

Rose) belongs has had such a lot of trouble ironing out their Quebec policy. But I am confident that no matter how many conferences or committees study our Constitution, the provisions relating to education will remain intact.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Woolliams:** The motion does not say that we cannot get the ten provinces together at a conference in order to iron out—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Is the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Rose:** To ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, my time is limited. I have listened intently to the distinguished member for Fraser Valley West and I do wish he would give me a few moments. As far as his argument is concerned, every member of this House climbs the political ladder. Although he endorsed the motion, like many politicians he was climbing the ladder but proving himself wrong by wrong by wrong. As far as this motion is concerned, he defeated his own argument by his own intelligence—his highly-developed intelligence, I might say, since he is one of the best scholars in this House.

So the reason the motion was worded in this way is because of the Constitution. To the provinces was delegated jurisdiction over education. Therefore, I submit the motion is properly worded. The gist of both speeches on this side is that the hon. members were asking for the same thing but by a different method. The hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) was absolutely correct in putting the motion in the way he has.

I support the idea that has been put forward in the motion. We are becoming more nationalistic today. We are entering a period where people move much more from place to place. Members of Parliament who have young families have to move from British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, as I did myself some years ago. My children are a little older now, of course, and I have grown a little older myself; but when students from Alberta come to Ontario they almost have to start a new course of study. This is what the motion is trying to cure. Perhaps I am being disrespectful to my own province in saying this, but when my daughter came to Ottawa, although she had been an accelerated student in her class in Alberta she found she was at the bottom of the heap here and had to work hard to catch up. The elementary curriculum in Ontario is of much higher standard than it is in Alberta. This is what the hon. member is seeking to cure.

I hope that government members will endorse this motion and not talk it out. Uniformity is a matter that is important to the welfare of our youth, particularly to the education of our youth. This is why I endorse the motion. It is drawn in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement reached at confederation; it is in accordance with the terms and conditions of our constitution; it is also in accordance with the needs and demands

#### *National Education Standards*

of our young people who require uniform standards of primary and secondary education across the country.

In view of the arguments put forward, I hope the House will now move to adopt the motion so that the government is moved to gratify the desires of the hon. member who was motivated to prove it.

**Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, the intervention of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has inspired me to say a few words on this motion, though not with any intention of talking it out. However, I have been left with so little time that perhaps I shall not be able to complete all my remarks in the time allotted to me, in which case I shall look forward to continuing them the next time this important notice of motion comes before this chamber.

My opening remarks are to express the gratitude of the House for the thoughtful care with which the hon. member for Calgary North clarified the careful thoughtfulness of the motion moved by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), and we are indebted to him. Most of us understood the motion before the clarification, but since we have had this clarification we can now deal with the motion itself.

In his remarks the hon. member for South Western Nova was correct when he pointed out that whenever we in this House embark on a discussion of education we are always careful to point out that jurisdiction over this field is clearly with the provinces. He made that point and all other speakers have confirmed it. He also made a fairly good case for common standards of education across the country—not, as he said, where there is one history book and one geography text. Like the rest of us, he claimed that he would support a system which allowed for the maximum degree of diversity along the lines suggested so cogently in the Hall-Dennis report.

He then went on to make a very interesting and fairly compelling case for the calling of a conference to discuss such standards. I share the views of the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) that a conference is perhaps not the best forum. I suggest this would really fall to the council of ministers of education. I think that the step the hon. member took in the interval between his previous address to the House and his speech today, namely, if writing to provincial ministers of education and making the submission to which he referred, is a constructive and useful one.

The hon. member also made the point, and made it very well, that in a federation children raised in one province should not be penalized academically if for one of a variety of reasons the head of the household is transferred. I feel strongly that this is the sort of thing that could well be discussed by a council of ministers of education.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order. The private members' hour having expired, I now leave the chair until eight o'clock.