting for their rights and now their rights are certainly given them. They'll have all the facilities, the chances to further their knowledge of the French language and it's up to them to do something about it. I think that we have different associations that are dedicated to just that and they have a certain responsibility - and here I would like to speak about La Société Franco-Manitobaine.

I might say that I feel that there is a need for societies such as La Société Franco-Manitobaine. I am a strong supporter of this association and I certainly agree with the aims of this association, but I think that they have to be very very careful not to divide the people, the French Manitobans, by seeming at times maybe to be arrogant or dictatorial. They should be very careful not to create an establishment but to speak for all those that they represent. I think that their mandate is mostly to educate the French Manitoban population to work with them, not necessarily to take over from all the school trustees in the provinces and the groups that have been working for this cause for many years. They are not necessarily speaking for 80,000 citizens, 80,000 French-speaking citizens of Manitoba, but they are speaking for their membership, and I think that we should do everything we can to make them stronger, make them grow, make them represent more and more people because it is certainly, and it should be, a non-political association.

But of course having said this, I think that I for one, and certainly the government, could not abandon their responsibilities and it must certainly seek advice and have dialogue with these people, but it must also seek advice with others if it is to be really representative. I don't think therefore that we should surrender our responsibilities. We should feel free to consult not only with the executive of La Société Franco-Manitobaine but all the other groups. I don't mean to be critical by saying this, Mr. Chairman, but rather to indicate the importance of understanding between all our people, between the government and La Société Franco-Manitobaine, La Société Franco-Manitobaine vis-a-vis all French Manitoba.

Also, I hope that we can establish means of communication with other groups. This certainly should be something, one of the aims of La Société Franco-Manitobaine, that they should try to dialogue with the other groups, the other ethnic groups, the English-speaking people, the Ukrainians, the Germans and so on. -- (Interjection) -- The who? -- (Interjection) -- I said that, I mentioned the English. I think that they should dialogue because I think this is a time when the French-speaking people of this province are worried and should try to build a fence around them to safeguard the little that they have. I think that the political climate in Manitoba has changed very much and I would like to see myself and other French-speaking people really doing our part to make the Manitoba mosaic a reality. I think that we have to realize, the French-speaking people must realize that we are not living in Quebec. It is sad to say, but many people of Quebec have little interest in us. Our friends are here in Manitoba and we must develop a French -- certainly we want to keep our culture and our language, but it must be a French Manitoban culture.

I think that speaking on this we certainly should say a few words on this policy of bilingualism, the Federal Government's policy on bilingualism and its policy on the two official languages.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) I think that we must give the present Federal Government the credit for the leadership that they gave us in this, but I don't know if they are really successful with their aims. What is the aim of the Federal Government in this field. Is it to encourage the people of both official languages to feel at home anywhere in Canada, to have true bilingualism, or is it only to recognize what was done in the past. And why I say this, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government of Canada has decided to spend \$300 million in the -- well, starting last year for 3 years in this field of bilingualism -- (Interjection) -- 4 years; that's right, and I have my doubts that they are going at it the right way, Mr. Chairman. I'm starting to ask myself is this just a hoax to satisfy the people of Eastern Canada and maybe to give in to Quebec a bit, because I think that Quebec will get, the Province of Quebec will get close to half of that and they'll have very little adjustment, very little to change.

Mind you, I certainly recognize that they should receive some help, recognize that this is the province that has done more to try to be really a bilingual province in the history of this country, but what is the aim? As I said, is it just to reward them, to thank them, or are we now trying to establish bilingualism, to have bilingualism in our country? If this is the case, I think that the Federal Government will have to do an awful lot more, will have to divide the pie in a different way. I think that it is up to them to help us finance. There is no difficulty here in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba, the Legislature of Manitoba are very intent in developing this bilingualism, and as I've said, we approved Bill 113 unanimously last year, but we need some financial help and I think that these pilot projects if they are going to work must receive financial help from the government. I think so far that the Province of Manitoba received only a little more than -- the Minister will be able to tell us better -- but I think it's a little more than \$100,000 and I think that for the first year we will be given approximately \$600,000 and this is not enough. This is a change, and what happens in Manitoba could change the situation here in all western Canada, because I think that as Manitoba goes so will Saskatchewan and eventually maybe Alberta and B.C.

So I am not satisfied with what the Federal Government is doing, with the leadership that it's shown. It accepted certain principles, fine, but what now? Is there going to be politics played in this? Is the west going to suffer in this again? Is this just a way to give more money to Ontario and especially Quebec, I ask myself. I am very worried about this.

For instance, one of the recommendations of the B & B was that there should be a teachers' college established here to serve the western provinces and the government said that they would go along. This was their policy. And for two years now, Mr. Chairman, the Province of Manitoba has done everything possible to have the solution to this. There has been more research and study and recommendations made; the government has cooperated fully with the Federal Government; but so far we seem to be very far from a solution. There is difficulties because education is a provincial matter, but certainly something should be done, something should be done soon. There is delay, delay and delay and this is not good enough. How can we go ahead and say we are going to teach French and we are going to have the French teachers, the textbooks, the program, without means of forming these teachers. I think that our program here in Manitoba, I would say, is in danger if there is not something decided very soon.

I think the Federal Government also should do its part; it showed leadership also. I think it should keep on. It should develop these programs. I was inclined to favour the remarks of the Honourable Member from Emerson to say that we need a larger staff to put these programs into force. I'm ready to see if the Minister of Education can prove me wrong and prove the Member for Emerson wrong. I hope that he can, and I know that he's well interested also and of course he has more facilities to know what is going on in his department than the member from Emerson or myself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I took so much time to speak about the French fact, I think that it was only right. After all, I thought to see some legislation such as we enacted last year, fought in this House for 13 years and at times I was all by myself and the government then wouldn't even answer me, and I'm certainly pleased to see what has happened, the change that we have had in the last two years.

But that doesn't mean that this is finished. I think that there's something else that we should tackle right now and that is try to do something for all our ethnic groups -- and mind you, this is not only in the field of education but we've had a congress, a mosaic congress where we got all the people together of all the different origins to try to find out how best they could live together, they could further their own culture and maybe have a real Manitoba culture where

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) we could have unity and diversity.

