

The Public Funding of Private Schools in Ontario: The Setting, Some Arguments, and Some Matters of Belief

Bernard J. Shapiro¹

the ontario institute for studies in education

Private schools in Ontario receive no direct public subsidy, but there are several arguments that they should. The commissioner who examined these arguments and their consequences suggested that the financial cost of funding private schools should not decide policy (Ontario could afford the extra cost) but rather social justice reasons, especially the parents' right to decide on the kind of education. Arguments for special groups should be balanced against social cohesion. The constitutional argument might imply that discrimination exists unless private schools are partly funded. The commissioner concluded that at least minimum standards should be maintained for all private schools, and suggested how society and parents could be sure of this.

Les écoles privées en Ontario ne sont pas directement subventionnées par les fonds publics, mais plusieurs arguments justifient qu'elles devraient l'être. Le commissaire qui a examiné ces arguments de même que leurs conséquences considère que les raisons qui expliquent que les écoles privées ne sont pas subventionnées par l'État ne sont pas tant des raisons financières (l'Ontario pourrait se permettre de payer les coûts additionnels d'une telle politique) mais plutôt des raisons de justice sociale. Un équilibre devrait exister entre la satisfaction des besoins de certains groupes sociaux et la réalisation d'une cohésion sociale. L'argument constitutionnel pourrait supposer qu'il existe une discrimination à moins que les écoles privées ne soient en partie subventionnées. Le commissaire a conclu que des normes minimales devraient être maintenues pour toutes les écoles privées et il a fait des suggestions quant à la façon dont la société et les parents pourraient s'assurer de ceci.

THE SETTING

There are two publicly funded school systems in Ontario both responsible to locally elected Boards of Trustees. These are the board of education schools (frequently referred to as *the* public schools) and, at least through Grade 10, the Roman Catholic separate schools. In addition, in 1984–85, there were, in Ontario, 535 private elementary and secondary schools serving 87,126 students. Of the 535 schools, approximately 48% and 24% were elementary and secondary schools respectively while the balance offered programs at both levels. Analyzed from another perspective, 70% of the Ontario private schools enrolling 80% of the private school students were private schools with religious definition. Finally, enrolment

data reveal growth in the Ontario private sector in recent years. Thus, in the period 1973–83, elementary and secondary private school enrolment increased by 60% and 90% respectively. In 1973, private school students represented 2.3% of the total number of elementary and secondary students in Ontario. In 1984, the comparable percentage was 4.7%.

Although Ontario private schools do not have access to either local education taxes or direct provincial grants for operating or capital expenses, it would not be correct to conclude that these private schools receive no public assistance. Most of the direct aid programs (e.g., access to the ministry of education's book purchase plan) are, however, quite minor in scale. Of greater importance is the indirect aid to private schools in the form of exemption from property taxes on non-profit schools, income tax deductions for tuition attributable to religious instruction, and income tax deductions for charitable purposes. The annual cost to the public treasury of these indirect programs – at the local, the provincial, and the federal levels – is not known. In fact, this cost is very difficult to estimate, for such an estimate would depend on currently untested assumptions such as the market value of private school properties, the marginal tax rates of parents receiving tuition tax receipts and parents or other contributors receiving tax receipts for charitable donations, and the proportion of tuition attributable to religious instruction. Moreover, in each area, there would be wide differences among individual private schools although the aid programs clearly favour those schools with a religious orientation. In a paper prepared for the Commission on Private Schools in Ontario, Lawton suggests that the actual level of aid "amounts to about one-sixth of the average total in cost per pupil enrolled in a private school" (Lawton, 1985, Appendix D). This seems a conservative estimate, and there are certainly some individual private schools where the aid level is at least twice Lawton's average estimate.

