

The following electronic version is for informational purposes only.
The printed version remains the official version.

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1975

Morning Sitting

[[Page 1971](#)]

CONTENTS

Privilege

Request for clarification of Ministerial answers. Mr. Wallace — 1971

Mr. Speaker — [1971](#)

Routine proceedings

School Tax Removal and Resource Grant Act (Bill 73). Hon. Mr. Barrett.

Introduction and first reading — [1971](#)

Community Care Facilities Licensing Amendment Act, 1975 (Bill 71) Hon. Mr. Cocke.

Introduction and first reading — [1971](#)

Medical Services Amendment Act, 1975 (Bill 72). Hon. Mr. Cocke.

Introduction and first reading — [1971](#)

Farm Products Industry Improvement Amendment Act, 1975 (Bill 65). Hon. Mr. Stupich.

Introduction and first reading — [1972](#)

Committee of Supply: Department of Education estimates.

On vote 46.

Mr. Phillips — [1972](#)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1972

Mrs. Jordan — 1972

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1974

Mrs. Jordan — 1974

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1975

Mr. Wallace — 1976

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1977

Mr. Wallace — 1978

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1978

Mr. Rolston — 1978

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1979

Mr. McGeer — 1979
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1980
Mr. McGeer — 1980
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1980
Mr. McClelland — 1981
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1982
Mr. Schroeder — 1982
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1983
Mr. Schroeder — 1983
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1984
Mr. Curtis — 1984
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1985
Mr. Curtis — 1985

On vote 47.

Mr. Chabot — [1985](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1986
Mr. McClelland — 1986
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1986
Mr. Curtis — 1987
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1987
Mr. Curtis — 1987
Mr. Schroeder — 1987
Mr. Curtis — 1989

Division on vote 47 — [1989](#)

On vote 49.

Mr. Wallace — [1989](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1990
Mr. Wallace — 1990
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1990

On vote 50.

Mr. Schroeder — [1990](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1991
Mr. Schroeder — 1991
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): Mr. Speaker, we have in the Legislature today a group of 16 students from the Queen Elizabeth high school along with their teacher, Ben Horne. I would ask the Members to make them welcome.

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, we have with us today a group of students from Princeton with their instructor, Larry Hanson. This is a group of students who are taking an upgrading course, and I understand that part of that course is communications — how they are to communicate with civic government, the mayor and town council, the regional districts, the provincial Legislature, and the federal government. I think this is very important that more people know how to communicate. I bid you welcome.

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): Mr. Speaker, in the gallery there are members who are going to be attending the 50th conference of the United Church of Canada. As you know, the United Church was born 50 years ago. Their conference for British Columbia is in the First United Church in Victoria starting tonight. I thought you should know there is a young lawyer who is the chairman of the church, John Jessiman; and Eleanor Gamble will be the new president-designate. We welcome you to First United Church if you can come over the weekend. Thank you.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of privilege and perhaps have

the record clarified.

I raised a point last night, which is recorded on page 913-2 in the Blues, in trying to determine the source of the salaries and expenses and support staff of Dr. Knight. The Hon. Minister (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) responded that these salaries came under the contingency fund. On the following page it is recorded that she said that they were in a contingency fund under the Minister of Finance. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the letter I read into the record from the Minister to the Treasury Board on October 7 shows that she requested \$500,000 by special warrant. The interim financial statement shows that that warrant was issued on December 13, 1974, and that \$263,500 was spent on education development research and evaluation. There seems to be a clear contradiction in the record, and I wonder if perhaps the Minister would care to clarify her answer to my questions last night.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to deal first, though, in a sense, with the matter as a question of privilege — whether it is, in fact, a matter of privilege. I think usually a matter of this kind is raised in the estimates in the Committee of the Whole House, and any clarification is obtained there between the Minister and the Hon. Member when this is brought to the attention of the Committee of the Whole House. How it becomes a matter of privilege I'm not quite clear at this moment. It appears to be a misunderstanding between the Hon. Member and the Minister. I'll take look at your point but in the meantime I would hope that this matter could be clarified in the Committee of the Whole House when it meets again. In the meantime I will look at the question you raised and see if there is anything I can do to assist.

MR. WALLACE: I'll respond briefly to that point you raised, Mr. Speaker. I made every effort last night to clarify that point and received the answer three times from the Minister that it was coming out of contingencies. I appreciate your point that this kind of matter should be cleared up in committee, but I made strenuous efforts to get it cleared up in committee last night and received the same answer three times, which was in conflict with the documentation that I was reading from.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll look at the matter. In the meantime, I hope you can clear it up in committee.

Introduction of bills.

SCHOOL TAX REMOVAL

AND RESOURCE GRANT ACT

Hon. Mr. Barrett presents a message from His honour the Lieutenant-Governor: a bill intituled school Tax Removal and Resource Grant Act.

Bill 73 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

COMMUNITY CARE FACILITIES

Hon. Mr. Cocke presents a message from His honour the Lieutenant-Governor: a bill intituled Community Care Licensing Amendment Act, 1975.

Bill 71 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

MEDICAL SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Cocke presents a message from His

Honour the Lieutenant-Governor: a bill intituled Medical Services Amendment Act, 1975.

Bill 72 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

FARM PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

Hon. Mr. Stupich presents a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor: a bill intituled Farm Products Industry Improvement Amendment Act, 1975.

Bill 65 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

Orders of the day.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 46: post-secondary education and training, \$268,994,000 — continued.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the Minister a couple of questions. How much money is in this vote for the community college at Terrace? How much money is in this vote for the community college at East Kootenay? How much money is in this vote for the Northern Lights College in the Peace River area?

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): We'll just have it for you in one moment. Do you want to ask another question while this one is coming up? I don't want to invite another one, Mr. Member, but, generally speaking, I can tell you, while we're getting the breakdown, that approximately \$1 million has been set aside for the four. You want the breakdown.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'd like the breakdown, if possible. I'd just like to ask the Minister while I'm waiting for that answer, do you....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would one person be seated? Would the Hon. Member for South Peace River continue.

MR. PHILLIPS: Would you advise the House if you plan to move swiftly on getting these community colleges functional?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I don't have the specific breakdown yet for each college because, as you know, the order-in-council will be going through very shortly. I can give you the ballpark figure of roughly \$1 million for starting off services this September. We're hoping that each one of those new colleges will be able to provide some services this September. I don't have the breakdown because it's up to the college boards when they're appointed to also give us their specific needs.

MR. PHILLIPS: But there is sufficient money, then, in your opinion, in that \$1 million to get all three of them underway by September?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, yes, but certainly not, as you can understand, a full-blown college. There is money so that some services will be able to start in September.

MR. PHILLIPS: They will be able to start hiring staff now. As soon as the order-in-council goes through,

will they be able to start looking for staff and getting the college council put together?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's right. The first step will be the appointment of the college council. Right after that the college council will move as quickly as they can.

MR. PHILLIPS: When will the people involved be advised to start working on the college council? Do they have to wait for the order-in-council?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, they have to wait for the order-in-council. But I know that the school trustees who are involved in the participating districts now are already looking for and selecting their people. I know some of them are already working on it. They're just waiting for the order-in-council to officially give them the right to go ahead.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Just a few brief questions to the Minister. Leaving aside provincial matters at the moment, I'd like to ask about the Okanagan regional college and our satellite campus programme.

First, I'd like to thank her for finally getting the title to the Harvey property transferred to the college council and the 25 acres for use as a Vernon campus. On this matter, I'd ask the Minister how much money is allotted to Okanagan College in total in terms of capital and operating funds for the coming year. Are those capital funds designated solely for the core complex development in Kelowna? Does that include the building of the gymnasium on the Kelowna campus?

Further to that, what funds will be available,

[[Page 1973](#)]

either capital or through operating expenses, for the development of buildings on the Vernon site? Will those funds permit the council to proceed with the acquisition of the Butler Building in time to be ready for use in September of this coming year?

I have a few questions, but would the Minister like to answer these as we go along?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We're making notes.

MRS. JORDAN: All right. I'm concerned that, now that the land has finally been transferred, there will be the opportunity to develop new buildings. I believe the staff and the council are quite willing to consider Butler-type buildings and that they will be serviced and ready for use by September of 1975, as well as what money will be allotted for the Kelowna campus and what moneys will be allotted in terms of capital expenses and operating expenses for the other campuses, particularly South Okanagan.

I would like to speak just a moment about the Harvey property when the Minister has time. As the Minister is aware, this is approximately 100 acres of land, a magnificent location basically overlooking Kalamalka Lake, the Coldstream Valley and the Vernon Valley, that was purchased by the former administration a number of years ago from a Miss Harvey, a local citizen. At that time there was a commitment made by the former administration that this land should be dedicated to education and educational facilities in the future. This has a broad context; it is not stipulated that it should be for one specific educational institution. I wish to make the Minister aware that the people in this area feel very strongly about that commitment and they would like to see this land used on the long term for educational facilities. Certainly the final siting of the Vernon campus there is quite compatible.

I don't know whether the Minister is aware or not, but the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) has entered into a negotiation with the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) to commit further acreage to the Department of Forests for the development of a seedling nursery. I think that this is something that one couldn't object to at first sight, but it is a situation that should be examined. If there are to be buildings built, then I would urge the Minister to see that those buildings are built in such a way that it wouldn't prohibit the use of

that land in future as a potential site for a university in the Okanagan Valley. I think the seedling nursery will complement other programmes we have through the forestry department in the North Okanagan, and it also will complement the study programmes we have both in our school and in our long-term projections of being an ecological study area for the universities.

