

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)

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 1117](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

An Act to Amend the Medical Act (Bill No. I 10) Hon. Mr. Cocke.

Introduction And first reading — [1117](#)

An Act to Amend the Mental Health Act (Bill No. 114) Hon. Mr. Cocke.

Introduction and first reading — [1117](#)

Oral Questions

Effect on private hospitals of Gorge Road Hospital. Mr. Curtis — [1117](#)

Ferry service to B.C. middle coast region. Mr. McClelland — [1118](#)

Sukunka coal agreement. Mr. Smith — [1118](#)

Night ferry service. Mr. Morrison — [1119](#)

Cost sharing of transportation losses. Mr. McGeer — [1119](#)

Committee of supply: Department of Education estimates.

Mr. Gardom — [1120](#)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1124](#)

Mr. McClelland — [1127](#)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1127](#)

Mr. Wallace — [1127](#)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1132](#)

Mr. Phillips — [1133](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [1140](#)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1145](#)

Automobile Insurance Act (Bill No. 35). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [1146](#)

Division — [1149](#)

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO
AMEND THE MEDICAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Cocke moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 110 intituled *An Act to Amend the Medical Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 110 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.

AN ACT TO
AMEND THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Cocke moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 114 intituled *An Act to Amend the Mental Health Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 114 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.

Oral questions.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

EFFECTS ON PRIVATE
HOSPITALS OF GORGE ROAD OPENING

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke)? Could the Minister give the House his views on the situation now being faced by small privately owned and owner-operated private hospitals in greater Victoria which I understand are operating at below capacity since the opening of the Gorge Road Hospital just a few weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me. Is this within the jurisdiction of the Minister?

HON. MR. COCKE: I would think so, Mr. Speaker. Under my purview, of course, is the extended care facility at Gorge Road Hospital. We opened that about a month ago and about 300 beds were made available to this general area.

There are a great number of people in the Province of British Columbia who do not have access, though qualified by virtue of their chronic illness for extended care, but do not have access to those beds. When those beds become available in the public sector — that is the non-profit hospitals or those hospitals that are controlled by the municipalities or regional districts — when those beds become available, naturally people are attracted to \$1 a day as opposed to \$400 or \$500 a month.

A number of people in Victoria have been moved, by virtue of the availability of the beds, to our extended care wing at Gorge Road Hospital. Other than that, I can't predict what will happen to the private hospitals.

MR. CURTIS: Supplementary question: With your leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. CURTIS: The indication — and again I emphasize these are not syndicate-operated private hospitals, but the small owner-operated hospitals — the indication is that at some time in the future, not named, they will be given perhaps six months notice of closure. So they are left in a state, of limbo. Would the Minister comment on this situation? These people have dedicated a lot of their years and a lot of time and energy to the care of the elderly, particularly, and indigent in this area.

HON. MR. COCKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to some hospitals in the Province of British Columbia that they may not have too much tenure. A number of them were warned they would likely be closed down by this December. We did close down one or two, who were just not providing the level of care that was needed. We had to close them down.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone on to say to the private hospitals in the area, or for that matter in any area in B.C., if they have a facility that could be used by the regional districts as hospitals, we are prepared to negotiate with them as we are at the present time with a number in the greater Victoria area.

I think we are being perfectly fair. As a matter of fact, most of those hospitals know we are taking a very serious look at their facilities as to where they might fit in the scheme of things for the delivery of health care in the Province of B.C.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to address this question to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water

[[Page 1118](#)]

Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) but since he is not in the House, perhaps the President of the Council might answer for him.

MR. SPEAKER: You must wait until the Minister is in his chair.

FERRY SERVICE TO B.C. MIDDLE COAST REGION

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, then I will address this question to the Premier and President of the Council. Yesterday, it was indicated in the House there were great plans for the general area of the middle coast of British Columbia and in particular, the Ocean Falls area. The question, Mr. Speaker, is: has this planning involved the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) in carrying out the former government's undertaking to provide adequate ferry service in this region?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, that matter is in the hands of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. leader of the Liberal Party.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF B.C. PROPOSALS TO WASHINGTON

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he is able to indicate to the House whether there will be any public discussion whatsoever of the proposals he intends to put

before the United States state department officials prior to the press conferences of Tuesday of next week which he mentioned yesterday?

HON. MR. BARRETT: There is no planned public discussions. I hope the leaders of the three parties will make themselves available to the opportunity of having a pre-release on the material. It would be unfair to the United States government to discuss the proposals without taking them to them first. I think that is only courtesy.

As a matter of courtesy, as I said yesterday, there will be pre-releases to federal leaders on the same stipulation as the budget speech and throne speech. I am sure many Members of the House understand that.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that question: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier, what the difficulty might be in discussing a proposal which you might wish to put before the American government in British Columbia beforehand. For instance, if the suggestion is an Arctic railway from Prud'homme Bay down to the southern 48 states, I can see no difficulty whatsoever in discussing this with British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I refer you to Beauchesne, page 148 item "g". You must not seek information about matters which are in their nature secret, such as decisions of proceedings by the cabinet, advice on matters still to be discussed between governments." You can't expect the...

HON. MR. BARRETT: I don't mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it's up to the Minister. He can answer if he wishes.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of courtesy, it is only proper that we follow the channels that have even been suggested by the federal government in terms of contact and in terms of presentation. I intend to make the material available to the House Leaders of the various parties before it is released publicly.

It would not be very wise, in my opinion, to start a public debate about a matter that the people who may be participants in, against or for or anything else...without them having the courtesy of seeing the material or the presentation of the government. I think that's only courteous.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the question was not directed to the channels to be used. It was directed to the presentation to be made — a different point which apparently I did not make clear when I asked my original question. The question is, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there will be discussion as to the merits or otherwise of the presentation to be made, not whether or not the channels used are those proposed by...

MR. SPEAKER: It's not an obligation of the Government to disclose in advance what proposals it intends to take or what advice it intends to give the Crown in respect of any matter, either with this Government or any other government. The question should not then be asked. The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

SUKUNKA COAL AGREEMENT

MR. D.E. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Hon. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (non. Mr. Nimsick). With respect to the Sukunka coal agreement, has the Minister of Mines any agreement with the private principals involved to undertake any underwriting of either the

[[Page 1119](#)]

initial capital development costs or any on-going operating costs?

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Mr., Speaker, in answer to that, all I will say is that negotiations are going on and I don't think it would be proper for me to discuss anything here in the House at this time.

MR. SMITH: Supplemental question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to get this straight with the House early in our question period. It is not the duty of a Minister to state to the House a matter in which he is still in negotiation and which he intends to give advice to the Crown and in which the Crown has not yet settled an agreement with somebody else, let it be a foreign government or a corporation. In view of that situation, I ask this simple question: How can you have a supplemental question on a matter that really — from the statement of the Minister — is not proper?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think you're anticipating a type of question that I was not really going to direct to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to be fair then, let's hear the question.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister a supplemental question. You say the matter is under discussion. Would you be prepared to table with the House the information that you have concerning the matters of either investment in initial working capital or on-going operating costs, when that information becomes available to the Government?