Now the Federal Government hasn't done too much in this. It is true that there was a report, Volume No. 4 of the B & B Commission that came out following Volume No. 2 on official languages. It doesn't say too much. I think it is a problem knowing exactly what to do. I might say that Manitoba certainly took leadership in this, by calling this congress and certainly it's not the intention of this government to stop there. We received a report and there'll be recommendations coming from these people how best we can help them further their culture and retain their language also. Mind you, this is not, as I said, all in the field of education, but a certain resolution that we received from this congress, or came out of this congress, will certainly go to the Department of Education now for study and recommendation and it is my hope, Sir, that at the next session this government will be ready to bring in legislation that might assist those other groups such as was mentioned here yesterday by the Honourable Member from Rhineland, the Germans, the Ukrainians, because we have a large population of these people.

Maybe I'm dreaming, Mr. Chairman, but I still feel that we have a facility here, we have everything needed in Manitoba to be an example to the rest of Canada and the rest of the world where we could live. We have so many different origins, so many people that demand to live together. In the past I think there's been fear, there's been fear from the French-speaking people, fear from the Ukrainians. They did not want to disappear, and I think that with the added dialogue that we're having, with the government showing leadership and helping the governments can't regulate and legislate everything - but I think we are now, I think more than ever, getting closer to eradicating the prejudices we all have, where at least if we cannot accept all groups - I mean if we do not agree with every group we should not only tolerate them but accept them and try to see their problems through their eyes and not necessarily through our own.

So, Mr. Chairman, with these few words, I might say I'm satisfied with the progress. After all, we are looking at the Estimates of the Department of Education, and from the demand of my friend from Rhineland, I certainly don't intend to vote to withdraw the salary from my honourable friend. I think he's earned it; I think he's done a very good job. There's always progress which can be made, there's no doubt about that. It's been a pleasure working with him and I hope that I can continue. Of course, as you know, Mr. Chairman, we're not all experts in everything; we're interested in many things but we probably specialize and we have certain priorities, and eradicating the prejudice in this beautiful province of ours and the coming into force really of the real Manitoba mosaic is my hope and I think we're on the right track. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm still not ready to let the item go at this point. I think I certainly could support a number of the points made by the Member for St. Boniface although he doesn't agree with my motion. I can understand because he is not in the situation that the people in my area are. If our people were getting the same grants I wouldn't be raising the fuss and the objection that I have to every year the Estimates come up for the Minister of Education's Department, because we are saddled with an increased load and with an improper share of the cost of education for my area. This is the reason, and certainly over the years that this government has been in office, we have heard from the Mines Minister repeatedly about the ability-to-pay principle when Medicare was changed. My, how they boasted about bringing about and applying the ability-to-pay principle, and yet when it comes to education we hear nothing about it. He's mum. He won't even get up and defend the government's policy or the government's stand because he knows too well that they're forgetting all about it when it comes to education, because the large part of the cost of education falls on land and on property, and the farmer today, certainly just by owning land doesn't mean that he will have an income or that he will have the means whereby he can pay those taxes to pay the cost of education in his area.

This is the very reason I put the motion before us, to impress upon the government the need for tax revision and to give tax assistance to the farmers of this province. We heard a lot about, previous to the session, even in the Throne Speech, that there would be a tax revision but again nothing has been done for the farmers and for the people in my area in connection with this matter. So this is my very reason for insisting and bringing the matter forward.

When I take a look at the British Columbia situation it is quite different, and I would like

(MR. FROESE cont'd) to read a few paragraphs from their January-February bulletin. It starts off this way under the Education section: "To meet the continuing challenge in the field of education this budget provides an all-time high appropriation of \$403,960,000, or 31 percent of the total provincial revenue in the fiscal year. While education of our young citizens is vital, the government must maintain a balance with other important government services." Then they go on to say: "Including the annual homeowner grant, the Government of British Columbia is now paying over 90 percent of the residential and farm homeowners' share of the total cost of public education." It's over 90 percent, and this government is priding itself on somewheres around 50 percent. Surely enough, Mr. Chairman, we have a long way to go to meet the situation that is in B.C. at the present time where people are getting much more assistance tax-wise and are not burdened as heavily as we are here in Manitoba.

When we take a look at the enrollment, and I would like to read another two sections. . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may just interrupt the speaker for a moment, it's of interest to the member, I'm sure. I'd like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 20 Grade 5 and 6 students from the Kronstal School under the direction of Mr. Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

On behalf of all honourable members I would like to welcome you to your Legislative Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT'D)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to read two sections of the report indicating the enrollment in their universities and higher schools of learning and I quote: "Current enrollment in the provincial vocational schools is almost 36,000, up 13.8 percent from 1969. A new 1 1/2 million multi-purpose Student Centre under construction will greatly augment the facilities of the British Columbia Institute of Technology. Total enrollment in our public universities will be an estimated 34,750 in September of 1971, a rise of 175 percent over 1960. The province is again providing substantial university operating and capital grants in this budget. In fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, provincial operating grants to universities made up 78.1 percent of the total university general operating budget while student fees made up 18.7 percent."

When we take a look at the homeowner grant which is applied in British Columbia toward the cost of taxes which go to pay the financial cost of education, we find that there is grants to school districts and provincial technical and vocational schools of \$220 million; provincial homeowner grants applied to school levies, \$60,500,000; and then there is various other grants totalling altogether \$295,860,000.

So, Mr. Chairman, I was going to point out that certainly we have a long ways to go in providing the same type of assistance that these people are getting, and I feel that this government should bring about tax revision so that not such a large portion of the education cost falls on farm property. We have heard made mention before, and I have certainly brought this in at an earlier discussion, about the Wilkinson Report that was made to the municipal affairs people at their convention last fall and their recommendations, and I feel that we should be working towards this, that we should be implementing the principle of ability-to-pay when it comes to pay for educational costs.

I also would like to see changes brought into the unitary system of administration. I think it would then be much more acceptable to the people in the province, not only to those that haven't got it but also to those that have it, because those that have the unitary system certainly by no means are all satisfied. I have heard a lot of dissatisfaction from various areas throughout the province. I get correspondence, I get phone calls from people who are very dissatisfied and irritated about the situation in their particular area. -- (Interjection) -- No, from Manitoba. A lot of these people want to have a voice in local affairs and education but under the unitary system they haven't got it, and I feel that we should be bringing in amendments to that legislation whereby the local people would have a voice in the educational matters of this province.