However, it has also come to my attention that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources is again discussing with the Minister of Public Works use of the latter part of this land for the Vernon effluent spray irrigation project. While most of the people in the area, and certainly myself, support this pilot programme that has been going on, I would caution the Minister to move immediately to enter into these negotiations and see that in no way is that land tied up for a period of longer than one year at a time. I am sure the Minister will agree that, regardless of what government is in administration, there will eventually be a university in the Okanagan Valley, although this might not be the first priority for the next university in British Columbia. Presumably one in the north would be. But when it comes to sitting of that university, one of the greatest assets that the Department of Education can have, and the government itself in utilizing tax dollars, is to have land available. The greatest asset you have right now, Madam Minister, and which the taxpayers of British Columbia have right now, is this land that is free, clear and paid for, which is in really the centre of the Okanagan mainline area, the absolute hub. It concerns the Kootenays, the Kamloops and the Revelstoke areas to the border area very effectively as a university. It is in the centre of an area that can contribute greatly in terms of agricultural programmes, in terms of recreational programmes and in terms of ecological and scientific programmes for any university to broaden out its basic base.

If these other two Ministers, the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, who has proven completely insensitive to people orientation and to educational orientation, and the Minister of Public Works, who seems to act as tsar of designation and lease-signing without any reason, get together and have their way, Madam Minister, and you're not consulted and you don't stand up and fight for education, the people of British Columbia are going to lose a golden opportunity to, when the time comes, establish a university in the Okanagan on an ideal site on land that is already owned by the government.

As far as the people of the north Okanagan area are concerned, they would be extremely concerned to feel that the sitting of a university in that area would be destroyed and that the opportunity would be destroyed because two Ministers have got together and destroyed the availability of that land. So I would urge the Minister to speak with her colleagues and to make very clear to them that the land may be used by other departments for non-educational purposes on a year-to-year basis, but that there can be no attempt to alienate that land from immediate use if it's required for the establishment of higher learning in the Okanagan mainline area.

Perhaps the Minister would comment on these questions at this time, and if I have some further

[[Page 1974](#)]

follow ones she would do so....

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I'll fight for education when I believe that we're going on the right track. But to suggest that I stand up and fight for, particularly, a university in the Okanagan, which happens to be the area in which the Member resides — and I can understand why she would want it there — is something that I find questionable until we're absolutely sure in what direction we're going to go in university expansion. She's doing her job, as a Member in the opposition, for her area. We can have other Members stand up all over this House and say: "I want a university in my area." So to suggest that I'm not fighting for education because I don't endorse her particular area for a university — I question the validity of that remark.

The Department of Education, as you know, since we came into office has increased the number of university services right across the province on a delivery system. At no time yet has there been any commitment made to a new university, period, in another part of the province, irrespective and putting aside the Notre Dame situation at this time. So this is a debate which could continue on whether you continue in one form to deliver university services the way we're going or whether another part of the province, the Okanagan, Prince George or some other area should have another university. So I just want to make that clear right now.

I think you're very fortunate in your area that since we came into office we have expanded, not only college delivery service, far more than under the government in which you were a Minister Without Portfolio, but we've also expanded university services. I thank you for appreciating and giving credit for the movement in the Harvey property area.

Now you have asked what the breakdown is. I cannot give you the specific breakdown on the operating and capital costs of one college zone; we don't have the breakdown here. You can go to the college council to get that or you can come to Mr. Vallen's office and get the breakdown.

But I would like to point out that the budget increase given to the Okanagan College this year was one of the highest in the province. It was a 47.29 per cent increase. That was granted specifically at this high level so that we could meet the expansion in the areas which you had mentioned — the Harvey property. That is why the Okanagan College received this very large increase in comparison to others; it was an area which we felt did need expansion in the satellite services.

MRS. JORDAN: Is that a commitment that the buildings will be built, that they will have the opportunity to get the buildings on the Vernon campus operational by the fall?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I can't tell you that yet. I know that the college council is eager, and should be, to get the services to the students as soon as possible. Where it rests just at this moment, I can't tell you. But as far as I am concerned, the sooner we can get the services in there, the better. As you know, we have to work very closely with the college council. They have their own local autonomy and they are working on the plans now. I know that you are in fairly close contact with the council. You could discuss that with them as well as check with my department. So I can't give you a specific answer at this time as to whether they will be ready in September. I do want to point out that you can get the breakdowns from my department or from the college council.

MRS. JORDAN: Further, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I just can't resist commenting that no wonder people have a lack of confidence in this Minister, when you ask a responsible question about a responsible subject and the Minister gets up, as she just did, particularly in the earlier part of her speech, and indulges in a lot of political hokey-pokey. Madam Minister, you are the architect of your own problems in many areas of education. It is very foolish of you to suggest that you have no responsibility in the area of a university of the future, as you did, completely misinterpreting what I said....

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think if we return to the consideration of vote 46....

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think so. I would also like to say I never said I had any responsibility. The former Minister and present Member of the opposition simply does not listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to....

MRS. JORDAN: The Minister is the architect of her own problems. Madam Minister, your responsibility, which I asked you to acknowledge just now, was to see that two of your Ministers who have proven insensitive to people needs and to education in this province do not alienate that land, the Harvey property, that was purchased by the former administration with the commitment to the community, to an individual, that that land would be used for educational purposes. I did not ask you for the establishment of a university in the Okanagan at this time. For you to climb out on a limb and saw

[[Page 1975](#)]

yourself off like that is, as I say, the reason that you are in so much trouble as Minister of Education.

Madam Minister, what the people from the North Okanagan want from you today is a commitment that that Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources in the secret confines of his and his assistants' office, or the Minister

of Public Works don't alienate that land from its original intent and don't alienate that land so that when the time comes, when it is seen and deemed advisable to develop further educational institutions in the Okanagan mainline area or whatever area it is to serve, the Minister of Education of that day doesn't find himself thwarted by your political stupidity, if I may say so, and your political games, having let that land be alienated under your administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I think the....

MRS. JORDAN: It's time that Minister dealt with some of the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that the term the Hon. Member just used was somewhat offensive to another Hon. Member and I would ask her to withdraw the term "political stupidity."

MRS. JORDAN: I was referring to the Madam's political moxie but I will withdraw it if it is offensive to her. I wouldn't wish to offend her personally.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister get the message? I am not asking for a university today. I am asking for this Minister to protect, within the responsibility of her office, that land for educational purposes so that we don't have high rise apartments, housing developments, alienation-to-land projects, that would prohibit its intended use. That's all. Surely that's not too much to ask. It just requires a meeting among the three of you. I will drop the Minister another letter on this so that I can have an answer and a commitment from her in writing.

As to the Okanagan College itself in terms of its financing, Madam Minister, if I may correct you, you are not quite right in your interpretation that it is the council itself that can designate where the spending is taking place. I wouldn't have brought this problem up if there wasn't concern there that in fact the department, whether the Minister is aware of it or not, has been exerting pressure on the council to complete the core facilities in Kelowna first.

With the exception of the gymnasium, no one has an objection to the development of the major core facilities in Kelowna at this time. No one disputes that a gymnasium is a very worthwhile part of any campus development. But the concern in the Okanagan is that this pressure is forcing the council into a position where they would build a gymnasium in one centre as opposed to having the money to develop basic educational facilities in another centre.

Madam Minister, our concern is that if the money is available, as you say it is, it be used in the best interests of basic education in the Okanagan College area. That means at this time the priority of developing educational units on the Harvey property, hopefully in time for the fall. It can only be done and be available in the fall of 1975 if this matter is cleared up.

The gymnasium would be a most attractive addition to the core centre in Kelowna. But in light of the fact that there is not even a recreational programme within the college right now, it would seem that unless there's some money to cover both, then the gymnasium is going to have to wait for a period of time or until the Minister makes the money available. If the Minister can advise me today that there will be sufficient funds in that amount that she talks about for the Vernon campus....

There has been subtle pressure from the department, whether the Minister is aware of it or not. I don't know the reasons that they've done this, but I do know the reaction in the areas to this pressure. They want the best judgment to be used and the basic educational needs of the young people to be met. I would appreciate this very much.

The Minister's statement about the amount of money to the Okanagan college is appreciated, except that I would have to question all her information because I understand that there are appeals being made to the Minister now from the college council in concern for the fact that they cannot meet their budget with any expansion. In other words, with the money she's given they can only meet their commitments for this year when they take into account inflation, increased costs of construction and development and salaries. They're not going to be able to initiate, really, any new programmes.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: First of all, I think the Member may be confusing capital with operating. But I want to assure her that as far as I'm concerned there would be no pressure put on the priorities set by a college council. If, when they are ready and present to us their plans for their gym, as I've done with other colleges, it's their priority. The money is forthcoming; it goes through the department for approval. I want to make that clear. I don't condone any pressure from my department on the priorities. If we did that, why would we bother to have local autonomous college councils? So I want to make that quite clear that I do not condone that. The priorities are up to the college council — then it's up to them to present it to us. Then we make the decision, of course — myself and through Treasury Board — as to when the funds can be released.

In the matter of alienation of land I find it rather

[[Page 1976](#)]

ironic to have that Member, who was a Member of the past government, suddenly being a crusader for non-alienation of land, when she came from a government which we know very well...

MRS. JORDAN: Recheck the files.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: ...what happened under that government when it came to alienation of land, and what would have happened if they'd still been in power today.

