

education in their mother tongue, a social and cultural tool they inherited from their parents.

Of course, this problem goes much beyond the present constitution which gives the provinces autonomy in the area of education. I think a provincial conference would be required to ensure equal opportunities to all Canadians in the tongue of their choice.

I should like to raise another point, which is perhaps more important: the Federal government employs some 275,000 public servants, and recently the adoption of a decentralization policy was announced. We do not have any Canadian government administration school designed to train civil servants. I think the development of a school of this type, like the one they have in France, might be worthwhile.

Of course, efforts are being made by the Treasury Board and the public service, but I do not believe they are very successful; the CAP program, intended for a few hundred persons per year, enables them to develop and better themselves and then reach higher levels.

And I am concerned about the decentralization factor, because in order to have a balanced public service throughout Canada with similar standards, we must set up a government administration school. I hope my suggestion will be looked upon favourably in the government administration.

The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) pointed out that the federal government had shown some interest in education. I believe some remedial action is required. One must remember that from 1955 to 1968, the federal government really showed interest in technical education. Through federal subsidies, it enabled the provinces to build composite and trade schools. Such a move was designed to satisfy a Canadian need in the matter of technology and technical sciences, a really pressing need, and the participating provinces obtained federal grants for the construction of composite schools which provide a wide range of technical options and enabled the student to further an education that was formerly considered as possibly incomplete. We know that a technical school was considered as second rate, but it was no more true than it is today. A technician, a technologist is also a first class citizen. It is no sin for a man to labour in his vocation. And not everybody can go to university and get a doctorate or a degree. I feel that this federal program carried out in co-operation with the provinces was successful; it was undertaken under the government of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), more specifically from 1955 to 1957. Millions were spent. Why is it, for instance, that even today it is impossible for our minority schools in Ontario to obtain French textbooks, teaching audio-visual aids, films and slides, all that necessary teaching material? Because provincial budgets are limited by ceilings, and often federal grants to bilingualism are not given in addition to them but included in them, which to my mind is not fair. It is time to put a stop to that practice whereby provinces include in their general budgets federal funds intended for specific purposes. It is also time that the provinces gave some attention to the educational needs of minorities, perhaps those located in areas such as that of the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate and Ontario. Those problems are acute, important; the

Education

provinces, in conjunction with the federal government, could sit at the table and discuss them. As the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate said, this motion does not bind the government; it only expresses an intention, a proposal, which proposal I endorse.

● (1620)

[English]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in my view there is no argument against the proposition that a Canadian is a Canadian regardless of where he lives in this country. I think it should be a main objective with us in Canada to make sure this is a country in which opportunities for a good life are as equal as they can be right across the land. That is why some of us are such strong advocates of universal programs in terms of pensions and social security; that is why some of us are such strong advocates of other government programs which raise the level of living and other standards all over Canada.

I fully agree with the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) that basic to all this, basic to the possibility of our attaining equality of opportunity, is the whole question of human resources and in particular the equality of educational opportunity. Even though the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Gauthier) did offer the odd note of criticism here and there, he ended by offering to second the motion put forward by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate and to support the idea that the federal government and the provinces should sit down together and discuss the whole question of human resources and educational opportunities across Canada.

This is the type of motion, I must say, which has been introduced a good many times in various forms during the years I have been here. However, that does not detract one iota from my desire to commend the hon. member for presenting his motion this afternoon. I am glad that thus far we are all in favour of it and I hope that even yet, despite the tradition of what happens to private members' motions in private members' hour, it just might get passed, and in doing so the House of Commons might say to the government: We think this is a good idea, an idea upon which you should act.

Mr. Ian Arrol (York East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the motion introduced by my hon. friend from Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) but with some slight difference in emphasis. I feel that formal education is highly overrated. I feel that the idea of formal education for all up to grades 12 and 13 is a failure. I suggest there is no necessary correlation between the amount of formal education a person has received and the worth of that person as an individual or his success financially. Success is not related significantly to the level of education. I hate to say this, but all modern research shows it: success is related to home background. The output of a school, no matter what facilities it has, is closely related to the backgrounds of its pupils when they enter. If they enter school unaware of literature, and so on, insensitive to it, that is, unfortunately, the way they leave.