HON. MR. NIMSICK: Mr. Speaker, that question will be decided on after the negotiations are completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Victoria.

NIGHT FERRIES

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Hon. Minister of Highways. Has the Minister of Highways written to the Greater Victoria Chamber of Commerce explaining that a night ferry between Vancouver Island and the mainland is really not a valid request, because the ferries are not a part of the highways system?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): I don't recollect having made such a reply, but I did write to a chamber of commerce, as I recollect. If you wish, I'll send you a copy of the letter.

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, may I have a supplemental also? Does the Minister not consider that to simply suggest that the ferries cost \$32 million a year to operate, has no regard for, first of all, the current operating revenues and, secondly, the wide secondary impact that the ferry system has on the revenue of the province through other developments on Vancouver Island itself? Does the Minister not know that the ferry system produces more revenue per mile than any other part of the highway system?

MR. SPEAKER: It sounds rhetorical, but if you wish to answer, Hon. Minister...

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Would you like to send those written questions over so that I can answer them one by one? I'm certainly aware that the ferries do contribute a great deal to the input of tourist traffic to Vancouver Island. I do consider them, as a matter of fact, a part of the highway system. At the same time, I think that as a responsible Minister I wasn't given a responsibility to spend money in a way that I didn't think was advisable at this time. I have to look at the overall cost of the ferry system and how it can be manned expeditiously and as efficiently as possible. The mere desire of having a particular ferry on at night or at 3:00 o'clock in the morning doesn't necessarily mean that it should be coming forthwith, presto.

We have to examine the overall picture as part of the overall cost of this province. I want the people to realize that it is different from a highway. You put a highway down there and it doesn't require the manning, the staffing and the catering and everything else that goes with it — when you put a highway down. A ferry does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey,

COST SHARING OF

TRANSPORTATION LOSSES

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the rebuff by the Greater Vancouver Regional District last evening of the Minister's proposal for cost sharing of transportation losses — the report was that it was greeted with laughter. Would the Minister have any new proposal to offer today regarding transportation problems in the lower mainland?

[[Page 1120](#)]

HON. J.B. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would say that I wasn't sure that there was the laughter or not, but there may have been. I must say that I was very disappointed that they didn't jump at the opportunity I gave them, (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: Who wants to jump over a cliff?

AN HON. MEMBER: The laughter here should be recorded, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. LORIMER: It's my opinion that people in the lower mainland and the Victoria area do require an efficient transit service. I was hopeful that there would be some suggestion made by the regional district — maybe a counterproposal or some suggestion as to what they would want — in order that we can facilitate the introduction of the operation.

All I can say is that it would seem to me that with the refusal we'll have to start again and look at it again; We're open to suggestions that they might have. We have a starting point which we started at and I was hopeful that they would make some suggestions to us. I understand that they will be doing so. I'm sure that the people in the area who will be affected by transit want transit. I'm hopeful that this will be supplied but it's not going to be completely supplied by the provincial government.

MR. McGEER: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it that the Minister would be prepared to meet in the very near future with officials of the Greater Vancouver Regional District to discuss alternative plans?

HON. MR. LORIMER: At the staff level, I anticipate that they'll be meeting probably the first part of the week. This is an on-going discussion. They're meeting. I can't answer whether I'm going to meet with them, but certainly meetings are taking place and will continue to take place.

MR. McGEER: The question, Mr. Speaker, was: would he be prepared to meet?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Saved by the bell! (Laughter).

Orders of the day.

Committee of supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 45: Minister's office, \$72,464.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If we go ahead and break the cabinet of the Government into their respective functions, we find that the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr.

Macdonald) would be regarded as the Government's lawyer. The Hon. Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) would be regarded as the Government's miner, not the pocketbooks of the mining industry. And we would have to record that the very attractive lady cabinet Minister (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) has got to be regarded as the Government's teacher. I have today a little something for the Government's teacher.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I hope it's an Okanagan one.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): I hope there's no worm in it. (Laughter).

MR. GARDOM: It's a hard-core apple, Mr. Attorney General. I'd like this to be Presented to the Hon. lady Minister of Education because she very much deserves it. I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that if there was an area — if I could have a little silence from the Hon. ex-Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) over there, it would be helpful. (Laughter). It's nice to have you aboard.

I would like to say that if there was ever a Minister who is deserving of a great number of smiles in the Province of British Columbia, it's the lady Minister of Education. There's no question that smiles indeed became the order of the day when she received her portfolio. I do hope very much that she enjoys the apple.

I know she's happily married. I know that I'm happily married. However, if the Hon. lady Minister deems to bake a pie, I'd be happy to provide the candlelight and wine and share it with her. (Laughter).

However, in every created commodity, Mr. Chairman, in one form or another, be it by way of SSMA, UIC, WCB, FHB, PDQ, MIK, stumpage, pumpage or dumpage, the most continuing payment and the largest payment that will ever be made in a lifetime by an individual is taxes, taxes, taxes.

The kinds we have come in every possible form and from every possible corner — licences, dues, fees, royalties, import and export, manufacturing and business, air, land and water taxes, registration charges, excise sales, income, personal, corporate and partnership, outcome and in-betweencome, federal, provincial, municipal, direct, indirect, obvious, not-so-obvious, and some downright concealed. We have life taxes. We have death taxes. There may well even

[[Page 1121](#)]

be Heaven taxes, Hell taxes and Purgatory taxes too.

MRS. JORDAN: And wife taxes.

MR. GARDOM: It's not possible for a person to live a day or die a day in the province without someone paying, for him, her or it, some kind of a tax. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we could readily survive without food, clothing or shelter far longer than we could ever exist without running into some sort of public payment or tax.

Our citizens on the one hand have chosen to become muddled and confused by the prolificacy of the thing and on the other hand governments have chosen to become nothing more than continually high-handed impostors and complicators, most often without even so much as a how-do-you-do as to how these things ever came into being, what their initial purpose was and how they could be cut or eliminated or be made more fair, feasible or capable of being properly understood.

I'd say in this field we have the grossest and greatest example of unimpeded, inexplicable, complicated and confused growth in the history of man.

There's only one direction that we can be certain of in the maze of taxation which besets us and that is in the direction of more. But that which governs society most, which is taxes, is that of which it knows the very least. I say that it is appalling, Mr. Chairman — it's nice to see you in the Chair today looking so well and retaining such excellent order in the House — it's appalling, Mr. Chairman and indeed alarming that the knowledge that our students possess today of how our tax system works is just about nil.

The fault, if it doesn't lie with the education system, which I very strongly believe it does, can definitely be cured by the educational system. I don't think it's too much to suggest that people should not leave school without some basic conception of how their city, province or country is run and how it is financed.

A learned writer said this: "The subject of taxation shouldn't be the preserve of an elitist group of experts." I ask that very, very fulsome consideration be given by the Hon. lady Minister as soon as possible to including that topic within our secondary school course content.

