

Education

are acceptable at the national level do not really do what we expect them to do when they reach the local level.

I shall quote from an article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, written by J. Bascom St. John, who is probably the best known writer on education that we have. It is headed "Interference by Ottawa", and I should like to read a few paragraphs from it:

We are not objecting to the use of national revenues for the assistance and advancement of education. In the university field, the government's financial support is an obligation.

It is another thing, however, when without consultation and without constitutional responsibility, the Ottawa government offers a huge sum—so large that Ontario alone may be given \$75,000,000—

That is a very conservative estimate because we know already it is \$124 million:

—to build technical and trade schools throughout the country. If, with the Ontario government's share, which is another \$25,000,000, the whole amount were to be spent, it would be equal to more than a third of all that has been spent on school building since the war, in this province.

The effect of this gigantic financial pressure is to tip over the balance of the traditional educational program, and force it into a practical groove which hitherto the people of this province have not urgently wanted.

In other words, by spending money so often we may affect education when we do not want to. I shall conclude by reading other paragraphs:

We are not opposed to dominion government participation in the financing of education. It is a matter of national necessity that more money be provided for education, and this source is the logical one. However, Ottawa should not pick and choose what education it will support, laying down specific terms which must be met before the money is forthcoming, as it is doing with these technical schools, and as the provincial government is letting it do.

This is interference of the most blatant sort in the constitutional rights of the provinces in the field of education.

It goes on to say:

They should reject the money on these terms. But, if for the sake of the future of the national economy, or the security of the country, or for any other good reason, the dominion government should participate in educational financing, it ought to do so in a proper, constitutional manner.

There ought to be a legal contract between the dominion government and the provinces, and it ought to be framed so the provinces continue to control education.

That is important.

However, it ought also to provide for national planning of education, co-ordination of policies and programs, establishment of broad aims and means.

I am sure that is what the hon. member who moved the motion hopes would happen, that we would be able to establish broad national aims, and set our aims to meet what we are trying to do.

This was certainly recognized at the Canadian conference on education, which the hon.

member mentioned, at which there were several resolutions which indicated the necessity for a greater responsibility at the federal level.

In the *Toronto daily Star* of Wednesday, March 7, there is an article headed "Ottawa urged to set up department of education". It reads:

Canada should have a federal department of education, two teachers said yesterday at the Canadian conference on education.

Max Bedford, Saskatoon teachers college professor, said the nation could start with a national advisory committee to the federal cabinet, later work up to a ministry.

There is another headline "Ottawa 'must' pay part of costs of education". This is a Canadian Press dispatch and it reads:

Constitution or no, the federal government must pay some of the costs of education.

That was the obvious sentiment that emerged from the five day discussions of the second Canadian conference on education.

Dr. Penfield, who is very well known in this field, and who was the principal speaker at the conference, was quoted in an article headed "Penfield urges national forum for education"—

Mr. Brunsten: Never mind the headlines. Read the article. The headlines are written by people who don't know.

Mr. Pitman: I do not want to take up the time of the house in reading these articles as I realize there are other hon. members who wish to speak. I hope the motion now before the house will be passed. We must deal with the problem of education at the national level. We must gain a measure of efficiency in what I think is the most important resource that we have in this nation, the minds of our young people.

Mr. H. M. Batten (Humber-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I think it is timely to have a discussion on a resolution of this type and I commend the hon. gentleman for proposing the resolution to the house. I suppose it is true that across this country people are generally aware that constitutionally and traditionally education has been the business of the provinces. However, I think we have reached the stage in this country when we must recognize the fact that, while education is the responsibility of the different provinces, there is at the same time a national aspect to it.

I hope the time will come when, even though education is under the control of the different provinces, we reach the point of being able to say that there is something Canadian about our own education. Over the years people in different countries have come to respect, for example, the educational system in Britain. There is something distinctly