However, I want to assure the people of the Okanagan that, as far as educational priorities go, I work closely with your college council. I believe there are approximately 200 acres; the Member is far more conversant, I know, with that.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Close to it, in that area. I know that the college council comes to the Department of Education and makes recommendations on the amount that they feel will be necessary for educational development. I can assure the Hon. Member that there is consultation with the other Ministers who are involved in this department. I realize that it is my responsibility if the college council can show there's a specific educational need, to not alienate that land when it can and should be needed for educational purposes. This is certainly brought to the attention of the other Ministers involved.

MRS. JORDAN: It's your responsibility for the future.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's exactly right — we have to look to the future. That's exactly what....

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That is why we have cabinet committees in this government — so we work collectively in these areas.

Interjection.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I'm quite happy to defer to my friend on the left if you want to distribute the....

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): You beat me!

MR. WALLACE: The Member for Dewdney was also seeking the floor. If you want to....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I'll recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay first, followed by the Member for Dewdney.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you. I just wanted to ask a few....

Interjection.

MR. WALLACE: I am trying to be fair — that's the point. I thought maybe you would want to alternate an opposition and a government Member. I was only trying to be fair. It's so easy to be misunderstood in the House, Mr. Chairman, even when you're trying to be fair.

I just wanted to ask a few questions about.... First of all, the Minister referred in passing to the Notre Dame situation. As she knows, we've had some communication. I wondered if she could bring the House up to date with the government policy regarding the specific purpose to which Notre Dame is to be put. As the Minister recalls, we had a royal commission on post-secondary services in the Kootenays. I remember attending a meeting when the report was discussed, but that's some time ago. I wonder if the Minister could perhaps bring us up to date on government policy regarding Notre Dame University.

I would also like to ask about the concept of college governments. She mentioned a moment ago in replying to the Member for South Okanagan (Mr. Bennett) something in passing about autonomy for colleges. I wonder if the decision has been made to remove colleges from the Public School Act, and give them their own specific autonomy similar to the autonomy enjoyed by the universities, for example.

It seems to me that one of the positive and praiseworthy efforts of this government is to expand the college system. There has been too much emphasis in years gone by that one either tended to be a dropout from high school and go into some manual, unskilled job, or you went on to university. There was this big gap in the middle, and somehow or other the whole concept of any kind of college, regional college or vocational school training was sort of second best. In point of fact, it is quite obvious from the complexity of our society and the problems of unemployment that seem to be ever with us that the greater diversity and choice available in education these days has to be a top priority for government. I think the government is trying very hard to provide just that diversity of educational services through the college system.

I sense a feeling by the colleges and by their statements that they certainly would be much happier if they had a greater degree of autonomy with the Public Schools Act. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us, first of all, if the government policy decision has been made, in fact, that legislation will be introduced to give us a colleges

[[Page 1977](#)]

Act, and if we can anticipate that at this session.

The other more immediate aspect which concerns me is the real concern at Camosun College here in Victoria about the expansion plans which have been impaired by the fact that there is not as much money available for the courses as had been planned. I think it is important just to record the details that Camosun College council faces. They are to receive \$1.9 million less than they had budgeted for. I just want to get the figures correct, Mr. Chairman. The cutback results from the Minister's department cutting the operating budget from \$7.8 million to \$5.9 million. The college appealed the Minister's decision and was granted another \$250,000 for academic and technical programmes and \$50,000 for vocational programmes.

This college, as I understand it, in the short few years that it has been in existence, has been tremendously successful and has had a steadily increasing number of entrants. While I am the first person to agree that there has to be some financial ceiling and that the Minister doesn't have an endless budget, I do think it is important to make the point that we can't have it both ways. If we are not prepared to make the diversity of services available to try and deal with the unemployment problem and have people educated to fill the kind of jobs that are available, then we either spend the money on more educational services or we are spending more money to pay people who are unemployed. I don't think anyone would doubt that the most productive and positive way to tackle the problem is to make available the widest possible range of services at our colleges.

I know from the remarks made by some of the people in the college regarding Camosun College in Victoria that they are very concerned that they will not be able to provide the kind of expanded programme for which they feel confident people are eager to enter.

I say again that I realize the pie has only so many slices and that you can't go on endlessly increasing Education or Health or Human Resources beyond a certain point within a certain time. But the Minister did remark this morning that Okanagan College has had an increase of something in the order of, I think the figure stated was 47 per cent, in the budget. If that Member was busy fighting for her area, I'm busy fighting for Camosun College which didn't get anything like a 47 per cent increase. I wonder if the Minister could perhaps tell us the rationale or the criteria which tend to result in one college appearing to get a very substantial increase and another college being very unhappy.

I wonder if the Minister could just briefly outline government policy regarding the vocational schools, particularly in some of the areas such as Burnaby and Terrace. Is there any specific change in policy? What are the long-term government plans for vocational schools?

The last question for now, Mr. Chairman, relates to the latter part of this vote regarding student aid and teacher-training scholarships and bursaries. I notice they are increased by 167 per cent — that is, by \$7.5 million. I receive quite a few letters from parents and students who seem to be somewhat puzzled by the ground rules and the qualifications for some of these bursaries and it may well be simply a misunderstanding, but I wonder if the Minister could comment as to whether there has been any basic change in departmental policy on the awarding of these forms of aid.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think the first question the Hon. Member asked was re the present situation with Notre Dame. As you know, we did announce that the government is purchasing Notre Dame, and that process is taking place now. I also announced that Notre Dame would be able to continue to grant degrees. In what form this will be done is now presently being worked out for us by Walter Hardwick, who was appointed specifically. He is a former Vancouver alderman and also works at UBC. He is to give us recommendations on how best those services could be delivered because at the time I originally announced this I said that we want to use the three present public universities to assist in the delivery of those services. So you can be assured that the degrees will be continued — you will still be able to go to Notre Dame and get a degree. In what areas, it will shortly be announced after Hardwick's report comes in — and in what particular form this will all be delivered. It is all being deliberated now. I have had a number of interim meetings with Walter Hardwick, and the final reports should be ready, hopefully, in a matter of maybe two months. So we are moving along there but there is no question about it that next year the status will stay the same as far as the students are concerned, but the following year it will be under the new system.

There will be no specific college Act this session. We are not prepared to move on that in this session. I have discussed this with the college principals and faculty and they are quite aware that there won't be one coming up at this session. There will be some amendments, I presume, relative to colleges but not a basic college Act at this time.

MR. WALLACE: Has the commitment been made to have one?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes. I have stated that I do feel that there should be a new college Act for the province, but it will not be brought forward during this session.

You expressed particular concern about Camosun.

[[Page 1978](#)]

I can understand that, because you live in the area, and I know that the pressures must be on you too about their costs.

First of all, you compared it with Okanagan. We have to look at the historical difference here. Okanagan College is in an area of considerable expansion of facilities at this particular year and, as you know, we are encouraging this development of the satellite campus at Vernon. Also they have experienced a tremendous increase in enrolment. Camosun College certainly has had an increase, but I don't think to the same degree. It comes at different periods for different colleges. For instance, last year Camosun's budget increase given by the government was 32.47 per cent and this year, you are right, it is in the area of 27 per cent.

So let's look at it this way: each college has to be treated separately according to their enrolment needs and where they are going physically at that particular time. We've done the best we can to try and meet the rapid increase in costs, as the Member appreciates. The areas that are going to be cut, I understand, are in programme areas where the enrolment is very small — where the class sizes are, say, four or five. I think the Hon. Member would agree that if there have to be some programme cuts in a period of inflation, they want to be put in the areas where there is the least impact. I think you will agree that if there were classes with, say, four or five students, that's one area that any college would have to look at.

We have done our best to give Camosun a budget. As you said, we did give them another increase and we feel assured that the basic services will be able to continue there except for the cutting out of some of those very, very small classes.

MR. WALLACE: Could I just ask one very short follow-up question? One thing worries me about Camosun. I appreciate that perhaps the smallest classes have to go. But, for example, I understand there was a very good two-month course being offered for upgrading of nursing and orderly personnel in the area of geriatric services. At a time when we are specifically trying to encourage the care of the elderly, disabled persons in their own home so that we don't have to go and build more and more institutions, it is vital that we utilize in our communities the personnel who perhaps haven't nursed for 10 or 15 years but were willing to do part-time work in the home. I understand that one of the courses which Camosun will have to cancel will be this upgrading course of nursing and nursing-aide personnel. It would seem to me that if it's not too late, even at this stage of the game, in conjunction with the aims of the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) who have, quite wisely, made the commitment to treat as many people in their homes as possible and are making more money available for home care. Home care requires, obviously, skilled people to provide that kind of attention.

It does seem a little bit of a contradiction that if the Camosun College programme has to suffer, that particular ingredient also suffers. Would there be some possibility the Minister might reconsider that, if asked? I'm not sure that the college authorities specifically have asked about that particular course, but I must say I was impressed to find that that was one of the courses cut, and I think it's very unfortunate.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Yes, I regret that also. You have brought it to my attention. I'm certainly not going to stand here and say, yes, we can put it in. But I regret that's happened and I can certainly ask my officials about it. That's about as far as I could say at this time.

Student aid. Yes, it is a complicated business. We're tied in, as you know, with the federal government student loan plan. I think you were talking not bursaries but student aid, primarily. Yes, it is complicated. The forms that must be used are the forms put out by the federal government. We periodically send representatives from our department back to meet with the Ottawa officials to express our concerns when we consider their problems with these complicated forms. We are tied in with it.