I'd like to talk a little more about course content. I think that we should be placing in British Columbia more emphasis on what I'd like to call social contact or social communication courses and more emphasis upon basic philosophies, I'd like to concern myself with the latter first.

I think that we should be teaching some basic philosophical fundamentals in our schools and providing comparisons too. I say that we should be teaching things about the dignity of the individual, the precept of law and order, the concept of justice and equity and equality, the value of spiritual doctrine and of aesthetic experience, the love of beauty, the need for environmental balance, the qualities and quantities of honest performance, and peace as a reality and the peaceful recognition of an opposing point of view.

Why there has not been any effective place for this in our pre-university institutions is quite beyond me. I'd like really to withdraw the word "institution," for that is really not what we wish our schools to be regarded as. I'd say that the successful programmes and the successful school administrations in the Province of British Columbia are the ones where the students are happy to be and the teachers want to teach.

I am not advocating the "free school" concept, because I don't believe in that. But I would say this, that for an educational system to be something of value it has got to be with it. There has never been enough stress on either the philosophical side, which I mentioned at the outset, or on the day by day practical side, which I'd like to say a few words about now.

There's been too much rote — and as Andy Stephen might say, "The moving rote having writ fingers on."

I would like to say a word now about the social contact, social communication side — the day by day, "bread alone" stuff. We eat, we drink, we sleep, we work, we live, we die, we procreate, we feed, clothe and shelter ourselves. Surely some basic instruction along those lines is not misplaced in our provincial primary and secondary curricula.

The lady Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) indicated last night that "Dick has all the fun and Jane gets all the blame." Well, I can't really agree with that. I know, Hon. lady Member, a lot of Dicks who never had any fun with Jane at all. (Laughter).

There's nothing wrong, lady Minister, with teaching cooking in schools. It would cut down all sorts of ulcers in later life. I would like to see the boys in the schools not discriminated against in this field, particularly by a bunch of female Chauvinistic primroses. (Laughter).

Now you notice this: we poor males cannot use the epithet they use to describe us. I had to use the word "primroses."

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Why?

MR. GARDOM: Well, I'll tell you, if this is not a female Chauvinistic discriminatory usurpation of vocabulary, I'd really and truly like to know what it is.

In the schools I would very much like to see, Hon, lady cabinet Minister, that we teach the nutritional content of foodstuffs and tell it how it is. Let's go ahead and expose what I'd call the "con," the

conditioned demand that the advertisers have forced down our throats by the next-to-nil nutritional value of the bulk of cereals, snap, cracking and no-popping across our breakfast tables.

Let's talk about some of the deceptions of packaging. Let's explain something about the need and the means whereby one can effectively equate size or weight to similar products in order to make some kind of useful and understandable comparison of cost and value. Let's have the distinction. Let everyone enjoy the packaging that he wishes to have, but let the general public, let our students in our schools appreciate the difference and be taught the difference and be able to be given some kind of instructional yardstick.

Let's teach the quality of fabric, the worth of fuels, the basic principle of home construction and furnishings and indeed appliance upkeep, to the boys and to the girls.

You know "puttee" is something that some people look upon as only what was wound around the legs of World War I veterans. A "washer" doesn't necessarily mean a person who wants to have five baths a day. There are really much more uses for a fuse than putting it under a parliamentary building.

Kids a long time ago used to have chores. In those days they weren't bored stiff. Today they've been technologically denuded of those chores. I would venture the suggestion that in some households that if the juice went off and the electric can-opener didn't work, not only would some people perhaps freeze to death but they would starve to death as well.

I think that we've got to go ahead and teach something about the services that we so blindly take for granted today — water supply, electricity, waste removal, fire, police and medical protection, and the services and mechanisms of government. Teach some health, preventive medicine, first-aid, water safety; teach them about cars and roads and drivers and pedestrian safety.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): And lawyers.

MR. GARDOM: And lawyers indeed. And chartered accountants and farmers. Teach them a little more about the practical side of life. Let's go ahead, Hon. lady cabinet Minister, and proclaim this section of the *Motor Vehicle Act* which I referred to during the estimates of the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) dealing with the training of student drivers. This was passed in 1969 and it has never ever been proclaimed. It said then,

"Except with the consent of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles, no person under the age of 18 years may drive a motor vehicle unless he's certified under a driver training programme approved by the Superintendent to be qualified to drive a motor vehicle."

This amendment did not come into this House by accident, and I cannot recall anybody in the House on either side voting against it. The Legislature approved it in 1969. It's never received public criticism and it has never ever been proclaimed. I would say that compulsory driver training should be taught in all of our high schools today.

I am very interested to hear I am getting some good support from the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) on that point. I have heard him make some good speeches himself in the House in days gone by on that exact topic.

I think we should be interesting our students in acquiring a hobby and particularly trying to develop more of an interest in them to participate in whatever it may be — athletics or acting or the arts or music or the outdoors. Try to cultivate in their minds the worth and the very, very great enjoyment of being a doer as opposed to being a watcher.

It would be a nice thing to put a little bit of emphasis on how to write a letter. Boy oh boy! Some of the stuff that comes through the mails from our secondary schools today is quite amazing.

One topic that has always enthused me and I well appreciate, Mr. Chairman, this is somewhat outside the Hon. lady Minister's portfolio, but the lady Minister is a cabinet Minister of this province and she is in a position to

advance this suggestion and this premise much more strongly than am I.

I feel one of the best ways to securing peace in our world is for people to communicate. No one will differ with that. And I feel that one of the best ways of teaching communication is for there to be a second world — wide language — I am not speaking of Esperanto. I personally don't think that would be the answer, with no criticism to it. But whatever language the United Nations would decide upon as being the second language of the world — conceivably the easiest one to learn might be Spanish. I don't know. Whatever would be the easiest one to learn.

How great it would be if we could be in Vancouver and speak English and "x" and go to South American and speak English and "x", or Shanghai — always to be able to speak "x" wherever one went in the world and wherever people trotted around in the world they would have the opportunity to converse.

Mr. Chairman, for none of this do we, for one minute, have to forget any of the classical yesterday or the classic procedures or the very stabilizing postures of the past. I think we have got to place terrific emphasis upon interweaving them into the realities and into the philosophies of the present. So far, in my view, that has not occasioned within our primary and our secondary curricula. I would like to have some of the comments of the Hon. lady Minister on what I have just discussed.

I would now like to make a couple of observations

[[Page 1123](#)]

about our colleges in B.C. I thought really how very paradoxical, in hearing the remarks from the lady Member for Vancouver Burrard (Ms. Brown) and the lady Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) last night, that in these marvelous meadows of perpetual enlightenment that alma mater is really being practised as alma pater. This was quite a revelation to me. It certainly was.

Dealing with this aspect, there is no question that we are a credentials oriented society but the barriers that exist to prevent B.C. citizens from obtaining a degree-granting education, in many cases, prevents very capable people from attaining important and creative employment because they are without the necessary skills or credentials.