Presently there is no forum available under the legislation whereby they can have

(MR. FROESE cont'd) discussions that will be meaningful to them. There's no forum that has legal status under the Act or under the legislation whereby they can take action of any kind whatever. There's no provision whatever in the legislation to do this and I feel this should be inserted, this should be brought about so that people would have a voice in education and also that they could then register their grievances, that they could formulate policy at the local level. This is what is needed; this is what is required in order to make it more acceptable. If this was done then certainly a number of our smaller centres who are now dying out because of their schools being removed wouldn't happen; they would be able to do something about it, but presently they're helplessly standing by, having to see these things go on and can do nothing about it. Mr. Chairman, this is what is required and I would like to hear from the Minister whether they will consider bringing in amendments of this type and making the legislation more acceptable to the people. Otherwise, it means that the policies are just dictated to them, they're brought in from the top down and we have no recourse.

Last night when I spoke in connection with teacher training, and I asked several questions of the Minister, he skirted them very nicely without giving me the real answers. I asked him about whether we'd in the near future just have degree teachers coming out, whether only degree teachers would be licensed and certified. I want to know just what is in store for the future for the next two or three years. What is the program going to be? Will we be further increasing qualifications that they will have to meet in order to get certification? Surely enough we should know because we can then base our assumptions, we can then base the costs, the increases that may come about. This is the other question that I posed to him in connection with cost increases in education in the future.

Then in replying he misconstrued what I had said completely, indicating that I was not in favour of having qualified teachers. Mr. Chairman, I've never said that we should license unqualified people as teachers; I've never indicated this, I've never mentioned it. How can he come in and say a thing like that? Certainly we know that the Act lays down certain qualifications that have to be met and this is what we are going by, so I would like him to correct this matter and not go on misconstruing what I've said.

Certainly this thing that when you have degree teachers teaching in all schools that this will increase costs, there's no doubt about it, and just by a teacher having a degree doesn't necessarily make him a better teacher. We have many teachers who are not degree teachers who are very able teachers, who are doing a wonderful job, and I feel that these teachers, why should they not remain, why should they not be able to retain their certificates. Is there going to be a requirement later on that these teachers will all have to meet higher standards at a later date? Surely enough these are fair questions. These are questions that should be answered so that we will know what we will have to contend with in the next two or three years.

I was interested in what the Member for St. Boniface had to say in connection with the French language. Certainly here again we have to retain our languages as people here with various backgrounds, otherwise they lose their culture. There's no doubt about that. If you want to retain a culture you have to be able to retain the language; in order to retain the language it has to be taught. The Mosaic Congress held here last summer, or last fall in Winnipeg, I think was a good idea. We had people from various groups present and there was very great understanding for each other and very good working arrangements between all the groups. I attended a number of these sessions and I certainly was impressed. I feel that the Ukrainians, likewise as the French and the German, should all be recognized and that we should get assistance so that these cultures can be maintained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, firstly, I'd like to comment on some of the remarks made by the Member for St. Boniface and I want to assure him, as I did try to last night to the Member from Emerson, that the Department is well aware of the need to move as rapidly as possible into the area of French language instruction. As I've reported already, we do have a staff and committees are already at work developing mathematics and science programs in Français at the elementary level. Additional committees will be formed, as a matter of fact are in the process of being formed I understand, for the evaluation of the materials, development of programs, and we expect at this September, September of '72, a number of pilot classes using French as a language of instruction will be in operation and that is anticipated for this coming September.

In the meantime, in order to help facilitate it, in order that it not be held back because

(MR. MILLER cont'd) of the usual requirements that the department has to go through everything and prepare everything, in the meantime school divisions wishing to proceed and who are able to proceed with projects, using programs and textbooks of their own selection or any materials of their own selection, are being encouraged and are being assisted to proceed with those projects so that there won't be a delay in the introduction of French as a language of instruction, because if you simply leave it to the department, we know that it takes very often two or three years before a program is developed and before new textbooks are made available, and with the multi-choices now that are going to be permitted, if a program can be conceived and brought forward then the department will approve it.

Plans are also under way to increase the number of French language programs on radio and television, and French films are being purchased that will be added to the library and hopefully they'll be in stock for this summer, or this fall, so that those schools that are ready to go can immediately start using them.

There is of course the problem of a shortage of teachers and this can't be corrected overnight. I'd hoped by now that the question of the French language teacher's college would be resolved. We have been working with the Federal Government and have been after the Federal Government now for, oh I guess it's a year and a half ever since I took office, to assure that that facility will be in Manitoba - St. Boniface. Unfortunately, the B & B Commission did not specify the province where that facility should be located. They said simply that there should be one in Western Canada and that I think was an error on their part. For the Maritimes they did designate the province where it should be located. For Western Canada they just simply said one for the three prairie provinces.

As a result, there have been numerous meetings between the three prairie provinces and there has been no agreement of mind on where the facility should be. The Federal Government, who I think in the final analysis should assume the authority, has tried to avoid it, and as late as last December when we met in Regina, the three ministers of the prairie provinces and the Secretary of State, we came to the conclusion that no agreement could be reached on a voluntary basis but that the Secretary of State to the Federal Government should be asked to appoint a committee of three people from outside the areas to review the matter and to make a recommendation.

This decision was agreed to at the meeting of the Premiers at the Prairie Economic Council in February. By resolution of the Prairie Economic Council the information was transmitted to the Federal Government and they then agreed, and it was agreed that the findings of this committee of three would be binding. It's now June and I don't believe the appointments to the arbitration board or the arbitration committee have yet been made. Names have been submitted, and within twenty-four hours after the names were submitted to me by the Federal Government I notified them that Manitoba was agreeable to the people being suggested. I gather that that agreement has not been accepted in other provinces. I think that's where the hold-up is, but whatever the hold-up is, it's regrettable that the matter is simply left in a state of suspension and nobody can go ahead as they should, because the key to a successful program of French language instruction is accessibility to a teacher training institution so that teachers can be trained.