As you know, we have increased substantially the amount of provincial grants in aid to the students of British Columbia so that I think, compared to the rest of Canada, our students have to incur less of a student loan than in most other jurisdictions. We will be announcing shortly some possible changes in that student-aid loan. I don't know if it'll make it less complicated, but we're always striving for ways to distribute the money as equitably as we can.

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): Further on that discussion in the vote on bursaries and student-aid loans, I understand generally that there are grants for students taking veterinary science, for instance, at one of the three places in Canada, the nearest one being Saskatoon. That's easy to understand. Being from an agricultural community, I hope that we gradually get more and more students. I gather it's currently eight students.

I would appeal to the Minister: I wonder if there isn't room for grants for programmes to students learning outside of the province. Maybe there's something comparable available; maybe there is a special emphasis or quality that isn't available in the province.

I can think of a student at Agassiz who is studying music and wanted to become a concert pianist. He had to go to University of Toronto under the

Toronto Conservatory of Music to get that kind of programme. I wonder whether we somewhat unwittingly discriminate against excellence by not seeing that there are funding, grants and loans to students outside the province. It would seem that this is, in a sense, saving you money. Obviously, if the person is studying at the University of Toronto at a very high level in music, I'm sure that's costing \$4,000, let's say, from the provincial and federal governments. It would be fiscally worthwhile, and certainly as far as quality, that maybe that system can be loosened up. The funding now does, in a sense, restrict the movement of students. I suppose it is control so that the Department of Education and the universities can have a greater sense of how many students actually will be crossing borders to take programmes.

Do I understand that the budget, which is about 26 per cent increased for universities, reflects about 15 per cent at Simon Fraser? Of course it reflects salary increases and operating increases which are very considerable. I wonder if the Minister maybe could comment on whether it really is less expensive to go to a junior college. In the case of Fraser Valley, we're talking \$2,600 for a full-time student for the university equivalent programme and about \$3,200 for a career student thinking of full-time hours. Certainly, I would gather part of the rationale for the junior colleges years ago was that it was, as well as being community-based, local, and helping the person in first and second year in the transition from high school to post-secondary, also less expensive. Could we hear some of the comparable costs of junior colleges? Is there an average, for instance, for the career students and an average for the full-time university first and second-year students as compared to the average cost at the universities? That certainly would be helpful.

[Mr. Kelly in the chair.]

One of the things at Simon Fraser that's really quite exciting is the teacher education programme. Of course, at Prince George, Kelowna, Vernon, Kamloops and other places — I think Penticton and Salmon Arm and Kitimat — they have programmes. I think that we should recognize that this is exciting. This is expensive and this is certainly going to up their per-student cost by training students out of the lower mainland. I gather the joint board of teacher education has recommended this, and this is some of the new thrust of the Universities Act. We're not just raining students down here. Also, under this joint board of education we're trying to see that the three different universities have their own kind of emphasis or slant so that there can be diversity even within a faculty within the three universities.

Also, I will ask again the question: have you heard from Mr. Faulkner, the federal Minister responsible for transfer of payments for post-secondary education? If you look at this immense vote 46, where are we especially constrained? What codes in vote 46 are especially tough on the provincial Crown this year? Do I understand that the feds will only increase 15 per cent over last year's vote in the various codes, or is it simply a global, 15 per cent increase on the vote 46 total that is all they will allow? If that is so, the federal government just isn't responding to the normal growth of new programmes, new colleges. We have a \$3.2 million budget in Fraser Valley College. That just didn't exist last year. There was just a semblance of a beginning of Fraser Valley College.

So those are just some questions. I don't think the MLAs realize that the fiscal transfer of payments programme is that constraining.

That brings up a whole discussion in transfer of payments. Somebody said that if there were more and more transfer of payments, an affluent province like British Columbia ultimately loses because those are transfer of payments to the less affluent parts of the country. I still feel that transfer of payments are helpful and keep a federated country together, and one of the biggest parts, of course, is in this vote 46.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Very quickly, Mr. Speaker. First of all, no, we haven't heard back from the Minister of State, the Hon. Mr. Faulkner, on our concern over the fact that they've set a limitation of 15 per cent. All post-secondary institutions are affected by this, exclusive, of course, of the vocational.

Yes, it is less expensive to go to the community colleges. Just generally, we have an average cost now of \$5,000 for university, for a student to go, if you take everything into consideration. That's what it's hitting now; and a

community college would hit more down in the \$3,000 level.

As you know, there are groups of Ministers meeting all the time on co-ordination of programmes and exchange of students. We have the veterinary school, and in time I'm sure that there will be more interrelationship with the other Ministers across Canada. So for a student who wishes to take art and has a special ability, I think we're going to be able to work out areas that way, as far as letting them transfer their B.C. grant to that institution.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are the Liberals having a secret meeting?

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): I think we're not doing badly — 20 per cent turnout, about what the government has. It's a better turnout than the press gallery this morning — a much better turnout than the Treasury benches.

[[Page 1980](#)]

Mr. Chairman, the Minister a year ago indicated how essential it was that we have new programmes in our universities, how they had to adapt to change and money would be made available and so on for these new programmes. One or two of them were implemented, and I think the Minister must have been pleased and the universities were pleased. But there are areas of major deficiency that are hard to see being corrected by the budget currently offered by the Minister. I made mention that at the University of Victoria some programmes have been postponed, and I wrongly suggested in the House that the faculty of law was not going to open this September. It is, but there have been delays in other programmes.

Still nothing has been done about the medical school in British Columbia since the NDP took office. We are still graduating no more than 80 doctors per year. We are still licensing about 300 doctors per year. We are still turning away over 500 applicants per year. The situation continues whereby able young British Columbians who would make fine doctors are being denied their opportunity to serve the public of British Columbia because of a lack of educational facilities.

I would like to ask the Minister whether she plans corrective action this year, and if not this year, next year and to ask specifically when British Columbia will be graduating as many doctors as British Columbia is licensing physicians.

I would like to ask the Minister whether she's contemplating the establishment of a second medical school in the City of Victoria and how she sees the development of new medical schools moving in to fill this gaping void between the numbers graduated, the numbers applying and the numbers being licensed. Could the Minister give some schedule? Can it go to 160 next year? Can it go to 240 the year after? Can it reach 300 and continue to grow until there is this equivalency? What does she see as the maximum size of one medical school here in British Columbia? Can we graduate 300 doctors per year from two medical schools, in her view? Or might it be a requirement in the future that we have more than two medical schools? Most important, Mr. Chairman, when is the government going to do those things that are necessary to commence graduating more doctors in British Columbia than we have up to this point?

HON. MRS. DAILY: I think the Hon. Member has brought up a matter which, yes, definitely concerns the government equally as he has expressed his concern. I personally had hoped that we would have seen more spaces at the medical faculty by this time. Our big problem, I'm sure the Hon. Member is aware, is in the area of the clinical facilities. That's the area that is holding back the expansion we had hoped for. As you know, the whole Shaughnessy, which has been taken over by the government, is one area which, if it can move ahead as speedily as it should, will be able to provide extra clinical facilities. So we're hoping that there'll be no barriers to the procedure in that area of Shaughnessy, which will give us an opportunity to bring more students in. Ultimately we certainly see at least, as you suggest, a figure of 160. At the moment we only have 80. You're quite right; for a province such as British Columbia we must provide the clinical facilities. That apparently is the area that's been holding us back.

No, we do not foresee a development of a medical faculty at the University of Victoria.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, might I follow up on that for just a moment? It's quite clear that the number of hospital beds is related to the population of British Columbia. If we expand the medical school, we're not going to change the clinical facilities at all. What you do have to do is to undertake a little administrative reorganization. That doesn't cost any money. The block is with the basic science facilities, which are preparatory to the clinical years. The other can be provided just by reorganization. You've got to have a big enough dissecting room so that students can study anatomy. That's where the block is. If all of the hospitals on the clinical level can't be organized to provide clinical teaching beds, then just start something in Victoria.

Mr. Chairman, the number of beds for British Columbians isn't going to change in the future. It never changes when a medical school is started. Last fall, for example, I visited the medical school at Galveston where I was lecturing. It's a small town; it's actually smaller than Victoria. It has no more beds than the Victoria area; there are 260 medical students.

Interjection.

MR. McGEER: Galveston. One can go all over North America and find that kind of thing. It's a question of how you organize your hospital beds. The difference is that they've got basic science facilities. They've got an anatomy dissecting room; they've got biochemistry labs; they've got the sorts of things that prepare medical students to the point where they can safely go on to wards with patients. That's why it falls directly on the Minister's shoulders. That's why it falls directly under this vote. Mr. Chairman, that's why the medical school isn't growing, and that's why we're turning away able young British Columbians.

HON. MRS. DAILY: I just want to comment.... I must defer to the Hon. Member, who is very knowledgeable in this area. I admit that in the basic science facilities there is a need for some expansion. But a number of MLAs from all parties

[[Page 1981](#)]

toured the medical science faculty, and I think we were quite impressed with the spaciousness and so on. But we're not the technical people in the area. I'm sure the Hon. Member can put his finger on maybe some areas that should be improved. You're right in the basic science. But there again we're down to priorities set by the university itself.

I think that we have to accept the fact that in areas like this the government does have to give an incentive. I can assure you that the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and myself are in consultation with UBC on this and also, of course, with the medical centre, which all has to be tied in together. I accept the points you have made, and your concern.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Just a few words in this vote about Trinity Western College, Fort Langley.

It is my understanding that under the federal fiscal arrangements Act of 1967 there is money available from the federal government in the amount of 50 per cent of the recognized college's net operational costs — directly available from the Government of Canada. I also understand that the previous government, some time ago, did make arrangements to have this granted to Notre Dame University, probably the only other university which was a comparable facility to Trinity Western in Fort Langley.