For example, those who in their youth were unable to go to college and/or who now are unable to leave their jobs and return to university, or a mother who must remain at home, or people in remote areas who are unable to maintain a second residence, or working mothers or what have you. The "in house" system, in my view, does not have to be, nor is it fair, that it should be the only system. I would strongly recommend non-residential, off campus, undergraduate degree-granting programmes become readily available from our established universities. Our academic leaders would not have any difficulties in setting the standards and the course content leading to these external degrees.

If you look at the dollar side of the situation — dollars would never be a major problem because capital expenditures would be minimal. The plants are there, the buildings are there, UBC, UVic and Simon Fraser.

It's not a new concept, Ms. Chairman, the University of London has administered external degrees on a world-wide basis since 1936. Australia has similar programmes, so does New York State. There is lots of precedent everywhere in the world. Even if there wasn't, that shouldn't deter us. There is no need for us to hang in precedent when you have the need, and we certainly do have the need in the province by virtue of our very geographical situation.

The job that we have to do is not to continue to require the student to accommodate himself within the institution, but to adjust the institution to accommodate requirements of those who can participate in. No question that quality controls can be maintained and the suggestion is certainly not one of an inferior degree-granting method, but an expansion of the means by which degrees can be granted to those who are not fortunate enough to be able to physically sit within the four walls of one of our established universities. I liked your remarks yesterday when you talked about the travelling unit system. I thought that was a great suggestion.

If the desire is there, and the desire is there in B.C. for this post-secondary education, the means should be. Because at the present time the actual physical attendance is definitely an obstacle which for many can never, ever be overcome. The people who would be pursuing the kind of goals that I am talking of obviously would be people who would be very keenly motivated and well disciplined and able to operate on their own. It is just another way of opening a door, Ms. Chairman and I would very much like to see the Government do it.

Before I sit down I would like to again say a few words about independent schools and ask some questions of the Hon. Minister. The Hon. Minister is well aware of the dollars and cents. I would say that she is well aware of the number of students. The Hon. Minister is well aware of the philosophy of education which is to educate. And the Hon. Minister is thoroughly aware of the fact that 23,000 children in the Province of British Columbia do not receive a fair break at the hands of this Government. They and their parents have never received a fair break at the hands of government in the Province of British Columbia — which I think is a tragedy.

In order to alter this, there is really and truly no need for an enormous philosophical shift. You just have to be fair. There has to be alternatives in society. You have to be fair and you have to recognize the quality of an alternative. We are not being fair when these people, the parents of these children, are all paying taxes, all putting their children through school and are being denied any kind of effective assistance or encouragement whatsoever. We are now the only province in Canada with that kind of a banner hanging over our heads.

We are educating people to become good citizens. They are educating people to become good citizens. They are doing their job as far as the revenues of the Province of B.C. are concerned. They are being misread insofar as the expenditures are being concerned. They have never taken the frontal attack to government in B.C. and I congratulate them for their wisdom in that regard and their high principles in that regard. They could take children out of their independent schools and they could put 23,000 children at the doors of the public schools in the Province of British Columbia and you would have to accommodate them.

The Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) says, "tomorrow", and indeed he is right. Under the law you would have to accommodate them tomorrow. Now, they are not asking for capital expenditures nor, in my view, are they entitled to them because it is a form of enriched education. They have chosen that course for their own reasons and they are entitled to do it. We live in a free society. We live in a democracy. They are entitled to do it. However, is it too much that they should request a share of the operating costs? Is that too much — or even less than that? Let's leave the dollars for a moment.

[[Page 1124](#)]

There was a situation in the riding of the Hon. Premier, where children last September, children in an independent school, were going to use a community facility — swimming. They were five-year-olds.

I'm not talking about the dollars here, I'm talking about the principle of the matter. The public school children should use the community facilities, and rightfully so — that's why we've got them. That's why we're talking about opening up our community facilities for the use of the public, for the use of the students. We don't want to see them dormant, laying fallow three months of the year. You have accepted that concept.

So these students wanted to use the community a facility for swimming. The public students did and the independent school students were asked for \$1.75 each. Gee whiz, I can't really and truly accept that as being fair. I can't really and truly find that there's any need for an enormous, philosophical impasse for some thing such as that. In the riding of the Hon. Premier, grade five students who go to independent schools — I've forgotten the name of the school — but they went, and they had to pay \$1.75 for their swimming lesson.

It's not right that these people should not have open access to educational aids and aptitude tests that are now only available to government schools. Busing? O.K., what about busing? Under the former administration there was rather an awful impasse on that particular point in one situation. There were quite ugly confrontations in the north. I'm not going to dwell on that. Eventually reason came to the individuals there, but the decision was made on the basis that government policy will really not let us do it. I suppose the school board that opted to permit busing to take an independent school child to his school, rather than leaving the poor little kid standing in a puddle and see the

bus go by with empty seats in it, opted probably to break the law of the Province of British Columbia and take the youngster to school.

Big deal! Now come on, let's go ahead and say that you're going to have a policy in B.C. of providing some kind of effective assistance to these people, They've got some very, very qualified teachers. You have seen the report, I've seen the record. But they have the same quality of teachers the public side have. For goodness sake, let their teaching time count towards standing with the B.C. Department of Education. You know, I've repeated this analogy in the House so often, I just hate to say it again. But to me it's so very simple. A hospital's job is to cure the sick; the job of a school is to educate. Who cares who runs the hospital as long as it is being properly run and properly curing? Really and truly, who gets disturbed as long as the school is being properly run and is properly educating!

Let them meet provincial standards. I would say all of them would and maybe even higher than provincial standards. They must meet provincial standards, and if any group in society has the benefit of public funds, it must subject itself to some degree of control and inspection. Otherwise they should not be requesting public funds.

I don't go with their argument that they're entitled to receive — and this argument I say would come from the tiniest minority — X dollars and do with it entirely as they will.

But I say providing they subject themselves to the control of school boards, providing that there is full accountability, providing they are furnishing the service, for goodness sake let's come along down the need and not be the only province in Canada out of step, and let these people have to bear the whole load themselves.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): Thank you very much, Ms. Chairwoman. First of all I want to thank the Hon. gentleman Member from Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) for his apple. First of all when you started off I did think it had a soft core, but as you finished, it has a pretty hard core there. (Laughter). But I still will enjoy it, and if the Member for Okanagan wants to try it out and find out where it came from.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I knew you did, but I didn't want to throw it across to you, in case he thought I'd rejected it, you see. (Laughter).

Now, the Hon. Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) last night asked a number of questions and I have them listed here. Some of them tie in with the Hon. Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) so perhaps we can cover some of them.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver–Point Grey was discussing, and I think it was very interesting, his ideas on curriculum and making it, I believe, more relevant. As you know, I certainly agree with you. You mentioned specific areas which concern you.

This ties in, I think, particularly with what the Hon. Member for Langley was asking me last night before we adjourned. I think it's very unfortunate, the terms which he used last night when he referred to sex experimentation in the schools, because I'm quite sure you know, Mr. Member, that this is not the intent at all of our new programme. Actually it really fits in with what the other Hon. Member was saying today. We're just trying to bring into our school curriculum courses which are relevant and fit the needs of the young people today.