There is, of course, no absolute answer to how much public monies should be used to support the education of persons attending elementary and secondary schools not owned or operated by government bodies. In a democratic and heterogeneous society, any existing policy in this area is the result of the interaction of many factors, and the current arrangements can and should be expected to alter over time. Further, in considering what – if any – change or changes would be appropriate currently for Ontario, one cannot look to other jurisdictions or the available research results for easy guidance. With regard to other jurisdictions, their experience, although often informative, is always conditioned by their special social and cultural history. Therefore, extrapolation to Ontario – even from other Canadian provinces – can never be either single or straightforward. With regard to the available research, there are

two problems. First, although the pace of inquiry has quickened recently, research in the area of private schooling has not, in fact, been extensive. Thus, the results of the research tend to be fragmentary and suggestive rather than cumulative and definitive. Second, the *facts* yielded by research studies cannot in themselves respond to the public *policy* question of whether to provide more public funds to private schools. The response to such a question is not so much a matter of facts as it is a matter of *values*.

Nevertheless, the decision of the Ontario government (in June, 1984) to fund Grades 11 to 13 of the Roman Catholic separate schools refocused public attention on the funding of private schools – at very least those private schools which were religiously defined. The Commission on Private Schools in Ontario was established by the provincial government and, during the course of its work, the commission received 514 written briefs. In terms of public policy preferences, the writers of these briefs represented a very wide range of options – all the way from the full funding of all private schools to the withdrawal of public funds from all schools, public or private. What were the most common arguments put forward to the commission for these various views?

THE ARGUMENTS

The most common arguments put forward in support of the public funding of private schools were the following.

1. Not only should parents be able to choose school environments that affirm and extend their own values, but they also have a prior right to select the kind of education they believe appropriate for their children. The function of the state is – within recognized limits of costs and standards – to enable parents to choose, free from financial constraints – constraints which now threaten, through the economics of schooling, the right of many parents to choose a private school.
2. It is discriminatory and, therefore, inappropriate for Ontario to continue to offer to its Roman Catholic community an educational option not offered to all other Ontario communities – at least to all other Ontario communities that are religiously defined.
3. Parents who choose to send their children to private schools should not have to bear the “double taxation” of paying both private school tuition fees and their share of the education taxes in support of the publicly funded schools.

These arguments were urged not only on the grounds of justice but also with repeated reference to the view that public goals can be realized in

many ways. It must, therefore, be recognized that diverse communities have, within them, different preferences for educational goods and services, thereby creating a need for different models of school organization. Thus, while education should be public in its finance and opportunity structure, it need not be public – or at least exclusively public – in its organization. Finally, it was suggested that the current near-monopoly of the state in elementary and secondary schooling reduces competition, raises costs, lowers efficiency, and degrades the quality of the product delivered while, at the same time, imposing majoritarian ideologies and life-styles and making dissent less legitimate. By contrast, the commission was assured that the provincial funding of private schools would ensure the diversity appropriate to a pluralistic society (compulsory education never implied that all children be schooled in the same way); reconcile individual freedom with majority rule, the very difficulty that has so bedevilled efforts of boards of education to act as a socially cohesive force; stimulate competition and, therefore, quality; rid parents of double taxation; and allow the free exercise of conscience and religion within all income levels. Moreover, the existing public school system would not be threatened by this policy change since those making the argument envisioned no large-scale enrolment shifts from public to private schools as a result of any decision to provide new and provincial funding support to the latter.

Forceful counter-arguments were also presented. The three most common of these arguments were:

1. that, whatever one's view in principle, the current financial constraint on the Ontario treasury and, consequently, on the funding of public schools makes any extension of public funding to private schools inappropriate – at least at this time;
2. that allowing the use of public funds to support and create private schools, many of which by their own admission would be segregated along lines of, for example, religion or class, would be unwise since it would sanction the isolation of students in homogeneous groups and thereby not only abandon the advantages of a common acculturation experience but also foster a tendency among the students to think of other people as outsiders – an invitation to prejudice and intolerance;
3. that support of private schools erodes the financial and ideological support for public schooling, and this, in turn denies equality of educational opportunity to large groups of students by fostering a two-tier system of schooling inimical to the democratic traditions that public schools are intended to serve.