Trinity Western College is a very important part of the Fraser Valley and delivers a great contribution to the quality of life in that area. It has some 400 students. It has now graduated 2,000 students, many of whom have gone on to other provincial universities. It's a two-year community college. Many other students have gone, about 100, to universities all over the United States and Canada.

Most of the enrolment at Trinity now is Canadian and most of it is from the immediate area in the Fraser Valley, so it is serving an important purpose for many students in our area.

I understand too that it is the only college of its kind and quality in Canada which doesn't get the opportunity

to take advantage of this federal money. The reason it doesn't get the opportunity to take advantage of it is that it has to be granted through the provincial government. The provincial government must make available the means by which the college's operational budget can be incorporated into the overall provincial budget for educational costs. In other words, it has to be the province which is the channel through which this money can go to Trinity Western College.

I'm told that Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec all make sure the grant money gets returned to their students who are in similar institutions, facilities. I see this refusal by the government as a discrimination, Mr. Chairman, against students in a very high-quality educational institution.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for a share of provincial education costs. I think that has to be made very clear. There will be no money from the provincial government involved. All we are asking is that this college be allowed to take advantage of federal money that is already available and waiting, and should be going to these students. We are not asking the government to make any commitment to future financing or present financing. There will be no precedent established. It is just a simple finance formula which can be followed and which would see Trinity Western College in Fort Langley take advantage of operating money already available.

I would just like to read a couple of points that were made by the students at Trinity College in a brief in support of their getting this money. I won't read them all, but I will read a couple of the pertinent comments.

"In view of the fact that the original federal grant to higher education was made through the Universities Foundation programme prior to 1967 as a per capita grant, the money actually belongs to the young people who are the students." I think that is an impenitent point, Mr. Chairman. "Therefore," and this is a student speaking, "it is our firm belief that the citizens of British Columbia are being deprived of their right when federal grants are not made available. It is also our understanding that one of the aims of the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act of 1967 was to have flow back into the province as much of the federal tax dollar as possible."

So that flow should also happen in British Columbia as it does in other provinces, Mr. Chairman.

"It is our opinion and sound educational philosophy" — and this has been mentioned by the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) on more than one occasion in this debate — "that the more options open in post-secondary education, the more healthy the climate in higher education will become. Hence we believe institutions such as Trinity Western should be encouraged by the provincial government. Colleges such as Trinity Western save the province a vast amount of money by opening their doors to young people who would otherwise attend a provincially-supported college or university at government expense. To us at Trinity Western College it appears to be a matter of good business for the province to encourage rather than discourage such colleges.

"Our last reason, and in our opinion the most important, is that Trinity Western College is not requesting a share of provincial revenue." And I went through that before.

But it is important to remember that this money

[[Page 1982](#)]

would come to Trinity at no cost to the taxpayers of British Columbia, no direct cost, at least, in provincial revenues, and it does bring more of those federal tax dollars back into British Columbia.

I think it is a simple request. One that I must stress again would require the government of British Columbia to make no commitments and set no precedents. It is a simple formula which can be followed, and I think the government should follow it in order that all of the students in this province are treated equally, and that there is no discrimination against either an educational facility or students within that facility, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MRS. DAILY: I certainly appreciate the concern expressed by the Hon. Member. The Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston) has expressed similar concern to me. I have also met with the Member of Parliament for your area and the Premier and I have met with some of the administration from Trinity. So the first point I want to make is that this government does not wish to hold back on designating Trinity College to receive federal funding.

I'll tell you the problem we face, though. It is not correct, unfortunately — I wish it were — that if tomorrow we did designate Trinity College it would not cost the Province of British Columbia any money. It would. That is the problem we face.

Now I'm going to try and explain this. There is a 15 per cent ceiling set by the federal government through the fiscal arrangements Act. We have written to the Hon. Hugh Faulkner asking to have that ceiling lifted because British Columbia faces a very, very special situation, we feel. We are one of the few provinces in Canada which is experiencing a massive expansion of post-secondary institutions. Therefore, when they set their federal share, which is originally supposed to pick up 50 per cent, and then have set a ceiling of 15 per cent increase each year when our increases for post-secondary costs are hitting 25 per cent on an average, and yet all we are receiving from them is a 15 per cent increase, you can see that presently the Province of British Columbia is not even receiving anywhere near 50 per cent of the costs of post-secondary moneys from the federal government.

So you see if we put Trinity on the list tomorrow and designated it, it would result in a 100 per cent provincial cost unless Ottawa lifts that 15 per cent ceiling. I explained this in detail to the principal of the college and to the local MP, and I am glad I have the opportunity to explain to you that this government does not want to stand in the way. We agree with the students; Trinity should be designated. But as long as it is going to cost the provincial government money at this time, and we are having great difficulty in even meeting the needs of the public institutions, you can see the dilemma we are in.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Three questions. First, we are establishing certain small satellite colleges. For instance, I noted with interest the announcement that we are going to establish a marine college, or a marine training facility. One of the news releases calls it a training facility, and one calls it a college. I am wondering if any of the plans have been finalized for the marine college. Where will it be located? Will there be any capital construction? Will there be a budget established for the marine college? Where does it fall in this particular vote? Will this marine college fall into a category similar to the mining school which the Minister announced back in 1973 — the mining school that was established at Red Mountain Mine in Rossland which was to be moved from there to another site just northeast of where there were some underground workings an old mine site? Where is this mining school now? Is it functioning now? How many students are enrolled? Do you have a college site as such, or is it the mining site? What is the progress of this particular college in the light of the fact that mining seems to be suffering in our economic structure today? Those are the questions.

Second, what is the report of the Minister on the experiment of the "college without walls" in the Fraser Valley? I noted that the capital expenditure, which must have been just office renovation or something like that, was something like \$8,000 — a little more than \$8,000. Is the experiment working? Is the Minister satisfied that a college without walls is a concept that could be applied over the rest of the province? Is there difficulty in finding teaching areas? The projected enrolment by the officials of the college suggests that by 1984 there could be more than 30,000. This seems astronomical to me, but the projections are that they could have enrolment of 30,000. Can a college without walls function with that kind of an enrolment or are there plans now to establish a campus site for the Fraser Valley college?

My third question has to do with teacher training. It comes under, I think, the last section of this vote. The Minister has expressed concern, and this Member has expressed concern, that we move quickly into special education — education for the handicapped, education for those with learning disabilities. Since we are not rich within the province in faculty for teaching teachers, not only to diagnose learning disabilities, but how to teach those students with learning disabilities, I'm wondering what the policy is going to be for loans or scholarships or bursaries, financial aid to put it in basics, for students who wish to go, for instance, to Western Washington where they have a good faculty for training teachers in the area of learning disabilities. I have a couple from my area who would wish to enrol in Western Washington and who have been turned down for a student loan or student aid by virtue of the fact this it is an

out-of-province college.

I would suggest to the Minister that until we have good training facilities within the province, particularly in this area, the area of learning disabilities, we utilize the facilities nearby, and that we encourage our teachers to take further training in this area. What has the Minister to announce in this area?

HON. MRS. DAILY: First of all, the steering committee for the marine college is just being created. The report is done now — that's to actually get it started and to recommend first of all, of course, the specific site. I think you have a copy of the report in which three sites were suggested, so the process we are in now, is to get final recommendation for the site. Now it could involve the building of facilities or it could involve the buying of some existing ones, depending on their recommendation.

One thing that was made clear was that it should be in the lower mainland. That doesn't mean that there won't be services provided, say, in Prince Rupert and other areas but the core would be in the lower mainland. So that is moving.

You asked specifically...no, there is no money in the estimates for this year. I think it will take us about that time to get the establishment of where it's going and set up the board to run it. However, we're very aware of the need for it, and I know that everyone involved in marine life is waiting anxiously, and we'll try and push it as quickly as we can.

Mining in Rossland. Actually the enrolment is staying the same. I haven't got the figures, but the words from here are that we haven't dropped. Is that correct? Basically, we haven't dropped and it is a mining site. That's right.

The Fraser Valley. I still endorse the concept without walls. Certainly it's more economical, and also I think educationally it can be desirable, but there are areas where you're going to have to put up some walls and, as you pointed out, Mr. Member, with those population projections which could be quite true...enrolment I mean, we may have to put up some walls there. As a matter of fact, before us now is a request, as you probably know, from the college for some walls. In examining the situation, if we find that there are absolutely no existing facilities which can be used — and that's the first criteria — then we accept their recommendation that there may. But I want to keep it as decentralized as we can.

MR. SCHROEDER: Any announcement on funds for teachers wishing to train in handicapped?

HON. MRS. DAILY: I think that's a very good suggestion, Mr. Member, that until we get our own training programme, why not encourage them to go where there is one close by? It's an excellent suggestion, and what's happening in that area is that we're now trying to work out a means in which....

As you know it was pretty inflexible before — the student was going into the United States, they couldn't take their assistance with them from the government, their student-aid loan. We are going to break this down and if possible allow the student to pick up their loan here and use it down there, which before was only done for very special courses. We also feel there should be some sort of reciprocal agreement, right? This is the area we're working with, but it's an excellent suggestion and we're going to move on it.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just a follow up. You anticipated my next area, and that was that I would like to recommend we expand the entire reciprocal agreement, not just with colleges and universities in our own country, but perhaps with specialized colleges south of the border.