[[Page 1125](#)]

I think you'd agree with me that a family life programme certainly is needed in our schools today. You can't produce a programme on family life and assistance to young people in our schools that will prepare them for adulthood, unless you do bring in, sometime or other, the matter of sex to some degree and the matter of the reproductive system, and the matter perhaps as in adulthood how they cope with this situation.

I just want to make it very clear that the PTA's of the province for years have asked for such a programme, trustees have, and many parents have. I can assure you that none of these programmes are going into effect without consultation with the teachers and the parents. The parents particularly. As a matter of fact, the department is just preparing a directive which is going to go out to the school boards announcing that we do want boards to consult with parents first. Because I think the parents, the students and the teachers should really be together on initiating these programmes.

We've been waiting for this a long time. There have been great demands and I think that it is rather tragic that many students who are now out in the world today have not been provided with a good programme in family living. That covers the whole area, as I mentioned before, of learning about their own bodies.

It also would include areas such as the other Member mentioned, the whole matter of how to handle their finances, consumer education. It's a very broad programme and I do hope that you would relay that to anyone who has concerns about it.

We are very hopeful that the young people of this province will, after these programmes get underway, come out and face the world, the very — let's face it — challenging, exciting world, with a little more knowledge of how to cope with the everyday problems of living. It's not going to be easy, because we know that parents themselves have the first responsibility, but certainly the schools have a responsibility also.

The other part that both Hon. Members were touching upon is the matter of independent schools. The Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) was referring particularly to the public school system, I believe, and the independent school aid, whereas last night you were referring to institutions such as Trinity College.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Specifically, yes. First of all, on the matter of public schools — I'm quite sure that the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey is well aware of the stand of this government. This is a major policy decision which is on whether one gives aid to independent schools or not. It is a decision, as it is major, which is made at our party convention.

We have met a number of times with the independent school association, and many of the points which the Hon. Member from Vancouver–Point Grey brought up, we have heard and we have discussed with them. We have told them that these decisions are made at the convention. At the present moment, the stand of the New Democratic Party made at the convention is that no financial aid is to be granted to independent schools.

With regard to Trinity College, I know you were comparing it with Notre Dame. Notre Dame is chartered under the *Public Universities Act*, while Trinity College is not. It was under the government of the party which you now represent that these arrangements were made at that time, to extend aid to Notre Dame. As a matter of fact, in 1967 and 1968 the federal government made direct grants to the universities. As you know, they do not do this now.

This aid extended to institutions affiliated with the universities, and at that time the Vancouver School of Theology and Notre Dame University were affiliated with UBC. I believe that was probably the basis upon which these grants were given. The grants now given from the federal government are not given in that manner any more.

Well, the point is there is a basic difference between Trinity College and Notre Dame, as I said. Notre Dame came in under public charter, and the other is under a private Act. Certainly we've had representations on this, and I've visited Trinity College, It's a very fine college.

Here again it's a matter of government policy. It would mean a complete new direction to give aid to institutions which are not public institutions. At this time the government has not made any decision on giving aid to Trinity College. It's not so much a matter of discrimination as a matter of policy. You can consider it discriminative policy, but many other people do not consider it so.

I think if you look across the country, and look at Ontario, where they do have separate schools, there is a

recent editorial in, I think, the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, which points out many, many problems for governments to handle these two separate systems. There are many problems inherent in it.

I'm quite aware of the fact that if all those schools closed up, Mr. Member, tomorrow we would have to absorb them. We are aware of that, I recall about 10 to 12 years ago when this situation happened in the area around where I live, I think it was Mallardville. The districts around had to absorb the students, and they absorbed them. This would be our responsibility, to absorb them, if this situation came about.

Have I missed a point? I think the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) also was asking last night about teacher tenure and I think you discussed it

[[Page 1126](#)]

with some of your Members. The Member, for instance, for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) sat on the committee of the House last year which dealt with changes in tenure regulations for teachers. It was an all party standing committee which came up with recommendations. I think if you studied that report you would see that there are ways and means for the firing of teachers who are ineffective, which I think you were expressing last night. The teachers themselves worked with us on this and all party members agreed on this report.

We realize it's only been in for a year and anything that is new and different has always been watched very carefully. I'm sure the teachers will be giving us an input on how they feel it is working. We'll be hearing from parents, and we'll be hearing from Members of the Legislature on this.

At this time I've had no particularly outstanding complaints that this is not working properly, but we are certainly open and ready to listen to any group that has a complaint on this. There are quite a number of safeguards in it because, as I said, some of your — own Members were there — all party members — to work on it.

You might be interested to know what's happened in the year since this new tenure regulation came in.

Situation 1: board of reference. This is to do with misconduct or neglect of duty. There were five cases in the last year. One suspended appealed — the teacher was upheld and the board is now appealing to the supreme court. The same existed in another case — suspended, appealed, and the teacher was upheld by the board of reference and the school board is appealing to the supreme court. In the third case, suspended, appealed, and the board was upheld. In this case the teacher is appealing to the supreme court. So you have the complete reverse here. Case number four, suspension — disposition subject to criminal trial. Case number five was dismissed.

Situation 2: review commission, which as you know is based on unsatisfactory performance. There were two cases. Case one — notice of termination issued, teacher resigned. Case two — notice of termination issued, no appeal, teacher dismissed.

So I think that gives you a picture of what the situation was last year. It shows that the machinery has been working, and it doesn't seem to point out to me that it's gone one way or the other. I think it's been handled pretty fairly.

I hope I've covered most of the points, Mr. Member — did I leave out one?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Performance evaluation? Maybe you'd like to speak on that again, if you're going to speak. I'm not quite sure what you want on that. O.K. We'll have a supplementary, and then you can carry on,

MR. GARDOM: Well, Ms. Chairman, dealing with the remarks of the Hon. Minister, I see in a summary of the New Democratic Party's stand on independent schools that the party favours access to busing and educational aids.

So I put two questions to the Hon. Minister. The first is this: will you make any provision to provide the

audio — visual aids and library resources that the public schools now have to the independent schools? That's the first question.

The second question deals with the education of *Soldier's Dependents Children Act*, which is Chapter 124 of our Statutes. Under that Act, Ms. Chairman, the funds are made available to dependents of veterans in case of financial need. I'd ask the Hon. Minister if the criteria used under that Act are the same for needy children who attend independent schools as for needy children who attend public schools.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, first of all, the matter of giving assistance resources to the independent schools — no, there is no intent to do that. Secondly, as to the matter of busing, I think there was an announcement made recently that the Government, of course, is looking into the whole area of rapid transit and busing and when we met with the Independent Schools Association we pointed out to them that the Government wanted, certainly in the rural areas, to provide far more bus transportation for all citizens. So I may say at this time the door could perhaps be opened in that area.