In support of these arguments, reference was made not only to the

various financial restraint programs of the provincial government but, more importantly, to the experience of other jurisdictions – most frequently of Australia and Great Britain – where private schools are seen to have played a major role in keeping alive and legitimizing the ideology of class and, therefore, in exacerbating the divisions in society. Overriding all these concerns, however, was a commitment to the public schools as a source of common (not in the sense of *low* but in the sense of *shared*) experiences and common opportunities and, therefore, at least potentially, of a socially integrating sense of purpose. This view stressed the great extent to which private schools were seen as catering to individual needs rather than the social ends of public policy. No claim was made that the rights of individual students and their parents were irrelevant. What was, however, emphasized was the likelihood that only in the public schools and through the public schools could social decisions be funded and reinforced. Those who argued against the public funding of private schools also suggested – since the custom-tailored can be expected to fit better than the ready-made – that such public funding would result in substantial shifts in enrolment away from the public schools, probably removing from the public constituency the most articulate parents, those most likely to champion change, development, and improvement in the public schools themselves.

In terms of the three most common arguments advanced by the proponents of public funding for the private schools (i.e., parents' rights, discrimination vis-à-vis the province's Roman Catholic community, and double taxation), the double taxation argument, although psychologically strong (a private school parent is, in fact, paying both a tuition bill and education taxes in support of the publicly funded schools), is nevertheless without real merit. First, the argument arises at least partly as an unintended consequence of a tax system which happens to itemize certain education levies but not other objects of public tax expenditure. Second, the argument confuses an education tax with a tuition bill, which is not the case. What the education tax represents is a general levy in support of what society has identified as a common good, a public school system. The raising of this or any other tax does not entitle a citizen to an opting-out process. Decisions concerning the raising and allocation of tax revenues are political decisions, and legal redress is available to individual citizens only through the periodic election process and the courts. Finally, the double taxation argument would seem to imply that: citizens without children (and, perhaps, citizens without children currently of school age) would not be expected to pay education taxes; that citizens with more than one residence are – or at least might be – not only double-taxed, but triple-taxed, quadruple-taxed, etc.; and that citizens' education taxes

should be in proportion to the number of their children. Each option is, of course, a potential public policy but not one is supported by any individual or group proposing the double taxation argument itself.

The argument arising from parents' rights is, it seems, somewhat stronger. Parents are the first educators of their children and their continued active involvement in their children's schooling can contribute mightily to its success. Further, it is reasonable to suppose that providing parents with a greater range of choice and, therefore, increasing the chances that they will identify closely with the option selected will, in turn, increase the likelihood of active engagement in their children's schooling. Finally, in a democratic society, individual choice is valuable for its own sake. On the other hand, although the idea of choice is important, it does not in itself define self-government or democracy as there are, for example, some things (e.g., slavery) which a democratic society cannot reasonably choose. Thus, I would *favour* the enhancement of parental choice without regarding such a choice as a *prior right*. Rather, parental choice is a desirable objective but one whose claims must be measured against the competing claims of other social policies and goals.

In contrast to this rejection of the double taxation argument and only partial support for the argument from prior parental rights, the argument against the status quo on grounds of discrimination against non-Roman Catholics is very strong. On moral grounds, limiting public support to Roman Catholic schools seems indefensible, for the constitutional provisions usually advanced to justify the special status of such schools serve only to describe its history. They do nothing to inform us about what we *ought* to do. In terms of this moral choice, it does seem inappropriate for Ontario to continue to offer to its Roman Catholic community an educational option not offered to other communities as well. It is true that a strict application of equity in this matter *might* limit any extension of this option to other religious communities, but the public good will not be served by involving the provincial government in decisions as to whether or not particular communities are to be considered as religiously defined.