We are trying as much as possible to get those teachers who are interested in furthering their French education to become more facile and more knowledgeable in the use of French as a language, to take training, and 25 Manitoba teachers will be attending summer courses in France this year under bursaries to take in-service training there. Of these, ten are English-speaking teachers who will be teaching French and the others, that is the 15, are French-speaking teachers who will be working in the Francais program. They will be leaving in July sometime - I think it's early July - for France, so we have 25 teachers and it's this sort of program which I hope will make it possible for both English teachers of French and the teachers in the Francais program to improve their facilities and their abilities in preparing the program and dealing with the question.

With regard to the development of programs in the Francais area, committees of teachers, who are being assisted by consultants, will be working on the development of programs. On the average, a committee consists I believe of about nine persons and they meet approximately 10 days during the year to help develop the program, and as I said earlier, it is the teachers who are in the field who can best contribute because they know what the problems are. And there are many teachers who are Francophones, they are native French, but because they

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) didn't take their training in the various disciplines of French, although they may be knowledgeable in mathematics I'd say or science, it is difficult for them and it requires adjustments to teach in French, and it will need considerable adjustment to be able to teach their subject in French although they may be very proficient in the subject matter itself.

As a matter of fact, one of the teachers who is in this program, or is himself French, made that observation to me, that although he is bilingual it is difficult for him to make that adjustment and that is why we are trying to promote in-service programs; that is why there is going to be summer schools of four to six weeks in length; and that is why these teachers are taking these courses in France under the bursary program which is sponsored by the Federal Government so they can improve their facility in the French language.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a group that you wish to introduce so I'll sit down while you make the introduction.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 31 Grade 8 students from Melita School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Reynolds and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

In the gallery to my left we have 60 pupils from Leonard Elementary School of 4 and 5 standing and these students are under the direction of Mrs. English, Mrs. Smith and Miss Vincent. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

We are presently discussing the Estimates or how much money they are going to spend on Youth and Education next year. On behalf of all honourable members I wish to welcome you to your Legislative Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: The Member from Rhineland informed me this morning that he is not prepared to let go and still feels that the people he represents - and he talks in two ways - he talks of the people he represents and then he talks about the farmers generally as if all Manitoba was non-unitary. I mentioned yesterday that with the inclusion of three of the non-unitary districts last year now becoming unitary, 95 1/2 percent of all students will now be within unitary districts, so that the suggestion and the applied suggestion that somehow he is speaking for all the farmers I think is somewhat incorrect. He may be speaking for that small percentage which still are in his area and which are operating non-unitary districts.

He asks about the Wilkinson report. It's known to me as it is to other members of this House. The Wilkinson report - Mr. Wilkinson came to Manitoba, spoke to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, and came up with the proposal, which he threw out at the convention, based on an ability-to-pay principle which was a form of income tax. It's a very interesting proposal but the province cannot do it on its own. This can only be worked if it's adopted by the Federal Government because it deals with the entire matter of taxation. It's another form of taxation, and whether one agrees with it or doesn't agree with it is really academic, because if I agreed with it 100 percent there is nothing I could do about it nor could any one province of Canada do anything about it. It is something that only the Federal Government through its tax policies and its taxation principles can deal with, so it was a very good after dinner speech he made but it really doesn't solve the problem nor does it come to grips with the problem.

He quoted some figures from B.C. about the fact that B.C.'s education budget is 31 percent of the provincial budget. I think you will find that in Manitoba a larger percentage than that of the provincial budget goes towards education. I don't remember offhand, I think it is around 34 or 35 percent. He did toss out some other figures and I would be very interested to know where he got them from. It sounds like a release of some kind, or a public relations release, and I have to say to him that I query and I'm dubious of some of the figures that he brought out there. I'm not saying he is incorrect in reading them, I'm just wondering about the source of this information and who published it.

He claims that people in the unitary divisions are not happy and that they have no voice in the unitary divisions. I'm not quite sure whether he meant that there should be some mechanism whereby the trustees once they made a decision that their decision should be overruled,

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) and if that is what he is talking about then it goes against the whole concept of our parliamentary system, the concept that one elects trustees just as they elect municipal councils, just as they elect provincial governments, and once having elected them they assume, and properly so, that these people will speak for them and they have to make decisions and make them. If the decisions are not satisfactory then of course the electorate in its traditional way, and one which I hope we'll always have in this country, will then take the obvious step and they will not re-elect them in the next election.

If he means that perhaps the number of trustees or the size of the boards are too small and there should be greater representation by having more people on boards, greater representation in that sense, I won't quarrel with him and I hope that we will be moving towards increasing the size of boards so that there can be greater cross-sectional representation. If he's talking in that regard, I'm with him; if he's talking as I say in the other, that there should be some veto power by some local group or some small group within a community that can override the school board or prevent them from doing certain things, then I think in the final analysis that would not help but that would hinder the development of education in Manitoba as it would hinder almost any action by any governmental body if that were the case.

He again asks about teachers and teachers' degrees and he asked what is the future portent, what is our eventual direction? Well firstly, I want to put his mind at rest. I never said, and I hope he couldn't read into any of my remarks, that teachers who are now in the field, because they don't have degrees that they will be decertified. I never said that; I didn't imply that; and I can't see how he ever even came to that thought because that is not the intention. If he's asking what the future portends, whether in the future more and more teachers will have degrees, the likelihood is that this is the case. The number of degree teachers in Manitoba has increased considerably as it has everywhere, and it's not an improper nor even inconceivable thing to suggest that the greater the education of the teacher, the greater his experience, perhaps the better and greater his teaching ability. Of course there are teachers - and I refer again to the first day that he spoke - he mentioned that teachers are born, but I want to again say to him that if we were to only staff our schools with teachers who are born teachers, who by virtue of their natural instinct and abilities make that kind of top teacher, that excellent teacher that everyone would like to see, if we were to wait for those teachers to be born, to educate our children only with those teachers, then education would grind to a standstill in Manitoba. There just aren't enough of them.

So when we talk in terms of improving the abilities of teachers, I don't think it's untoward nor wrong to think in terms of teachers having as wide a view of the world about them so they can impart this kind of view to their students. Teachers who can inspire their students, who can spark them, who can instill in them the curiosity which young children have and which young children should be encouraged to have, I think it makes sense that if teachers want to improve their qualifications and their abilities then we should not impede them in this direction; as a matter of fact we should encourage them in this direction. At the present time we have the two methods of achieving their recognition, a two year program beyond Grade 12 and the degree through the university,

There is not an immediate intention to eliminate the two year program; that may come, I don't know, but that isn't something that I can foretell. I think we have to play that very loosely, I think we have to judge what the needs are. For me to stand here and say to the Member for Rhineland it isn't going to happen would be misleading him, nor to say that it is going to happen would also be misleading him. We will simply have to see how these things develop.