For instance, we have a college right nearby, the one that I have already mentioned in western Washington, which has fantastic facilities in teaching the area that I've mentioned in learning abilities. We have other colleges, for instance, the College of Mines in Western Colorado, to which we may well wish to send some of our students to equip themselves with the basic education in mining. I think we should expand this whole concept of reciprocal agreements with various colleges.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

I know that it has to have limitations. It has to be limited to a number of students and, of course, you have to

have an interest from students of that area who would normally enrol in, say, the Colorado College of Mines, who would express an interest that they wished to come to one of our universities. But I think that the reciprocal thing needs to be expanded. I wish that the Minister could give me some assurance today that I could go, for instance, to the couple who have applied through me, with some assurance that they should be able to send their application for a loan, if not a bursary or a grant, to the department. Would the Minister welcome this letter when it arrives on her desk in a few days?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes. I can give that assurance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Oh, beautiful. Next...

AN HON. MEMBER: Next? (Laughter.)

MR. SCHROEDER: Both! I noticed yesterday that the Minister was very proud when she said that the increase in operating grants to universities was

[[Page 1984](#)]

something like 26 per cent, 26 point something per cent. If the needs of the universities were something similar to that figure, I think that we would stand in the House and commend the Minister for meeting the need. However, in the University of Victoria alone, the operational fund requirements show an increase of some 42 per cent. This was the projection of their budget, the budget which was presented to the department — 41 per cent was the increased needs.

Now involved in that 41 per cent increase were some new programmes, to be sure. The faculty of law, the schools of nursing and social work were to be established. I'm amazed that there isn't a school for teacher training that would involve training facilities for teachers wishing to follow the field of specialized education. Nonetheless, these three programmes are programmes that were included in this 42 per cent increase and it is questionable whether these three programmes will be able to go ahead because the 26 per cent increase is all that these universities could realize in their operational grant.

I'm wondering whether the Minister is doing any research into the actual cost of servicing — or providing the services of education. I'm wondering whether the review teams the Minister sends out are doing any research into the area of how come a 41 increase in costs? If 42 per cent is a legitimate increase, then how could the Minister be satisfied with offering them a little more than half of that and say: "Here you are boys, see whether you can't make it this year."

What actually it means is that we are going to have to withdraw some of the plans for expansion, some of the new programmes that I am sure the Minister would like to see take place within the province. We are going to have to withdraw those plans and be satisfied with status quo and still have a 26 per cent increase in the cost of education.

Are there any designs on assisting local councils and local boards to assist them in teaching them how to hold costs down? Is there anything like this?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, first of all, with reference to the universities: As you know we have the university council now. We don't send out review teams any more, as you know. We never did, actually. This was the first year. You were asking about universities, right?

The university council made the recommendations to us. Out of interest, the universities get, as you know, \$156 million, roughly, and the universities had asked for \$161 million. So, you see, the university council did not accept the fact after their research. They are the ones who do the research for us. They said, "No, we don't think that is necessary." So they suggested \$156 million and, as you know, the government came in with \$156 million, which is a 26 per cent increase. I think in these times that that is a fairly healthy increase for the universities. I know it does mean some readjustment of priorities, but it is our feeling that if they readjust those priorities, they should be able to keep some of those good programmes going.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): A matter has come to our attention very recently where the Minister may be able to assist the committee. Some doubts have been raised in view of a telegram I propose to read in a few moments with respect to bidding practices in the construction of various community colleges and other facilities. Perhaps the Minister is familiar with this specific. I raise it now because we are obviously still in this vote and also because it does seem to be of concern.

In part, the telegram addressed to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) refers to the need to

PREVENT THE AWARDING OF A SUBSTANTIAL \$1,816,491 CONTRACT ON THE CAPILANO COLLEGE TEMPORARY CLASSROOM PROJECT TO CHIMO STRUCTURES LTD. WHO DID NOT PROVIDE THE MANDATORY BID SECURITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. UNFORTUNATELY, NUMEROUS EFFORTS REQUESTS TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY,

that is Capilano College

THE ARCHITECTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS AND THE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES HAVE BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL IN PREVENTING THIS FLAGRANT VIOLATION OF UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED BIDDING PRACTICE, NOT TO MENTION MORAL AND ETHICAL BUSINESS PROCEDURES.

The telegram continues:

FURTHER EFFORTS TO DATE BY THE AMALGAMATED CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION OF B.C. ARE BEING UNDERTAKEN TO CONVINCING OWNERS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE IRREGULAR BIDDING AND CONTRACT-AWARDING PRACTICES. OTHER TENDERS RECEIVED DID INCLUDE THE REQUIRED \$191,000 BID BOND, WHICH WAS SUBJECT TO FORFEITURE IN THE EVENT A CONTRACT WAS NOT ENTERED INTO WITHIN 14 DAYS OF SO BEING ADVISED BY THE OWNER.

The telegram concludes by requesting our assistance in ensuring that justice is served in this regard. It is a telegram over the name of R.B. Russell, vice-president and general manager of Fabco Leasing.

So some very real uncertainty, as I indicated, has been raised concerning awarding contracts. Does the Minister know, Mr. Chairman, through you, if an unusual bidding procedure has taken place in this specific or in any other cases where public money is being expended? I wonder if the Minister could take

[[Page 1985](#)]

just the few moments necessary in answering to indicate the guidelines that are set out by the Department of Education.

I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that the telegram, sent by a well-known company in British Columbia, levels some very serious charges, and I think that we do require some clarification by the Minister of the situation as she understands it today.

[Mr. Kelly in the chair.]

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, I'm not happy with what you have brought to my attention, I must say. Unfortunately, right to this moment I wasn't aware of it. I'm just having a check made with the superintendent who approves capital approvals. As you know, the college is the contracting agency, but the department must be involved in this. He's just doing a check by phone now. If we have an opportunity later, I will fill you in on what I find out on it.

I certainly am not happy with what you have informed me, and we will check it out for you right now.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, this has just come into our hands in a telegram dated today, and therefore there was no opportunity to even advise you of it before the House sat this morning.

Should this vote pass, do we have the Minister's assurance that she could, with leave of the House or under any other mechanism available to her, later advise the committee or the House as to what the inquiries have uncovered?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, I will.

Vote 46 approved.

On vote 47: grants to school districts, \$436,500,000.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Just one brief question to the Minister regarding grants to school districts and the additional burden of the introduction of the metric system. I've had some correspondence over the last six or seven months, some with the Minister of Education and some with the federal government. I find that in times gone by I've accused the Minister of Education of British Columbia of being a little slow in answering her correspondence, but it's nothing compared to the slowness of the federal government, I assure you of that. In a letter from the Minister to me regarding my view on the costs of the introduction of the metric system into the educational system, the Minister in one paragraph says, and this is the letter of October 22, 1974:

"However, I'd like to inform you that at recent meetings of the council of Ministers of Education all Ministers expressed concern regarding the added cost to the provinces in connection with conversion. We (that is, the Ministers) have been working closely through our officials with federal departmental officials to clarify and have some idea of the full cost of this conversion. We certainly concur with you that the federal government should be making a contribution in some area, whether that be straight financing or the provision of material."

I strongly believe that the national government should be making a contribution. I've written to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Turner, and about two and a half months later he wrote back and told me that he was referring this letter to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who is in charge of the metric commission.

I very recently have received a letter, which disappoints me very much, from Mr. Alastair Gillespie, dated "Avril le 23, 1975," and it says:

"Dear Mr. Chabot:

"My colleague, the Hon. John Turner, has furnished me with a copy of his reply to your letter of January 21 regarding the possibility of federal aid to defray the cost of introducing the metric system into the schools in British Columbia.

"You will appreciate that education is a matter of provincial jurisdiction and that the primary responsibility for distributing costs of education must lie with the provincial government. The federal government does not have any jurisdictional responsibilities to intervene in matters of education costs."

Now that's a lot of nonsense, because it's my understanding that the Ministers of Education throughout Canada are meeting with the metric commission or the top officials, probably even the Minister, regarding some kind of financial contribution from the national government for the costs that have been superimposed on the provinces in the introduction of this new system of measures. We have the Minister, Mr. Alastair Gillespie, hiding behind the fact that education is a matter of provincial responsibility. No one's denying that it is a provincial responsibility, but certainly here I thought that talks were going on and that cooperation would ultimately result from these negotiations. I find Alastair Gillespie now using these words to the effect that education is a provincial responsibility.

I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether the national government is going to assist, because I don't really believe that the new system should be a burden on the local taxpayers. Certainly we find that the mill rates are accelerating like they never have before.

Now if we're going to have additional costs thrown on the backs of the property owners of British Columbia,

I don't think it's very fair in view of the fact that the national government is superimposing this responsibility on the Departments of Education of every province. I'd like to hear from the Minister if she can convey to me whether the negotiations have come to a standstill or have broken off and whether we can believe what Alastair Gillespie says in his letter of April 23.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We're just as disappointed as you that to date we haven't received any concrete word of assistance, and that letter — "it's provincial jurisdiction" — we keep getting this too. The point is, Mr. Member, that one official from my department is representing us right at this moment in Toronto on this whole matter of the metric conversion. We are expecting to get an up-to-date report from him on where we stand at this time. But I think you're quite right: it finally will have to rest with the Ministerial level. There will be a council of Ministers meeting, I believe, in June, at which time I know all the Ministers will be wanting to exert more pressure for this. At the moment I'm as disappointed as you that we have no specific assurances.