MR. GARDOM: Only for busing? You are not prepared to go as far as visual aids and libraries?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No, that's correct. When I say only buses, it doesn't mean that we are stating here and now, Mr. Member, that there is a policy to give busing to independent school children. I'm simply saying that the Government is studying the matter of providing more bus service to all of the citizens of the province, and this, perhaps, could alleviate the situation, but no details have been worked out. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) will be working on this, and when he's ready he will announce what the policy could be. It could be fairly all-embracing. But I can't speak on his behalf.

MR. GARDOM: No, but there have been citizens. They would obviously be included.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: When the announcement is made we'll see how all-embracing it is.

The Soldiers' Dependents Allowance — there

[[Page 1127](#)]

apparently was no provision for that to be given to independent school children. It's under a board that handles this itself, but it is under the School Act, as you say. It is administered under the School Act. But I would like to point out to you that if you look at the estimates you will now see that this has been transferred to the welfare department.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay, I'm sorry. Will you relinquish? The Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): With regard to the performance evaluation — a question that I asked last evening. There has been serious concern among educators and among members of the school boards that some method be found so that the teachers' performance could be evaluated. The problem seems to be who does the evaluation — where and when. Is it left to the teacher? The B.C.T.F., I think, would like to see it left that way. The school trustees would like to see it in their hands. So somewhere along the line the impasse has to be settled, because in every area in which public money is spent there has to be some sort of evaluation done.

The other question has to do with the problem again that you partially answered, of teacher tenure. Regardless of the comments that you made about there not being any problem, we see a fairly large problem in the community, in that if it becomes difficult for the removal of a teacher who is not competent in the eyes of some members of the board of school trustees, what often happens is that that board of school trustees makes it difficult for that teacher to continue teaching in that school district, to the point where that teacher leaves, goes to another school district and becomes the other school district's problem. The easy way is taken out. It seems to me that the government would be far better off if it would establish some guidelines or ground rules, better than we have now, to solve those kind of problems.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: You know, when it comes to teacher evaluation, I don't know if you agree with me on this, but as a former teacher may I say this. I think the best people to evaluate the teachers are the teachers themselves. They're the first ones who can point out who the ineffective teacher is. I know that in the many meetings I've had with the teachers they are concerned about this. Just as concerned as you are and parents are. I know that constantly through their professional programmes they are trying to upgrade this. They are keeping a watch on this whole matter.

The teachers themselves, I think, are the most capable ones to make this judgment. At the moment, of course, it comes under the district superintendent, who is basically a teacher. Personally, however, I would like to see a system set up where the teachers themselves would have a little more control in evaluating their own peers.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think they would be delighted to have the opportunity if we could work out the proper machinery. I'd be pleased to discuss it with them.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I'd like to touch initially on some philosophy of education and then perhaps discuss a few specific matters.

I think that health and education certainly have to be the two major pillars on which our society flourishes. It really is rather disappointing, Madam Minister through you, Madam Chairman, to see that there are only two other Ministers of the cabinet in the House today, when we are discussing education, education, not only because of its vital importance to our society but even in terms of dollars, which we all recognize as being very substantial, going into education and necessarily so. The lack of interest from the cabinet benches leaves me very disturbed.

I'd like to start off by complimenting the Minister of Education on several of the positive progressive steps which she took soon after assuming office. I'm referring in particular to the local autonomy which was returned to school boards and for which I voted when the bill was brought before the House.

The question of kindergartens has been discussed in this House each year that I've been here. When the Minister was on the Opposition benches, she strongly supported the idea of kindergartens. I'm delighted that this was one of the first aspects of education which she took measures to implement. I think human beings are the same the world over in terms of their ability to assimilate experience. Certainly the European and British experience is that you can start the educational process long before six years old. I'm delighted that kindergartens are to be encouraged in this province.

The other matter which I discussed in a former session of the House was the implementing of family life programmes. It's been mentioned many times but, in fairness to the Minister, I would like to compliment her for realizing that this is such a vital part of the total process of education, which, as everyone agrees, is a never — ending experience. It doesn't go on just inside the four walls of a classroom, that's for sure. It's such an all — embracing part of our lives that even to begin to claim that we're educating future citizens without taking regard for

[[Page 1128](#)]

our reproductive function and our sex drive, is really very shortsighted.

Having made these positive points, I will try to be constructive and positively constructive. Whether we like to take a very mature and farsighted view of education, I consider the first requirement of education is to produce literate citizens. I think it's very disturbing to find the millions of dollars that we're pouring into education and to find the percentage of illiterate people who come out at the other end.

There was an interesting editorial in the *Vancouver Sun* of February 21. I would just like to quote from Dr. Jill Conway, who is vice-president of the University of Toronto, and Prof. Hayes of York University. Their feeling is that

illiteracy is the crux of the modern school problem. They say that our liberal attitude to education produces students who understand math but can't use it and are unable to put a sentence together. These are people graduating from high school.

The comment of these educators is one of concern that in trying to be more and more farsighted and perhaps sophisticated in our educational process, we're losing sight of the first basic requirement. That is to teach the child to communicate and, in fact, to become a fully literate individual.

The lady Minister has many times said in this House, and I fully agree, that whatever our philosophy is and whatever the structure of the system is, we must focus on the needs of the child. It is hardly a conclusion that we would get excited about if we can teach them sophisticated subjects and ignore the very basic needs in the literate sense. I think we all agree that we're trying to produce a well-informed and a well-adjusted individual who can fit into society as an adult. But surely the first and foremost goal has to be to make the person literate.

The other element in our schooling — and I think I'm speaking for many parents, I've mentioned it before and been heavily criticized — is permissiveness. I'm not separating the school children from the adults. I'm talking about society as a whole. To take some specifics in school, I think that when we just adopt the attitude that a child can go to school dressed in the sloppiest of fashion and that the whole business of getting groomed and dressed is a very casual thing, as far as I'm concerned I regard that as encouraging an equally casual approach to the process in which they're involved — the very vital process to them of becoming educated.

The whole question of discipline is one which is almost unpopular to discuss nowadays. The feeling seems to be that the child must be allowed to do his or her thing, regardless of the effects on others. I think it's only fair, although I personally am opposed — and I want to make this very plain — to corporal punishment; nevertheless, I think in fairness to my role as a representative of people in Oak Bay, it's certainly my firm conviction that my personal opinion is not shared by the majority of parents.

We had a citizens' advisory committee to the Victoria school board in May. This is a report in the *Daily Colonist*. I won't go into all the details, but by and large that committee was split right down the middle. It reminded me a little bit of the public debate on the death penalty.

But the fact of the matter is that since the Minister announced her decision to abolish corporal punishment, I certainly have had many communications by letter, by phone and in person. The majority feel that this should have been maintained in the schools, and that the present system might have some shortcomings in the light of some of the incidents the Minister herself has outlined — we don't dispute that. Many of the people who talked to me are principals of schools, I haven't yet, in the area of Sidney, Oak Bay and part of Victoria, met a principal who agrees with the decision to abolish corporal punishment.