I want to say to the Member for Rhineland that the people in the non-unitary divisions have chosen, have chosen to remain outside the unitary system. They still get their tax rebates whereas the farmers and residents, property owners in unitary divisions gave up that rebate when they went into the unitary division. The people he represents still get their rebate; they do not contribute towards the Foundation Program; they do not in any way contribute as I say towards the levy; so if they are finding it difficult, I would suggest they are not finding it perhaps any more difficult than most other people today. Last year when we lowered the Foundation levy by one mill and this year when we lowered it by one and a half mills, and when we infused more money into the Foundation Program, we did it in order to ease the burden on farm and residential property, and as I say, this covered most of Manitoba. The fact that the area, two of the areas that he represents have chosen to remain out of that, is a choice that they have

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) consciously made and consciously are living with. My hope is that they will recognize the need and the value of the unitary educational system, which I think is superior on the one hand and also if they are as concerned as they are I'm sure about costs, that they will also recognize the value of entering with the rest of Manitoba into the unitary system that is established here, and I think all other provinces, so that they, too, can become part of the mainstream of education in Manitoba.

I think I've answered all the questions he posed. If I've missed any I am sure the Member for Rhineland won't hesitate to remind me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I believe we're discussing the Minister's reduction in salary, and that it seemed to me with the marathon replies we're receiving that obviously a very keen wire has been touched because he's obviously very worried about whether or not it'll go through. Certainly he doesn't have to convince his colleagues by the lack of interest they're taking in what he's having to say because they're spending a good deal of time out of the House.

It's not my purpose to make a lengthy speech, Mr. Chairman, but rather just touch on one or two points. I noticed with interest that we were given an address this morning by the Member for St. Boniface. I suppose that is natural by the fact that he is the Legislative Assistant of the Minister who is addressing the House, and he gave us a word picture of his interest in French education in the Province of Manitoba - much of which we've listened to for many many years. I don't fault him for what he is endeavouring to do, but I noticed that the Minister followed through and explained the increased thrust of the department in this direction involving possible great expenditures of public funds and my only comment is that he did go on to say, amongst many other things, that this effort will require expenditures in books and staff and other material, including the purchase of French educational films which will be included in the library this fall. These films, I presume are going to be for TV coverage. It occurred to me in listening to that, Mr. Chairman, I wondered if the Minister would consider, or is he considering the provision of Ukrainian material of this particular type of film. I know the people of my area are predominantly Ukrainian and I'm sure with the television facilities that are available to them, that material such as this would be well received. I'd remind you, Mr. Chairman, that Ukrainian people make up the second largest group in the Province of Manitoba, and there are other groups, too, that I feel should be considered when we are thinking of expanding our form of education to take care of the several ethnic groups. I believe that their population, as such, demands that the government of the day and into the future, requires that they be recognized in this direction and be given the same consideration.

There's just one point further, Mr. Chairman, and that is I wonder if this kind of material could not be built up for the Indian and Metis people, many of whom I represent and certainly a great number of them throughout northern Manitoba. They have this TV facility now and I believe with the interest that is being taken in so many directions toward bettering their lives, I feel that the Minister of Education would be remiss if he did not consider the potential that this method of education can be to those people. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I notice that there's no special item in the estimates for the Public School Finance Board. Just under what item are the costs of this particular board charged? And in connection with the legislation that was passed here a year or two ago giving this board authority to acquire buses or any other facilities that they can hire or rent to divisions and bring about an exchange, have any facilities been acquired or what is the situation? Has any action been taken under this part of the legislation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that question, the purchase of school buses last year, the first year it was tried, was purchased centrally. Instead of each school division tendering and buying its own two or three or four buses, it was done centrally and I believe - oh, 90 odd buses were purchased last year and then supplied to the school divisions; and this is paid for, of course, by the Finance Board because this is part of the Foundation Program. -- (Interjection) -- It was one tender, yes. This policy is continuing this year. We have not yet moved into any other areas for central purchasing. We're looking at them, but there are problems involved in developing this sort of program and we won't move into it unless we feel that there is indeed a saving and that something can be gained by going into central purchasing.

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.)

The other question with regard to the Finance Board and their operation, it will appear under Item (4) in the estimates dealing with financial support, public schools. The budget, I think, of the Finance Board appears there, and I could deal with it when we come to that point.

Regarding what the Member for Swan River mentioned, I agree with him that more could be and should be and is being done in regard to the teaching of other languages. A program of studies for teaching Ukrainian has been developed with the co-operation of the Canadian-Ukrainian Association with whom we're working very close, and there is a case where I felt that again by using organizations such as the Canadian-Ukrainian Association we had access to people with qualifications and knowledge who could help develop programs much faster than if it was done in the traditional way through the department; and as a result of their efforts and in co-operation with the government we helped - by making grants available to them they have come forward with a program of studies in the Grade 7 to 12, I think, levels, which was far superior to what we had before. It includes tapes and that sort of material which can be used anywhere in the province where the teaching of Ukrainian is being contemplated or is now under way; and where the number of students warrants it and if the parents want it and if the school board wants it, they can introduce these programs. So this is certainly an area which is developing and which we are helping and encouraging in the development.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a procedure through which you can go if members - (Resolutions Nos. 104 and 105 were read section by section and passed) Resolution 106 (a) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the different allocations for the various universities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Minister indicated he'd be making a statement on university grants. The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, regarding universities, I indicated earlier in my opening remarks that I would like to make some special comments with regard to post secondary education and universities in particular.

As members are aware, costs of university education have risen considerably over the last few years, as has enrolment; costs, however, have risen at a greater percentage than enrolment has. This is not confined to Manitoba, this is the trend everywhere in Canada, and everywhere in Canada today there is a great deal of soul-searching going on about our universities, where we're heading for and what is the answer.