MR. McCLELLAND: Just briefly again, to the Minister, this may not exactly be in her jurisdiction, but I'd like her to talk to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) on a matter regarding exemptions for independent schools which are operating in various communities. I have a specific case in mind which the Municipal Affairs Minister knows about but which I realize has to go through all of the ordinary appeals. In the meantime, the Municipal Act requires an assessor to decide whether or not an institution operating as a school is in fact a school.

The assessor, who has no training in that field, and can't be expected to have and shouldn't be expected to have, has to make that decision as to whether or not a school is actually a school for purposes of exemption from taxation. I don't think it's fair for a person, highly trained and trained as an assessor, to also be asked to make those kinds of decisions. When they're making those kinds of decisions, I don't know what criteria they have upon which to base that decision.

So it seems to me that the Minister could consult with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) on the Municipal Act and perhaps have the Act changed to have that criterion established at least with the Education department — not with an assessor who is now attached to the assessment authority. I don't know how many cases there are of this happening — I know of one specific case. Once the precedent has been established of an assessor refusing exemption for a facility which is operating as a school, there may be a rush of similar kinds of things happening. But basically I think it is wrong to ask an assessor to also be an assessor of educational standards, because that isn't the job for which he's trained. I really believe that that section of the Municipal Act should be amended, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I see the Minister has left, but I will chase him later and we will discuss it. I think you brought up a good point. If I can find him I will talk to him about it.

MR. McCLELLAND: Thank you.

Can I just bring up one other quick matter, Mr. Chairman? I'll do it very quickly so you don't rule me out of order. I want to make a suggestion to the Minister with regard to education within our local school districts. I know she is interested in drug education and things like that. I was just handed a copy of a clipping from a newspaper today about some students associated with the health education centre in Victoria who made a dummy called "Nikki Teen." This dummy is being used to portray the dangers of smoking to young students. I think it is a heck of a good idea. I would like to pass on to the Minister for her consideration that the department might expand this programme and have a couple of other dummies.... (Laughter.) I withdraw that unconditionally, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister could expand into the whole education system through the local school boards a series of these dummies. There could be three, I'm suggesting, rather than just one named "Nikki Teen." We could also have one named "Al Cohol" and one named "Herr Oin" and have them used as graphic examples throughout a really accelerated programme of education for the students and have them used in the schools on a regular basis. I think it is a really good idea this education centre has come up with and I would like the Minister to consider its expansion.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I accept that and certainly we will take it back to the department and see if we can make further use of those dummies.

MR. CURTIS: Yesterday the Minister was quite helpful with respect to provision of facilities or alteration of facilities for physically handicapped individuals. Reviewing the *Hansard* Blues, I see that in connection with the specific which I raised — that is Spectrum Community School in the greater Victoria School District 61 — the Minister stated that she was not very happy. I quote:

I immediately asked for a reason why Spectrum was not going to be available to the physically handicapped. I simply was not ready to accept that.

I asked the people in my department to go back to

[[Page 1987](#)]

the greater Victoria School Board and just see whatever possible means can be done to ensure that the handicapped can get into that school.

Continuing to quote the Minister, Mr. Chairman:

I feel as strongly about this as you do and I am sure the school board themselves must realize that a community school must be a community school. I can assure you that I don't intend to let this one drop. I think we all have a responsibility here.

So we did discuss the specific which I raised and we kept it in that context of a single community school in this school district. What we did not do yesterday was to even briefly seek the Minister's opinion with respect to departmental policy overall in terms of other community schools and major secondary schools which are in the earliest planning stage or which are perhaps moving well along in the planning and design stage and will go to construction within the next few months.

I think it is an area of concern which should be explored once more under this vote. What is the policy? What is the encouragement, or, if you wish, directive, to individual school boards because of this transfer of funds in this vote to the individual school districts from the department to just increase the provision of the ramps, the wider doors, the enlarged cubicles in washrooms, et cetera, that are so necessary for the physically handicapped?

The point I made yesterday in the specific, and I make again today in the general, is that as the province properly moves into more community use of school facilities for adults by individuals in the community, then surely these should be available to people who are otherwise shut out.

So many public agencies now are aware of and responding to the demand for the kind of easy access which is vital for the physically handicapped, those confined to wheelchairs and so on. I would like the Minister to just tell us what the policy is or how it is evolving and what kind of guarantee we can have on this side of the House that this segment of public construction in British Columbia is keeping up with the rest.

HON. MRS. DAILY: I appreciate the sincere concern of the Member on this. We've brought this to the attention of the school boards. We have met with the physically handicapped provincial association, and we've passed on to the school boards and endorsed that the schools should be made available for the handicapped.

I think the Hon. Member would understand, having been in municipal politics for so many years, the cost to schools — the cost to renovate, for instance, old schools in this area, and also the fairly steep costs for even building new schools with this. So what we've said to them is that where possible, in every community we want to be sure particularly that a community school has that accessibility. We're also encouraging them, where they can within the grant structure that's available to them through capital grants and their own, to build their schools with some entry. I just cannot give you any assurance that every school in the province will have it. I think you'd appreciate that. But we have sent out the message, and I think this is important. Frankly, it has been a tragic scene where none of us in the past has given that concern and even recommended this to be done. I think the scene has changed here; the school boards of the province are alerted to this. I'll be speaking with trustees on Monday and I'll have an opportunity there to reinforce this.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

MR. CURTIS: I would think that the Minister can go to the annual meeting of the B.C. School Trustees Association, knowing that in this specific instance she has the full support of the official opposition. Of course, not every school can be made to accommodate or, indeed, need be made to accommodate the physically handicapped. But you, Madam Minister, have indicated the community schools in particular. That was the point I attempted to make yesterday and again today.

I also would point out that the renovation or the alteration of existing school buildings to accommodate physically handicapped is clearly very expensive. But in the planning stage, right from the first stroke of pencil on paper, surely the cost is relatively low — and I emphasize "relatively low." A doorway two feet wider, when it is provided for on paper, on plan, is considerably less expensive than having to remove a concrete block wall, steel beams, whatever it might be, after the building is in the finished condition and, in fact, in use.

MR. SCHROEDER: I can't let the opportunity go by without calling on the Minister again to end that discriminatory practice in the direction of school grants which allows no grant at all to go to that segment of our society which is providing an educational service for over 23,000 students and is giving no recognition and certainly no financial assistance. By "none," I'm using the absolute for the relative.

It wouldn't be so bad if it was just a matter of saying to that segment: "You are on your own; you are responsible for your own financing. You are responsible for your own administration and for your own teacher placement. You are responsible for your own capital construction and you can use your funds do it with." That would be understandable.

However, that same segment of society pays through the assessment and taxation programme the same number of dollars in taxes as do the rest of us

[[Page 1988](#)]

who do not belong to that particular community. Their tax dollars go into the general revenue from which these grants are made. As a result, it's clear that it's discriminatory and unjust, in my opinion, that these dollars being siphoned from them for education are not returned to them so that they can render the service which all of us agree is due every child in this province.

And I must, without seeking to be redundant, call on the Minister again to start even this year — if she started with a small percentage perhaps — with a commitment that over a period of perhaps two or three years, these people would be put into the full flow of the grant programme which is represented by vote 47. If there was a ray of light that said this year they're going to get 20 per cent.... I know it's not there and I know I'm asking for the impossible to have it inserted here, but I'm speaking philosophically when I say it would be at least a recognition of the fact that they are offering equal if not better educational services to a segment of society. It would be a recognition of that fact if we said to them: "Okay, this year we are going to take step 1 and we are going to give you, say, 20 per cent of your operational costs per instructional unit that is being offered to the public sector."

I find it unfair; I find it almost impossible to believe that we in our society could be so unjust as to take from this segment of the population their tax dollars, tell them that it is for education, and then not return to them at least a similar number of dollars so that they can use those dollars for the purposes for which they were originally collected.

This is the area on which I have spoken several times in this House, Mr. Member. I think it is very, very obvious; it should be very clear by now what we are asking for. I think that it is a just position. I don't think we are asking for something that shouldn't exist. We are not asking for something that could be considered as something that looks like welfare. No way. These people belong to our structure; they belong to our society; they pay taxes as all of us do. When assessments are increased again this year for school purposes, as they most definitely have been, and when tax assessment and mill rates around the various school districts are 40, 41, 42, 41.6, 41.1 per cent, these people are being discriminated against again. They pay. What do they receive for those dollars?

The Minister could easily say: "Well, it would be better if we removed taxation from property." That way the dollars wouldn't be designated for education and the people wouldn't have the knowledge that so-and-so dollars are

being collected for education and then not received. Nonetheless, it would be just as discriminatory if the funds were coming from general revenue or from resource funds.

Therefore, I call on the Minister again: take step 1; give them some recognition. Give them the return, this year at least, even if it is just a percentage of the dollars that have been collected from them for education purposes.

I have to commend the Minister for having taken the step that says: "We are going to do a review to see what services can be rendered to these people in independent schools to be sure that there is equality in education and that every child in the province shall have the same opportunity for education." I have to commend her for saying that facilities will be available.

There is a question about textbooks. She has said that examinations will be available. I am pleased to announce that in some areas of the province transportation is being provided on a non-discriminatory basis. I have to commend the Minister. She has taken some steps, and we recognize that. But when it comes to the almighty dollar, there is a tight fist. I know it is a philosophical difference, but my plea to you today is: what is so wrong, even economically, with the philosophy that I represent? I think we owe these people something for the years of neglect, for which I hang my head. We owe them something for the years of neglect in recognition and in dollars today.