I repeat, I personally am opposed to it but I'm trying to represent the point of view which I think, is stronger than perhaps the lady Minister has acknowledged. The Minister may care to comment on this, but one of the elements in their dismay is that on the very day, I understand, that the Minister announced the abolition of corporal punishment, a committee of the BCTF and the school trustees were having a meeting to continue discussions towards presenting their point of view to the Minister. I'm sure the Minister can answer this, but there is a strong feeling among the parties concerned that the Minister acted on her own without the fair and considered consultation with educators, trustees and teachers.

I think the question has to be answered, of course: If I'm opposed to corporal punishment, what is the alternative? There's no point in abolishing one measure which you don't like and not replacing it with something which you feel is better and more effective. Certainly the study that was done in Victoria at least came up with some alternatives. One of them was very interesting. It suggested that the child be referred to the parents. I can't think of a better answer to the whole problem. If the parent believes in corporal punishment, he can act in the manner of a wise and judicious parent. If it is a recurring problem after referral to the parent, presumably expulsion has to be probably the only other alternative.

I'd like to come in a moment to the question of the different child or the handicapped child — the one who

cannot adapt to the four walls of a classroom — and ends up in the situation of being repeatedly punished.

Another alternative to corporal punishment that was put forward was judgment by your peers — the question of a student body being given the decision of trying to take action against a student who, by his behaviour, is disturbing the whole classroom. In

[[Page 1129](#)]

discussions with principals that I have had since the Minister's decision, this is very clearly their realm of concern: that it's all very well to talk about abolishing capital punishment — corporal punishment. I get the two mixed up. (Laughter). Maybe we should have capital punishment in schools too. I don't know.

But the feeling coming across is that the principals and the teachers are very concerned about being able to handle the unruly male who disturbs the whole classroom. Maybe these alternatives that I've outlined are pretty lukewarm and too soft in their nature to be effective. At least, I personally think that if a teacher or a principal can't handle somebody, the parent is the first person to be given the responsibility of trying to straighten out the mess.

I find another interesting facet of this question of trying to teach children responsibility and maturity: in large measure I think our students are aware of the problems of the environment and of the need to preserve the world around us. Yet, talking to one principal, I find that the simplest, most unbelievable vandalism...there's one area of glass in the Oak Bay Junior High School that's been broken, within weeks, three times over. It's now boarded up with painted plywood.

I just can't understand, if students are so aware of environment and some of these values that attach to preservation of the environment, how we have this kind of problem. Certainly to ask the teachers for more and more supervision at times when they're not in the classroom, I just don't think that's the answer either. I don't for a minute criticize the teachers for rebelling at this trend, that they should be more and more watchdogs and supervisors instead of educators.

I was talking about permissiveness and the lack of discipline. I think we simply have to be fair and consider why our children behave this way. I think it's because they see it in the world around them.

It's certainly my feeling, unpopular as it might be, that we have to stress two elements that are certainly being lost in our educational system. One is discipline and the other one is morality.

It's not popular these days to talk about morality. The populist philosophy seems to be that if you're not breaking a few rules and smoking pot or swapping wives or some such thing, you're living a pretty dull life and you're not a swinger. Madam Minister, I'm probably being a little blue today and probably I'm being too negative, but I think it's about time it was put on record that one of the politicians feels this way about the present system.

For example, in our media our children are exposed in a way which even 20 years ago I was not exposed to in terms of what appears in press or what appears on television. The best that the *Victoria Colonist* newspaper could do the other day was to give a front-page picture of some baseball player who's been living with some other baseball player's wife and they've finally decided to get married, This apparently is considered to be front-page news for the citizens of British Columbia.

Our children read these newspapers. How in Heaven's name can we expect any other kind of behaviour from our children when this kind of incident in adult life is glamourized and made to look exciting?

I think sadly that so often three of the ingredients that I'm always seeking in society — freedom of choice and freedom of speech and freedom of action in a democratic society — are frequently being confused with licence and self-indulgence.

I don't think for a moment that we would have many of the problems we have in our schools with drugs or illegitimate pregnancies, abortions, marriage breakdown, broken families, if we were to try and bring back into the

school system a sense of the importance of discipline, responsibility in the child as a measure of proving its own maturity, and a new awareness of a morality that we lost many years ago.

As a society we profess a sanctity for human life. Yet for all practical purposes this same society permits abortion on demand. I'm not going to get into a long harangue on abortion. I'm simply saying that we say one thing as a society, we tell our children to respect the teacher and the principal, and to respect human dignity and human life — yet we pass laws which destroy human lives every day at the stroke of a pen.

I think the children can only conclude that their parents are a bunch of hypocrites. We pay lip service to the value of human life and then we allow or encourage our elected representatives to turn around and take life.

I am sad to say that very often, when this abortion is permitted, it is simply to try to overcome an inconvenience in the life of a student — a high school student or a student in early year at university. I know of what I talk, because I'm on the abortion committee. I see the letters that come before us time and time again. Frequently this is just a procedure where the student is granted an abortion because it would be an inconvenience to her academic career.

I must confess that sometimes the stated medical grounds are extremely slim.

Perhaps the time has come, Madam Minister, to hope that maybe the children will show the adults the way. Maybe if we can instil some of these concepts in the school system to a greater degree...and of course we always run the risk of being laughed at as "preachers." Well, I don't care if I'm being laughed at today as being a "preacher." As far as I'm concerned we could do with a little bit of preaching if it means a better-integrated, more moral, literate, responsible individual who leaves high school.

To get on to some specifics, since I could talk a

[[Page 1130](#)]

long time about philosophy, I've talked with quite a few teachers and principals and they're not all as happy as the Minister has suggested about the abolition of grade 12 exams. There is a feeling among certain teachers, certainly that I've talked to, that really the net effect is to lower standards.

Perhaps it's even another measure of our permissive attitude that nobody must be put under any stress any more. Nobody must have difficulty. Nobody has to endure the suffering of an examination. Well as far as I am concerned, it seems to me everywhere we go in life we're being subjected to some kind of examination. You need to pass an exam to drive a car. Certainly once you get to university you have to pass exams.

In fairness to the Minister she has pointed out that there is to be a reappraisal of the student's work under a different system. But the fact is that for graduation requirements — I went into this in detail because it interested me — students entering grade 11 are no longer required to complete French beyond the level of grade 8, and mathematics beyond grade 10.

Some of these students are going on to University. In terms of the departmental examinations there seems to be the feeling amongst many teachers that the graduation diploma is coming to mean less and less and to be less highly-respected because of the greater ease with which it's awarded. I think that only adds up to one thing: that we're lowering the standard of education by abolishing an examination which more accurately, in conjunction with class evaluation, proves what the student has attained.

I think evaluation by the teacher and exams both have a place. I would wonder if it's such a unanimous feeling of the teachers that it was a great idea to abolish the grade 12 exams.

In passing, I'm told that it runs the risk too that the teacher may not cover the whole curriculum as fully because she or he may choose to emphasize one part of the curriculum, which is certainly to the detriment of the students when they go on to university.