It is obvious now that there is a great demand by people everywhere from all walks of life for access to post secondary education. At one time the university was considered simply the institution where people went for full-time training and full-time enrolment was the most important aspect of university education. Today that is changing. It was estimated a number of years ago, I gather, that somewhere in the middle '70s that part-time enrolments might exceed full-time enrolment or at least equal it. Well, we've hit that now, where part-time enrolment is greater than the full-time enrolment. This is an indication that there is a demand by the public for access to post secondary courses; in many cases this is as a result of the fact that people in various businesses or professions or vocations realized that with the changes in their particular business or in their sphere of activity, in order to keep abreast of changes and developments they have to go back for refresher courses or they want to improve their knowledge in a specific field. This, I think, accounts for the fact that there are more enrolled at summer school now than ever before; there are more part-time students taking courses during the day and more enrolled in the evening courses; and the costs have reflected this. And, as I say, a great deal of soul-searching. I think we have to come to grips with this problem. Manitoba, a province of somewhat less than a million people now has three universities, and I needn't tell members that when you have three universities the costs are very very high.

A number of years ago an organization or a committee, if you want to call it that, known as IPCUR - the Member for Riel will, I hope, remind me what it stands for. It's the Inter-provincial Committee on University Rationalization, I think, consisting of the three prairie provinces that met to try to come to grips with the problem and see whether they couldn't somehow rationalize within the three prairie provinces, within the region, at least some commonality of approach whereby they could meet the needs of post secondary education within the regions rather than having each province go on its own. Unfortunately that hasn't been too successful and provinces have gone pretty well on their own in most areas. An example of

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) the kind of rationalization that could take place was the decision where Manitoba did not build or open a school of veterinary science; instead it decided that it made more sense to use the facility in one province, in Saskatchewan. This I think was a very sensible approach - the kind of approach that benefits everyone.

Unfortunately this same kind of thinking didn't prevail in other areas. Manitoba has an excellent school of architecture, but nonetheless Alberta has opened its own school in Edmonton and I'm now told that they're going to be opening a second faculty in Calgary. It's this sort of duplication and proliferation that I think has gotten us into trouble. As a result of that another committee was established and this time it was a committee which was to include the Ministers involved from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. We met once, we kicked this thing around, and we all agreed in principle that there should be some rationalization. We looked at the courses; we looked at the fact that it really wasn't too efficient to offer courses of low enrolments in all of the three prairie provinces and whether it made sense to consolidate some of these. So far it has been simply talk; nothing concrete has come out of it.

I'm not too critical of the universities themselves, because it is inevitable that under the pressures of rapid growth and the rapid growth which took place in the '50s and in the '60s which were generated by the community - I recall in this House and generally in the newspapers and community at large that the demand was for more and more expansion of the universities, and it is inevitable with that sort of pressure and with that sort of expansion that a rapid growth would ensue, and that each university, because universities are traditionally autonomous bodies who were somehow separate from the general educational stream, they certainly were not as dependent as they are now on the public purse, they had many sources of private income, but that each university under the pressures of the '50s and '60s naturally tended to think of its own expansion in isolation from other universities, not only outside the province but even within the province; so there has to be, and I think it's vital, that there should be greater co-operation and rationalization interprovincially and certainly intraprovincially. Interprovincially it's difficult because we have to have the co-operation of the other provinces; intraprovincially this is within our own house and if we can't resolve the problem here within Manitoba then I really can't see how we can resolve it on a regional basis.

As a result of the pressures that I mentioned and the universities tending to work in isolation from each other, and without suitable controls, very often unnecessary and I think undesirable duplications of programs and facilities must inevitably follow and it is this sort of thing I think we must now in Manitoba address ourselves to. We must become very concerned about it.

I think the universities have become aware of this. I get the feeling very much that the universities recognize that they must now work within themselves to examine what they are doing, what has happened in the last few years and to try to come to grips with the problem. In Manitoba here they work with the University Grants Commission who work very closely with the universities and are paying, I think, particular attention, they're trying to pay particular attention to a reduction - or I wouldn't say reduction - a restraint of costs because I don't think you can cut it, but perhaps to slow down the rate of expansion of costs, the acceleration of costs, a reduction of costs and looking in particular perhaps at those courses which are uneconomic in the sense that they're the low enrollment courses - they have value but if we have to look to priorities, then maybe the universities have to look at those priorities to determine what should continue and what perhaps should be discontinued or what can be developed in conjunction with other universities in order to eliminate duplication.

We are, of course, faced at the same time, while all this is going on, with a very real problem. Some members may be aware that we are operating under the Fiscal Arrangements Act which was entered into in 1967 between the Federal Government and the various provinces. That Act is supposed to expire, and will expire in 1972 - '67 to '72 - that's right. There have been a number of meetings at the Council Ministers' level; the Secretary of State visited Manitoba to discuss this; a proposal was put forward by the Federal Government that because they hadn't had an opportunity to fully explore and study the whole question of post secondary education, they suggested an extension of that program for two years, to 1974. Unfortunately, it wasn't a straight extension; it was a modification of the existing program and we in Manitoba and others in other provinces felt that this modification really was introducing a new concept, because what the Federal Government was saying was that they wanted to put a ceiling or a cap on their participation and they wanted that cap or ceiling established now. This meant that the

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) provinces could be faced with a very severe problem in that the Federal Government would be able to limit itself in their contributions, the provinces would be faced with an open end which they might not be able to deal with.

The last meeting which was supposed to finalize this matter was held in Montreal in May, I believe - yes, in May, May 7th, and at that meeting no resolution of the problem was arrived at and as of today I am in no position to state whether or not this agreement will be extended, whether in its present form or its modified form. There's absolutely no agreement; the Federal Government therefore has at the present time not indicated what it will do. I'm hopeful that as a result of the coming Constitutional Conference in Victoria, some of this information may come forward. If not, it may be included in Mr. Benson's Budget which everyone is awaiting and we will know at that time what the future for federal participation in post secondary education will mean. I do know this, that if the Federal Government withdraws from support of post secondary education, then the universities, the community colleges, all our post secondary institutions, will be in very very dire straits and the province will be faced with a massive problem which a province such as Manitoba with its limited fiscal abilities will not be able to cope with. So this is the background and the shadow under which we are trying to meet and deal with the whole question of post secondary education.