The year 1975 could be a banner year for education. Let me tell you why again. This system of education which we call independent, and which I see as a part of the total, represents the flexibility in education which we all want. It is at least a step in the right direction which says that we can have schools with different structures. We don't all have to be under the same monolithic form. I am right on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I was just going to ask the Hon. Member — he is doing very well — to relate his remarks just a little more directly to the vote.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, thank you, thank you. Thank you for that interruption, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that through these grants we could give recognition that they are offering to our province this particular service. They are showing us the way, Madam Minister. They are showing us that our society has the flexibility that these two different concepts can co-exist within the province. I think we should show them that we recognize this by offering them this year at least some token dollars that say to them: "Hey, help is on the way."

These people show us that there can be a completely different attitude in the classroom structure and a completely different attitude between students and teachers, that there can be such a thing as a highly disciplined classroom and a loosely disciplined classroom. They show us that there can be

[[Page 1989](#)]

an open classroom and a more structured classroom. They show us that the ratio of students to teachers can be far less and still have a lower operating cost per student than we have in the public sector. They tell us that the cost per student, which these grants represent in the public sector, is \$1,262 per student. If you move into the independent sector, the last figures I have from them tell me that their costs are still around \$900 per student, with a lower student-to-teacher ratio.

The fact is that these students who come through this particular school system do not suffer in their education. They are as acceptable at university as we are. Their marks on any aptitude test or enrolment examination or entrance examinations score just as high as we do. Therefore they are offering a system to British Columbia which could well show us the way. We could do well by saying to them: "Show us how you are doing it. Let us compare the two." This comparison might do us well not only in this year but might also do us well in the years to come. The innovation which we seek is in this structure in part, I would suggest to the Minister: let's do it. Let's give them the ray of hope that we care, that we recognize their abilities and that we appreciate the flexibility which they can give.

Madam Minister, if you would stand on your feet today, you would be doing education in this province a great service by saying: "Here we are; here's a few hundred thousand, a few million dollars for these particular

people." I know I am asking the impossible but, good heavens, if you don't start knocking on the wall of the impossible, you can never make the impossible even pro—bable. I believe that this recognition is due today.

HON. MRS. DAILY: May I say that I have noted the concerns of the Hon. Member?

MR. CURTIS: As I see it, as a relatively new Member of this House — certainly not with the Legislative experience of the Minister — vote 47 is the essence, the heart, of the education finance problems which have plagued British Columbia for quite some time. This represents grants to school districts, and it clearly is not enough money. It clearly is not sufficient money in order that education can progress in British Columbia as most of us would like to see it happen.

So we really have at the heart here, on this line of \$436.5 million, the record of the broken promise of this government with respect to removal of costs of education from property, from homes and farms. And we see so many disappointments which have been enunciated by the teachers federation, the B.C. School Trustees Association and by, most importantly, the taxpayers. This vote is the focal point of the failure of the NDP in British Columbia to deliver what it said it would in campaign promises. We are going to oppose this vote, but let it be very clearly understood why. It's because the funds are insufficient and the promise has not been kept.

Vote 47 approved on the following division:

YEAS — 27

| | | |
|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Hall | Macdonald | Barrett |
| Daily | Strachan | Stupich |
| Hartley | Calder | Sanford |
| Cummings | Levi | Lorimer |
| Williams, R.A. | Cocke | King |
| Lea | Young | Lauk |
| Nicolson | Nunweiler | Gorst |
| Rolston | Steves | Kelly |
| Webster | Lewis | Liden |

NAYS — 13

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------|
| Smith | Bennett | Chabot |
| Richter | McClelland | Curtis |
| Morrison | Schroeder | McGeer |
| Anderson, D.A. | Williams, L.A. | Gibson |
| | Wallace | |

HON. MRS. DAILY: Mr. Chairman, will you have this brought to the attention of Mr. Speaker, and have it recorded?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I got the message. Agreed.

Vote 48: Teachers Superannuation Fund,

\$22,300,000 — approved.

On vote 49: night school grants and training programmes, \$2,000,000.

MR. WALLACE: Just a quick question, Mr. Chairman. I'm interested in the item for new Canadians. We've discussed in debates earlier the difficulties of children coming into the school system who do not speak English. The Green Paper on immigration is a very topical question at the moment.

I wonder if the Minister could give us some details on this \$ 1.5 million entitled "courses for New Canadians." I think, indeed, that if we are to integrate various cultures and various ethnic groups, we perhaps haven't been paying enough attention to the need to start right at the beginning with the children from these different backgrounds who may, right off the bat, even have the language difficulty in not speaking English. I think the lady Member from one of the Vancouver ridings brought this to our attention earlier in the debate. I just wondered what this \$1.5 million encompasses. What kind of...?

[[Page 1990](#)]

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, it's a bit noisy. Do you think we could have some order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Hon. Member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) and other Members have made the point that sometimes we get a little disorderly. So I would ask that we observe general rules of decorum. Carry on.

MR. WALLACE: I just wondered if the Minister could tell us what the course are to be and who is actually designing the courses for the new Canadians. Is it to be through the schools or the colleges? To what degree is it to be dedicated or directed towards children coming into the system or adults who are now living in British Columbia who are having language problems with English?

Above all, I'm interested in how much of this \$1.5 million, if any, is matched by federal funding. The federal government surely has a very important responsibility, in developing its new immigration policies, to come with more money for the widest possible look at the field of education. If we're getting any federal money, could I ask the Minister if there are any constraints or restrictions or preconditions which have been spelled out by the federal government under which the Minister can take this kind of initiative?

I think the department is taking a wise step in this direction and deserves credit. But I think it should not just be by any means a provincial responsibility, particularly in the financing. If there are matching funds federally, what, if any, conditions has the federal government spelled out?

HON. MRS. DAILY: The \$1.5 million is an agreement between the province and the federal government which provides assistance for landed immigrants and adults only. That's the crux of our problem. That's why, when I'm in Ottawa, we'll be making this specific demand to have it include the children so that we can get funds for the students, which up to now have been paid primarily by the local school boards and the province. The grants, though, which are made just for adult landed immigrants and citizens, are made to school boards and colleges, and are shared one-half by the federal government .

MR. WALLACE: Just a quick follow-up on that, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister, then, if this is very much a matter of college and school district autonomy in deciding whether or not they will seek grants, or is there a certain amount allocated to each school district? Is it very much up to the school district, if it wants it, to seek the money?

Furthermore, has the Minister on previous occasions asked the federal government to extend the help to school children rather than just landed immigrants and been refused, or has the request never really been made?

I think there isn't enough publicity given to the fact that the federal government, in many of its efforts to improve the overall immigration picture, has perhaps overlooked the obvious important factor that if parents come to this country as immigrants speaking another language, while it is important that they gain employment — and that is contingent upon communication — surely the fact that the children are landed with the very serious problem of

going into school and not being able to speak English is of equal importance. Has the Minister previously asked the federal government for such funding and been refused?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, we have. We have specifically been before them. I went with other Ministers of Education, and we brought this to their attention, I think, over two years ago. As you can see, we haven't had any specific results. But the latest word I have in talking to Members in Ottawa, et cetera, is that I think the federal government appears to be amenable to this. So what we have to do is pin down the actual cost-sharing. This is what the council of Ministers collectively will be doing at our meeting. I see that there is a distinct possibility assistance can come; I assume that from what I've heard. But you're quite right; it should have been here long before this.

The grants are supposed to come through the department. After we get the enrolments and the needs, then we present that to Ottawa.

Vote 49 approved.

On vote 50: salary contingencies, \$ 1,951,759.

MR. SCHROEDER: The departments heretofore have been explaining that this salary contingency figure represents anticipated salary increases for the number of people in the department. Yet just a quick comparison...

Interjection.

MR. SCHROEDER: Oh!...with from the Department of Consumer Services, under which we had quite an elaborate discussion of salary contingencies. Where they have 68 people, their salary contingency figure is \$652,683. A quick computation on the number of people that are in the Education department — did you know this, Mr. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) — shows there are 524 people in the department and their salary contingency is \$1,951,000 and a few odd

[[Page 1991](#)]

dollars. Now if these salary contingencies are computed on a basis of percentage increase for the number of people within the department, if that same percentage prevails, then the salary contingency figure for the Education department should be just a little over \$5 million. But I want to know how the \$1,951,000 was computed. Maybe it has nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, at all with an expected percentage increase or the expected salary settlements for the next year. I want to know how we arrived at \$1,951,759. How was the figure arrived at?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We're satisfied, if you compare the number of employees listed and then take into account what is projected as the increase, which is approximately 24.8 per cent. Then your possible increases and increments.... It would work out to that, as far as we're concerned.

MR. SCHROEDER: Madam Minister, it just doesn't add up when you make a comparison. We got the same answer from the Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young). Exactly the same answer. Now she's got 68 people, Mr. Chairman. Her allotment for contingencies is \$652,000....

HON. MRS. DAILLY: On a point of order, maybe I could clear something up here. In our block vote we also have included under our staff the ones who teach in the vocational schools — okay? Therefore, if you take that block vote into consideration and pick up those staffs out there, you can see where it would add up.

Vote 50 approved.

Vote 51: advances re rural school taxes, \$10 — approved.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to inform the Premier that there is a motion before the committee on the Department of Housing to reduce the Minister's salary. I hope the Premier hasn't forgotten that.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh, we didn't forget that, but we thought you had. (Laughter.)

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee reports resolution and asks leave to sit again, and further reports that a division took place in committee and asks that this division be recorded in the *Journals* of the House.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

[Return to [Legislative Assembly Home Page](#)]

Copyright © 1975, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada