

Canadian Home and School Association. Nevertheless it seems to me this work would be more efficiently done by one agency to which all this information could be sent—an agency with the funds available to stimulate further research.

The situation in Canada is not very different from the situation in the United States, as far as the constitution is concerned. Education there is the responsibility of the individual states. Yet for many years the United States has had a federal office of education—an agency in Washington. The states have throughout carried on their own educational systems—there are 50 states with 50 educational systems—but there is also a central agency which tries to co-ordinate the work as best it can.

This idea that there should be a federal office of education in Canada was presented to the Prime Minister by a delegation from the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation in 1963. At that time the following report appeared in one of our newspapers. I quote from a Canadian Press despatch.

A parent-teacher delegation said Tuesday its proposal for a federal office of education has been endorsed in principle by Prime Minister Pearson.

The prime minister told the group, however, that the department could be established only if all provinces agreed.

The proposal was put to him by the 300,000 member Canadian Home and School Parent Federation, which also asked for federal-provincial co-operation in providing more resources for vocational guidance.

I would disagree with that statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). If the federal government wants to establish such an office to handle its own educational functions it has every right to do so. Whether or not the provinces wish to co-operate is another matter but I suggest many of them would wish to do so.

I think we should recognize the fact that the federal government is already deeply involved in education. When you spend more than \$250 million a year in a particular field, you are involved in it. This involvement will grow in the course of the years. Certainly if the report of the Bladen Commission is carried out the federal government will be heavily involved in education. We might as well accept this situation and create an agency in Ottawa to carry out this function of the federal government as usefully and as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Aiken: Would the hon. member permit a question? Does he see this office as a

Proposed Federal Office of Education
separate department or as a branch of the proposed Department of Manpower?

Mr. Prittie: I did not suggest that a separate department should be established. I am not much concerned about titles. I am more concerned about the functions to be performed. I think that initially this office would be a branch of another department—a secretariat of some sort.

Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): During the debate on the Speech from the Throne I had an opportunity to speak briefly on the subject matter of the resolution before the house today. I supported the idea that an office of education should be formed within a department of the federal government and I urged the establishment of such an office. I was interested to note that during the same debate the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska (Mr. Dubé) also spoke on the subject and made what I thought was a substantial contribution toward an understanding of federal participation in education.

● (5:20 p.m.)

I rise today to support enthusiastically the principle of the motion put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie). My only reservation is that perhaps the motion is too restricted. I would hope and expect that a federal office of education would be more than a clearing exchange, and that its interest in research and information would not be restricted solely to elementary and secondary education. I would hope and expect, too, that such an office would stimulate more and better research in the whole spectrum of education which has too long been starved for lack of research in Canada. I would hope and expect, further, that such an office would provide leadership, not just in post-secondary education but, in co-operation with the provinces, in every aspect of education in which there is a national interest.

My hon. friend referred to the United States office of education. What he did not say, but what might be interesting to hon. members, is that the United States has had such an office of education since 1867. I suggest that by 1967 it will be high time Canada had such an office.

It might be instructive to quote from a document published by the Committee on Education and Labour, of the United States House of Representatives, in July 1963:

Certainly education is a national concern. Undoubtedly, no democracy can long endure unless it develops a national policy regarding education. Even though the federal government has been