Now today it's true that there has been a slowing down of the growth at the university. For about four or five years the projected figures were achieved; in other words the growth at the universities did hit the figures that were anticipated. This year, for the first time, that figure was not reached and fell considerably short of its mark. This created a serious problem of course at the universities, because their staff had been hired based on projected enrolments, you can't hire people in September for the school term, you hire them in the spring, and a great deal of dislocation naturally resulted.

The explanation for the slump no one has yet been able to come up with. We don't understand it. We do know that the same thing has happened in Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia. On the other hand, the same is not the case in Eastern Canada where their projections were achieved and where their growth was maintained at the rate that they anticipated. So whether this is an aberration which will not occur again, I don't know, and we won't know perhaps until next fall whether this is a new trend or whether it's, as I say, an aberration which occurred this one year and will correct itself.

Perhaps some of it can be explained by the fact that the growth at the community colleges was far greater than anticipated. Perhaps many of the students who in the past traditionally looked to the university as their only natural step beyond secondary - this being the only way they could achieve further education - now recognize that the community colleges were a logical, a rational and a sensible road to follow and as a result the community colleges had an expansion, a growth of 40 percent which was far greater than we anticipated, and as a result we had problems at the community college level of course which were very difficult to cope with. I want to pay tribute to the people at the community college for the way they were able to respond literally at the last minute in September when enrolments were far greater than, as I say, they anticipated, where students appeared at the last minute, where staff had to be hired at the very last minute. They met the challenge, they met the needs of the students, staff was hired and they were able to start the year in September with the staff required to look after the increased enrolment of 40 percent with which they were faced.

They had another crisis in November when the Federal Government through Canada Manpower just advised us the first week in November that they were prepared to purchase 80,000 man hours of training providing Manitoba would and could meet this demand, and again the tribute I want to pay to the people who operate the program - by the end of November, in other words within three weeks, the program went on stream and in order to make it possible we extended the day at the community college and many of the classes were run between 4:00 in the afternoon and 10:00 at night, which I feel is the direction perhaps in which we should be heading and the one I'm trying to encourage, which is the total utilization of the facility.

At the universities there's obviously a need to establish guidelines relating to graduate programs. Graduate programs are the most costly in terms of per pupil cost -- (Interjection) -- Louder? Listen a little harder, it's easier that way. At the universities the need to establish some sort of guidelines with regard to graduate programs is absolutely essential. The one institution offering graduate studies in Manitoba today is the University of Manitoba and there's a very serious question that we have to address ourselves to - whether we should expand the graduate studies to other universities, whether a province the size of Manitoba can or should

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) expand graduate studies to its two other universities. Without giving my own views on it, I think it's something we have to watch very carefully because once you start on that path then I don't think there's any turning back and the costs will and must escalate then at the university where the graduate studies are introduced.

We also, I think, have to look very seriously at the length of our school term, or university term, whether 7 1/2 months makes sense today or whether it should be lengthened. Members have asked about utilizing the plant for longer periods. There is a movement in that direction. This summer it's expected that 9,000 students will be taking courses at the universities, so it is quite unfair to suggest that the facilities are standing idle for 5 1/2 months; they are being utilized. Perhaps not as much as they could be and a trimester system or some semester system is something that we should examine. It has been tried in other areas. It has not proven, as some think it will - and I want to caution them if they think that's the answer - it has not proven to be a money saver, that in fact where it has been tried the results indicate that there is an increase in costs. That doesn't mean we shouldn't go into it but I don't want people to look to this as a means of saving money, although it would mean that more students could avail themselves in a given year of the facilities and perhaps the problem of all students coming on the job market at the same time might be eased somewhat, and that is a plus factor which should be taken into account.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the government intends to do, that the best way would be to establish a committee to look at the entire question of post secondary education, the rising costs, the greater utilization of our facilities, and to see what we can do with the moneys available to rationalize and make more effective use of the facilities, examine the programs, examine where we're going. It is our intention, therefore, to establish a special committee for this purpose because we want to ensure both a fresh look and an objective look and to do that we will want to draw on people from outside the province, as well as inside the province, who have some knowledge of post secondary education, but who will not be handicapped by commitments to what exists, because I think this is one of the things we have to try to break out of, is the established patterns and practices which have been with us for so many years that we tend to follow them without really looking and examining whether indeed these same practices should be continued. So this committee, as I see it, would bring a fresh look at our universities and post secondary institutions generally, an objective look, without being in any way tied to any commitment or to any particular institution. I would expect that out of that, and would want sincerely, that out of that would come some very new and some very imaginative proposals with regard to post secondary education.

Other jurisdictions in Europe and elsewhere have moved towards universities without campuses and I think that is one avenue that we have to look at. That perhaps it isn't necessary any longer, in this day and age with communication being what it is, that people can take post secondary courses without a campus, without having to attend a given university in a given classroom but that it can be done through extension courses, through correspondence courses, through perhaps radio and TV, through other means, in order to meet the need, in order to satisfy the growing needs of a sophisticated society without constantly being locked into a traditional method of delivering that service.

We also have to examine whether the open enrolment is possible particularly if we stick to the present method of delivering the service. The University of Manitoba through its own planning and research capacity has suggested a freezing of 18,000 in the size of their enrolment. I don't know how they quite came to that figure, I haven't studied it but this is an area certainly that should be looked at. Maybe that limit is too high, maybe 18,000 is too high, maybe it's too low, but in any case we have to look at it, examine it and see what the impact is and what it means to those people who want to and should have an opportunity to participate and to receive courses at the post secondary level without being denied that right. And, of course, I'm one of those who doesn't believe that financial ability should be the yardstick by which a person measures his right to attend a post secondary institution. It should be the ability to absorb, the willingness to tackle the programs, the ability to succeed in the programs, rather than the financial ability to pay for those programs that should be the determining factor.