On legal/constitutional as well as on moral grounds, the special status of the Roman Catholic schools is discriminatory. The relatively permissive nature of s.93 of The British North America Act – it specified only which schools must be funded and not which others could or could not be funded – when read together with the anti-discrimination provisions of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* provides a strong argument for the extension of public funding to private schools. The strength of this argument is increased by the recent extension of public funding to the secondary Roman Catholic schools since this appears more clearly an act

of political will than fulfillment of a constitutional obligation. The government is, of course, clearly entitled to exercise this political will but not on a discriminatory basis. On the other hand, the arguments for maintaining the unique status of the Roman Catholic separate schools do not seem convincing. Thus, for example, the argument from the large size of the Roman Catholic community, while of some political and, perhaps, economic interest, is not convincing on either moral or legal grounds. Similarly, the argument from historical and constitutional status is, as suggested above, unconvincing morally. Further, its legal basis seems firm only if one suggests that a publicly supported denominational school system was an unfortunate historical mistake, one which may have to be supported or tolerated but which certainly should not be repeated. Given, however, the recent Canadian constitutional exercise during which the historical policy with regard to denominational schools was reaffirmed, the historical-mistake argument seems unconvincing with regard to the development of public policy. Since Ontario appears much more than casually determined to maintain and fund publicly the Roman Catholic schools, only very strong arguments about other public benefits could justify a continued policy of discrimination against private schools from other than Roman Catholic communities.

In terms of the three most common arguments advanced against public funding of private schools – social cohesion and tolerance, equality of educational opportunity, and spending priority – the spending priority argument is of little merit. Interestingly, the two most common premises of this argument are acceptable – that the public schools should be the priority public investment in education and that, at present, the public schools are underfunded. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded that as a matter of public policy there should, therefore, be no extension of public funding to private schools – funding estimated at no more than \$200 million annually, compared to the \$6.5 billion per annum already being expended on the public elementary and secondary schools in the province. Further, since educators are fully engaged in maximizing the funds to be made available to their work and then fully expending these funds in the interest of their students, it is hard to imagine a funding context in which the public school community – or any other school community – would see itself as having sufficient financial support to enable the funding of other systems to assume a first priority. The spending priority argument must therefore be rejected.

The social cohesion argument is on stronger ground. The argument has two facets. First, it posits the need, in a heterogeneous society, for more rather than fewer common cultural touchstones, arguing that the public schools (rather especially the board of education schools) represent

the only institutional vehicle for providing a common but non-commercial experience for young Ontarians of, at least potentially, widely different personal and family backgrounds. While sympathetic with this view, I recognize that in many actual settings (e.g., the neighbourhood school or the separate school) the student body of a particular public school may be quite homogeneous. Nevertheless, a society should strive to realize some common socialization experience, and public schools represent the most likely setting for this effort. It is not easy to imagine that largely segmented schools will lead to a cohesive social environment, though one cannot totally dismiss the alternative minority group argument that common settings can hurt their distinctive needs.

The second aspect of the social cohesion argument relates to tolerance. It is argued that, in a multicultural society, tolerance is among the supreme civic virtues. It is, however, the unfortunate experience that, with some exceptions, schools – whether public or private – do not actually take this matter seriously in developing their own programs. Public schools too easily assume that the mere physical presence of various groups within their student bodies somehow, of its own accord, breeds tolerance and understanding. On the other hand, private schools, most of which are religiously defined, rather too easily assume that piety produces good citizenship without taking into account that, for at least a number of religious groups, the claim to universality often means the spiritual repression of other religions and cultures. It must, however, be admitted that no one knows just which schooling experiences will produce understanding and tolerant adult citizens and that, from the point of view of minority groups, large-scale common settings are often repressive settings. One cannot help but recall, for example, Ryerson's own opposition to cultural diversity when he wrote in 1846 about the arrival of the Irish Catholic victims of famine:

