

standards and affluence. The poor areas do not have enough money to spend on teacher training, buildings, equipment, curricula, development, and so on. The students are disadvantaged because of this, and the gap is growing wider. The same can be said from country to country and, as in our case, from province to province within a country.

About one year ago the *Globe and Mail* contained an excellent article about the lack of educational opportunities for Métis and Indians and how the lack of a suitable educational system had a negative effect on the future they could build for themselves. I would have been much happier to support this motion if the word "norm" had been used instead of "uniform standards". I think a standard applies undue rigidity. It also applies an autocratic superimposition upon the student of a particular area. The public regard it as a box in which all children, regardless of ability, are squeezed. We stamp-out a particular product, like cookies. If we had a minimum norm for all children it would be extremely useful to students, parents and teachers.

As long as we look upon norms as being voluntarily accepted, they will be valuable as objectives. They are of value to parents and students to compare the quality of education in a particular district with the national minimal norm. If one area is below the norm, parents can bring certain pressures on the local educational system to have it at least brought up to the minimum standard. It would be useful to have this pointed out.

When talking about norms, we should consider special norms for disadvantaged groups. Children in some areas do not have the same educational advantages nor the social, domestic or home advantages. This is reflected in their level of achievement in school. If we had minimum norms for these people it would be very useful. There could be a special norm for certain ethnic, immigrant minorities. We cannot expect everybody to jump over the same hurdle at the same time. We do not expect this in athletics, nor should we expect it in education. There could be special norms for Métis and Indians who are so often out of their own depth. It is very tragic when Indians and Métis, who have reached a certain level in their schools, come to an urban school and find that they cannot "hack it" because their educational background is insufficient. This would be helpful in assisting these disadvantaged groups.

I do not agree with the hon. member for Algoma that education per se will solve the problems of all people. I do not agree that a high educational standard necessarily means a high economic standard or high standard of living. I do not know whether it is a cause or effect. It may be that a high economic standard produces a high standard of education. It is like the chicken and the egg. I am not convinced it is necessarily so.

We have tended to oversell success through education. In the past few months many people have placed their faith in being highly educated, only to find that the economy of our country is not sufficiently developed to absorb them. Ph.Ds and others with high academic qualifications are joining the ranks of the unemployed.

National Education Standards

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is nodding in agreement. I know that he believes in this because he has mentioned it in the House many times.

There is a fundamental disillusionment with universal literacy. We thought that when literacy became universal everybody in our country would suddenly become very interested in politics, that they would become leaders, and that sort of thing. However, people are becoming influenced, not by the press but by the listening media. Mr. McLuhan has had some interesting things to say about this subject.

I think the motivation behind this motion is positive and goes in the right direction.

Mr. Comeau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Rose: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Comeau: Does the hon. member think that grade 11, for example, should be recognized as grade 11 from one province to the next? This is what I think is meant by uniform standards in the sense that credits are not lost in moving from one province to another.

● (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Rose: I am pleased the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) has risen on this point. He asked whether I believed this. I was not certain, after his speech, what he believed. I would be prepared to say that grade 11 is grade 11; it should mean 11 years in school. We should not rule that grade 11 means the successful passing of one particular course as opposed to another when one course might not be suited to a student's particular talents. I should like to go into a great deal more detail on that point, but time will not permit.

Employers have been unduly impressed by certain documents such as certificates and diplomas. I do not believe education makes a person intelligent. I do not think education has anything to do with intelligence. Education provides a certain amount of verbal facility, perhaps, but it does not make a person smart. There are many young people who do not possess the standard academic qualifications yet they are capable of making an excellent contribution to society. Too often they are ruled out because they do not possess a union card or a certificate of education. Employers deduce from this that they lack ability. I do not think this is necessarily so. Moreover, school is often not the best place in which to store people for 11, 12 or 15 years. We are foolish if we suggest that education ends when we leave school. Frequently, far more education takes place out of school than inside it.

An hon. Member: You are talking it out.

Mr. Rose: I shall not talk the motion out. I cannot, in any case, because I am limited to 20 minutes. If there are no further interruptions, I shall end in a few moments; otherwise I shall ask the Speaker to subtract the time taken by interruptions from the total time available to me.