We have to examine, too, the question of research in our universities. There's no doubt that research brings into the province considerable sums of money, but we have to evaluate whether indeed the sum of money which is injected into the province through research grants, whether in fact we are ahead of the game in this regard or whether the results of

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) introducing research programs really places a far greater burden in the long run financially on the university; because once one accepts research money, one is committed, of course, to do the job of research, and it means that people who might be otherwise teaching, lecturing, are tied up in these research programs so that the university has to then provide staff to fill the vacuum which is created by people who are busily involved in research; and when the research programs are discontinued, as has happened in the last couple of years where the Federal Government simply arbitrarily decided its research funding will end, they simply end it; they don't consult, they end it. The universities are then faced with the problem of having been launched into a program of research, having been launched into a program of studies, having developed a staff and expertise in this field and then being left without the research funds to continue, so it adds a burden on the universities which I think we have to examine very very carefully.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal I am putting forward is that we will be establishing a committee that will be exploring and studying university education, post secondary education in Manitoba. The study group will be asked to look at all aspects of university functions, how they operate, whether the funds that are now being expended are being expended as efficiently and as effectively as they might be. We want them to examine as well the staff-student ratio and the teaching loads. We want them to examine the length of the academic year and the academic program; the utilization of the plant itself; the phenomena, which I don't think is any longer a phenomena, which is a fact of life, of what part-time enrolment will mean to the universities and how they can best adapt to it; how they can best make available their facilities for part-time enrolment; whether it, as I say, has to be done through the traditional way or whether it can be done through other means such as offering through extension courses, through correspondence courses, through perhaps even itinerant professors lecturing in various communities from time to time, because the demand for post secondary education is there and even though there has been a shift from the university to the community college, there is no question in my mind that post secondary education is now accepted by society as being essential to the development of any modern industrial society, which is what Canada is, and if Manitoba is to play its role then of course Manitoba can't fall behind in this regard.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I now welcome questions from the floor from members opposite if they so desire on university grants. -- (Interjection) -- I don't recall the question asked by the Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- The allocation to the various universities. Well let me see if I can just put my hand on that. Well, if the member will bide his time I'll see whether I can locate that for him at the present time.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Perhaps we could give the Minister a second here to find his appropriate place because there's going to be a number of questions on this item that will want to be asked and are probably all on the same page.

First of all, I want to raise a matter that I think is becoming serious in the estimates. I don't know if it's a matter of House privilege or not, but certainly traditionally, the Minister's philosophical position has usually been presented under his salary and then when we got to the item the members of the Opposition and members of the House were able to ask any specific questions to elicit information about the amounts of money shown in the estimates. The Minister is wandering so widely here in the general discussion that it's going to make it very difficult for us to get through the estimates in the allotted amount of time, because we're half gone now and it's pretty clear that the government is speaking about three hours for every one that the Opposition is asking in questions. We want to get through this and we've got a lot of questions to ask about education on the specific items. I raise it as a matter of I believe, I think House privilege, to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has raised it as a matter of House privilege. The Minister had indicated when he first presented his estimates that it was his intention to give his philosophical address relative to education in general and reserve the philosophical implications of his estimates relative to universities until the item pertaining to universities was presented, and there was no objection raised at that time. But the member's remarks are duly noted. The Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps while the Minister is looking up the information, I wonder on the University Grants Commission, if he could tell us how much capital has been shifted from the year ending March 31, 1971 to this year; there's a net reduction of two million, a little better than that, and I wonder if he could indicate what portion of that is capital so we've got some

(MR. CRAIK, cont'd.) means of comparing, because with this shifting going on in capital we can't tell how much more, how much less is going to universities.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, first may I say to the Member for Rhineland, I haven't got the breakdown for this - I assume he's asking for this year '71-72 - I don't have the breakdown between the three universities; I'll try and get this information for him this afternoon.

The question with regard to the capital - I think that was the question asked - in total there is \$16.6 million in capital of which \$9,108,000 is in current, \$7,535,000 is shifted - was in the Capital Supply Bill. That's the two figures totalling \$16.6 million.

MR. CRAIK: If it's eliminated - I'm just attempting to find out the ratios from last year to this year - if the capital is eliminated from both, how do the amounts compare? Have you any idea what the total capital was last year?

MR. MILLER: Last year the capital was included in the current; this year we broke with that practice and we transferred some into Capital Supply and some into Current, and that's why the figure shown here in the estimates shows a lesser amount because, as I say, 7 1/2 million is shown in Capital Supply. If you wanted to compare it, you could add 7 1/2 million to the 47 million which appears under the estimates, to come up with a total figure of 54.6 and that would be comparable to the 49.6 under last year. Do you follow that?

MR. CRAIK: That's assuming that last year's capital was the same as this year's. What we're really trying to get at is, what's the amount of the operating budget, exclusive of capital?

MR. MILLER: The operating budgets last year, 1970-71, were \$36,850,000; that was last year. This year, if you want to really relate the figures, it would work out to 40.35 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 106 -- pass? The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, the comments of the Minister and also the questions of the Member for Riel are most revealing. It has indicated something that to me has been a matter of concern for quite some time, and I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that really the Minister has very little control over the spending of the University Grants Commission, and I believe that this House is very uninformed as to the activities of the University Grants Commission. I realize that in the past there have been resolutions put forward asking that a special committee of this House be set up to study, or to have the opportunity of having the Board of Governors or the Senate of the university appear before a legislative body of this Chamber to explain their actions, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that such a move would be very valid at this time in light of the fact that, while the Minister's estimates indicate a two million dollar reduction, actually there's a five percent or greater than five percent increase in the expenditure in the University Grants Commission field, and this causes concern on this side of the House and also it causes concern in the eyes of the public. I think it would be most appropriate that if we could at this time establish a special committee of this Legislature so that they could in fact have the University board appear before them, that the information that could come out of such a meeting would be most beneficial. It would be beneficial to the university and it would also be beneficial to the public at large, because I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that lack of information causes doubt, and if the people have an opportunity, through the democratic process, to question, to interrogate and to seek answers to the many questions through such a committee, that the university would benefit and the people of Manitoba would benefit as well.

I have always been concerned about our increasing expenditure, Mr. Chairman, in the field of post secondary education. I believe that we have to establish priorities in education, and while the Minister has successfully moved a considerable portion of the funding from the estimates into the capital field, he in fact has an increase of five percent, while his estimates show an estimated five, 5 1/4 percent reduction. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that that may in fact not be enough. I think that the reduction should probably be greater than that, so therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that this committee consider the advisability of reducing Resolution No. 107 to the amount of \$44,640,000. I would like the House to consider the whole problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As it nears the hour of adjournment for lunch, I would like to take this amendment under advisement over the lunch hour.

I'm leaving the Chair, if we call it 12:30. I am leaving the Chair and will return at 2:30.