It is therefore of ... importance that every possible effort should be employed to bring the facilities of education within the reach of the families of these unfortunate people that they may grow up in ... industry and intelligence ... and not in the idleness and pauperism, not to say the mendicity and vices of their forefathers. (Ryerson, 1984, p. 300)

Nevertheless, in the absence of sure knowledge, it does seem plausible that tolerance and understanding will more likely arise from settings in which various groups are interacting rather than segmented and segregated – whether voluntarily or otherwise. Indeed, if the opposite is true, that is, if familiarity breeds contempt or, what is worse, contamination, then the very concept of a multicultural and pluralistic society becomes a contradiction in terms. Thus, I would argue that the context of the public

school represents, whatever its past failures, the most promising potential for realizing a more fully tolerant society.

With regard to the equality of educational opportunity, I agree with those advising against the funding of private schools. One of the historic missions of the public school has been to act as a kind of social mobility ladder for young people who do not bring to schooling special advantages of background, experience, and/or wealth. It cannot be claimed that this mission has always been achieved and that the public schools have always risen to Thomas Jefferson's historic call for an "education to enable every man to judge for himself what will secure or endanger his freedom." Indeed, it is often observed that the public schools help reinforce and maintain the high status of the exchange rather than the utility of credentials. This inevitably results in a hidden curriculum that favours the middle class and harms working-class children and values. Further, on occasion, the public schools actively prevent citizenship and promote the stifling of government. Nevertheless, there have also been many successes and, more to the point, the alternatives seem even more unattractive. The great advantage of the private school is that it can focus its priorities and its programs to fit particular students (and their families). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that those for whom the school is designed find that it suits their needs more admirably than the public school which must, perforce, provide a program of much broader and less focussed dimensions. Thus, readily recognized individual advantage is provided by the private school – at least for those for whom the school is designed and who can afford its cost. The funding of these schools might make such advantages available without regard to parental income, and this could result in an increased interest in attending such schools although the actual extent of this new demand is difficult to forecast. The resulting benefits would be individual but their cost a social one encountered in the growing realization that the seemingly legitimate parental desire to gain advantages for their children is something to be fully accomplished only at the expense of others. In any case, if such funding should result in any large transfer of either the higher achieving or the more affluent students from the public to the private schools, public schools (as the schools of second choice) could no longer offer equal educational opportunity. It is, of course, by no means certain that this outcome would occur. It would be, however, a rather large risk to take.

SOME MATTERS OF BELIEF

In reviewing the various arguments and my own response to them as outlined above, the emerging difficulty was how to envision future

schooling arrangements for Ontario that would increase parental choice and address discrimination while not only maintaining but also enhancing – in the name of social cohesion, tolerance, and the quality of educational opportunity – the integrity of Ontario's public schools. In considering this matter, the language of rights tends to be rather absolutist and not, therefore, helpful when conflicting rights emerge. Second, in the matter of schooling, children's rights would be important, and, relative to these rights, it is difficult to determine whether it was society's (or the government's) vision of these rights or the parents' visions that should take precedence. Nevertheless, the question of values could not be entirely circumvented. Social viability is always based on a shared system of values, for it is only with common values that a truly shared existence (as opposed to mere coexistence) is possible. Thus, for example, in multicultural societies such as Ontario, among the common or shared values must be a conception of tolerance which demands respect for others and alternative points of view. This, in turn, is based on a commitment to such values as the minimal order required for dialogue, a respect for truth, the need sometimes to act for the sake of others, and so on. Of course, in any society there are conflicts of value and, therefore, alternative visions of what constitutes justice and appropriate social policy. In fact, such conflicts have historically shaped Ontario's policies in education. Thus, commitments to common schools and private schools start with values not subject to empirical demonstration and with beliefs about what sort of society Ontario should become – that is, with a vision of a preferred future expressed as a particular kind of schooling for the young. Policy making in education is, therefore, primarily political. As such, it must be seen – within a democracy – as a question to be settled, in the final analysis, not by social scientists but by elected officials or the courts.

Thus, the importance of values and the implications of different values and value systems for public policy with regard to schooling would be difficult to overestimate. Education is a dominant social concern and, although schooling is only part of society's much wider arrangements for education, the more complex and dynamic the society, the greater its need to clarify the function of its schools and their role in realizing a better society. In this context and without any claim to a complete and comprehensive view, I believe that:

1. Elementary and secondary schools are important institutions whose goal is to develop, nurture, and enhance the intellectual and moral autonomy of the young. This goal and attendant responsibilities are shared with parents and other societal agencies.
2. In a democratic society, this goal (i.e., intellectual and moral autono-

my) is a social and individual good of sufficient importance to justify the compulsory schooling of children.

3. Such schooling should be made available so as to: (a) maximize the equality of educational opportunity, that is, the likelihood that persons will be prepared to realize their potential and to make informed and independent choices as to their future; (b) provide for the shared responsibility of government and family – the family exercising its natural interest in and responsibility for the welfare of the child and the government acting on behalf of the interests of the wider society and as a protector of the rights of individual children; and (c) ensure that, in a pluralistic and multicultural society, schools can contribute to strengthening the social fabric by providing a common acculturation experience for children.

However, it is clearly not logically necessary for governments both to finance and to provide educational services, but I do believe that the requirements of accessibility and accountability make such a double role entirely appropriate. Further, such a double role provides, in a way that no other policy can, a context in which publicly funded schools are tied not only to the private purposes of self-interest and individual mobility – principles heavily weighted in favour of those already advantaged – but also to the provision of public service committed to improving collective and democratic traditions. Further, discussion and action about public and common schools presents at least a potential opportunity for citizens to become concerned about what is good for themselves or their children and what is necessary to bring about a more just and efficient society for others. Finally, to the extent that the public and common schools are chosen by most families, these schools can respect group differences while helping their students to perceive the common concerns that transcend such differences. Schools are better able to teach common understanding and shared values if they are less homogeneous and can, at least potentially, bring children of different backgrounds together. That is, I believe that:

4. It is appropriate for the government to finance and provide an effective system of common public elementary and secondary schools that meet society's educational requirements for schooling; are accessible and open to all; are tuition-free; provide substantial opportunity for parental and community participation; represent the priority, but not necessarily the exclusive, public investment in education; and are the schools of choice for most young people and their families.
5. *Relevant constitutional issues aside*, no further obligation for the public funding of elementary and secondary schools exists.

Constitutional issues must, of course, actually be considered. In addition, none of the above denies the value of private schools. Thus, for example, in a heterogeneous society, the arguments for a common acculturation experience can be overstated so that dissent and variation are suppressed in favour of some single, necessarily imperfect vision; and, unfortunately, the public school community has not always avoided this pitfall. Past failures should not, however, rule out the present potential of the public schools in which it should, in principle, be possible both to widen and to deepen the existing social consensus by capitalizing on our differences without unnecessarily institutionalizing them. I, however, believe that:

6. There should be no legal public monopoly in education, and private schools that meet the minimum standards specified by the government in terms of obligation to society and individual children should have a clear status in recognition both of the rights of citizens to make alternative choices and of the general value of diversity.
7. Moreover, diversity within the public school system should also be encouraged.

Finally, although – again, constitutional issues aside – no obligation for the public funding of private schools may exist, some public assistance to private schools might, nevertheless, be a feature of a creative public policy. Thus, I believe that:

8. As a matter of public policy, and so long as the public policy objectives outlined above are not substantially eroded, new initiatives both in public support of private schools and in the relationship of these to the public schools should be actively developed and tested.

Given both this framework of belief and the importance of dealing more equitably with the constitutional issues of discrimination raised by the funding of the Roman Catholic separate schools, Ontario should modify its current arrangements with regard to private schools. The particular recommendations of the Commission on Private Schools in Ontario can be found in its report, but, although these recommendations were regarded by the commission as appropriate, I cannot argue that they are the uniquely correct way to proceed. Whatever policy route Ontario elects to take, it is, however, likely to succeed only if all of those involved are prepared to summon up their resources for cooperative, perhaps even conscionable, behaviour. Interestingly, Green (1984) has described a variety of aspects of conscience among which are the conscience of membership (i.e., the recognition that we must sometimes act for the sake of others) and the conscience of sacrifice (i.e., the willingness to override

the pursuit of self-interest and act beyond the limits of mere duty). The success of any proposed program will, in fact, depend to no small degree on the extent to which these aspects of conscience are exhibited by the government, by the boards of education schools, by the private schools, by the separate schools, and by the many communities and individuals to which each relates and responds.

NOTE

- ¹ This article is based on and drawn from the author's work as commissioner for the Commission on Private Schools in Ontario. The commission's work is more fully reported in *The Report of The Commission on Private Schools in Ontario* published by the Government of Ontario in October 1985.

REFERENCES

- Green, Thomas. (1984). *The formation of conscience in an age of technology*. San Antonio: The John Dewey Society.
- Lawton, S. (1985, October). Alternative methods of financing private schools in Ontario. In *The report of the commission on private schools in Ontario* (pp. 81-108). Toronto: The Government of Ontario.
- Ryerson, Egerton. (1984). *Journal of education for Upper Canada* (Vol. 1). Toronto: J. H. Lawrence.

Privatschulen in Ontario bekommen keine direkten Subsidien von den Staatsgeldern, aber es gibt einige Argumente, daß sie es sollten. Der Beauftragte, der diese Argumente und ihre Folgen untersuchte, schlug vor, daß die finanziellen Kosten, den Privatschulen Geld zu geben, für diese Politik nicht entscheidend waren (Ontario Könnte sich die zusätzlichen Kosten leisten) sondern, daß die Gründe der gesellschaftlichen Gerechtigkeit eindrucksvoll waren-am stärksten war das Recht der Eltern, die Bildungsweise, die angenommen sein sollte, zu entscheiden. Argumente für besondere Gruppen sollten gegen gesellschaftlicher Zusammenhalt abgewogen werden. Das verfassungsmäßige Argument Könnte zu verstehen geben, daß das Vorurteil existiert, wenn die Privatschulen nicht zum teil unterstützt werden. Der Beauftragte sagte zum Schluß, daß mindestens Minimumnorme für Privatschulen erhalten sein sollten, und schlug vor, wie die Gesellschaft und die Eltern davon sicher sein Könnten.

Las escuelas privadas en Ontario no reciben subsidio directo de los fondos públicos, pero varios argumentos señalan que deberían recibir. El Comisionado que estudio dichos argumentos y sus consecuencias, señaló que el costo financiero del fondo para escuelas privadas no fué una política decisiva, pues Ontario podría asumir el extra costo. Razones de justicia social, como el derecho de los padres en la decisión de la educación para sus hijos, fueron tambien fuertes componentes. Los argumentos presentados por grupos especiales deberán ser equilibrados con los de cohesión social. El argumento constitucional podría dar a entender, que la discriminación existe en tanto las escuelas privadas no sean financiadas parcialmente. El Comisionado concluyó que se deberian mantener unas regulaciones

mínimas para todas las escuelas privadas, e insinuó como podrían asegurarse de esto sociedad y padres.

Bernard Shapiro is the former Dean of the Faculty of Education and Vice-President (Academic) of the University of Western Ontario and is presently Director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, President of the Social Science Federation of Canada, and Past-President of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education. Dr. Shapiro's previously published work focusses on educational evaluation, cognitive development in young children, and policy studies in higher education.