I'm going to say something else that doesn't seem to be very popular around here, Everybody gets all excited about post-secondary education. I suppose if you say anything against any part of education it's like talking against motherhood. I've already spoken about the people who are against motherhood.

The fact is, Madam Chairman, that there's a very interesting quotation I found from one of the well-known English educators, P.G. Mason, who's the headmaster at Manchester Grade Schools. He states that:

"Seventy-five per cent of the formal achievement pattern has been acquired by the age of 13, and in terms of formal education it may be very hard to undo what happens between the ages of 6 and 9. For it is this period which is crucial for the development of learning patterns."

One of the other favourable steps which the Minister undertook soon after she assumed the post was to change the instructional unit. This reduced the instructional unit from 30 to 25 pupils at the elementary level. I think that this is a tremendous step forward. The sooner we can go even further along the road to reducing the teacher-pupil ratio, I think the likelier we are to produce better students going into junior high school.

We've already talked about kindergartens as part of that same goal.

For that same reason, Madam Chairman, through you, I would hope that the Minister... I think she mentioned that a research officer had been appointed to the post-secondary field. I wonder if she would consider appointing some research officer or similar staff to the elementary area of education.

One of the points which seems to become clear — and I'd like to talk just a little bit about Beacon Hill School in Victoria — is that in the elementary school the problem seems to be that it's the middle wedge in the class that gets all the education. The bright ones are bored and the ones who have difficulty in learning tend to fall by the wayside.

I would like to just mention to the House, Madam Chairman, the project that is going on at Beacon Hill School here in the City of Victoria. This is where a principal, who was formerly a clinical psychologist, has obtained a federal grant to carry out education of children with difficulties and some with mental retardation. Some have physical disabilities and others have behavioural problems. This is on a one-to-one basis.

I understand the Minister has been invited and is to be visiting Beacon Hill School. This is a fascinating and exciting project, Madam Chairman. I don't think it's been done in British Columbia before; it may have been done elsewhere.

These are highly skilled, trained teachers, many of them with master's degrees, who are working under this initiative programme at about half the salary they would receive in the public school system. They're teaching on the basis of one pupil for one teacher. The principal is Mr. Benson, if the deputy Minister is wondering which school I'm talking about — Beacon Hill School. Mr. Benson is the principal.

This school accepts referral of children of all grades from the social agencies, the mental health clinics, the Eric Martin Institute or from wherever the child is having difficulties or for whatever reason he can't attend normal school.

This project began in December, 1971, and is still fortunately receiving federal LIP money. I might say in passing, although this isn't part of the pitch, that the money runs out in May, 1973, Madam Minister. While this was, I presume, a pilot project, I've visited

[[Page 1131](#)]

the school and talked with the principal and it just is exciting to see his results.

He assures me that about 75 per cent of these students are helped to a degree that they can return to the normal stream of education. Many of them in the later grades would otherwise have become jobless and ill-equipped to hold a job; in other words, would be unemployed and on welfare.

I would hope that because of the tremendous success...and it's very easy to sense the dedication this man has and that his staff have in dealing with these children with either learning problems or physical or mental disability, even to the extent that they write some of their own textbooks. Mr. Benson designs the textbook for the child with a learning disability to use a certain vocabulary; yet still be able to teach subjects at grades 7, 8 and 9 with a limited vocabulary in words where, for example, the learning problem is the assimilation of words.

He mentions that there might even be scope to increase the programme if he had the funds. It's important to mention that the Beacon Hill School turns away two out of every three referrals. There's only one out of three of the children who is able to gain advantage from this programme.

Just two or three things before I sit down, Madam Chairman. One point that has been brought to my attention is the question of children moving from one school district to another. I'm not referring to transients who don't know where they are. I'm talking about children who may be seeking a course or courses which are not available in their own school district.

I understand that when this happens — and I have had a case brought to my attention in Oak Bay where the lady student has been asked to pay \$380 or some such sum for her education in Oak Bay, although her parents are paying taxes in Campbell River.

In passing, Madam Chairman, through you, I would say that I had nothing but the best and fullest cooperation from the school board of district 61 in trying to track this problem down. Apparently there is no guarantee in the school Act that Campbell River, for example, or any other district, has to transfer the funds to district 61. If the Minister is planning to change this, this is fine. But I've prepared an amendment which I'm ready to bring into the House, to section 158 of the Public Schools Act which should make it quite clear that, where there is good reason to move from one district to another, the transfer of funds should be automatic or binding. I think the wording in the Act right now says "may" instead of "shall." Once again, the one word can make quite a difference.

I was also interested to bring before the Minister the whole question of referenda. If we're going to be taking the education tax off property, that in itself should diminish the need for referenda. But we had the very depressing experience in Victoria on February 17 when we held a referendum to spend \$1.6 million in school property expansion and 11.28 per cent of the voters turned out to vote.

Since it needed a 60 per cent majority, the actual vote passed by 17.6 votes. I think that if we've reached this point, where the importance and respect for referenda is as bad as this, then probably the Minister would care to comment as to whether or not the time has come that we should no longer consider referenda worth the time and the money and the effort when frequently the "no" vote is not representative of the situation.

I've one final point I'd like to — ask the Minister, Madam Chairman, regarding the development of a marine college in Vancouver. This is causing a great deal of concern for the staff who previously, under the aegis of the vocational school at the Vancouver Vocational Institute, have been providing marine training for officers and seamen.

I understand they're very upset because the Canadian Merchant Service Guild has already had meetings with the Minister and is very keen to develop a separate new marine college at Jericho Beach. There are none of the North Vancouver Members here at the moment. Where did they all go?

AN HON. MEMBER: They've gone home.

MR. WALLACE: Not North Vancouver, but the Members from Vancouver who are most concerned about this. I'm just saying that because they're the ones who make most of the fuss when things aren't done right. You folks are most co-operative.

To continue, the fact is that not only is the use of this land apparently not designed for this purpose anyway — there's two — thirds of it I gather has already been deeded as a recreational parkland and the other acres are undecided and in limbo as far as the federal government is concerned — but there are many good reasons,

experience, the availability of equipment and all the services that already exist in the Vancouver Vocational Institute which would really to some degree be duplicated if they moved it to a site somewhere else.

While I'm not going into a long debate on this subject, the people at the college, as I understand it, are concerned that the Canadian Merchant Service Guild is dealing directly with the Minister of Education. There are other parties deeply concerned, not the least of whom is the college itself, and also the mayor and council of Vancouver who, along with the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) when he was alderman in the City of Vancouver, were very much opposed to using the Jericho land for any such purpose as this. The attempt was to have it all designated as recreation or parkland. I'd, like the Minister to comment on that.

[[Page 1132](#)]

Finally, a question that I've put on the order paper and I don't think it's been answered: whether the Minister will try to get a better deal in the paying of the salaries of substitute teachers? I don't think substitute teaching is the least bit easy; it's probably tougher for the substitute teacher than the regular teacher.

I realize that the Minister, Madam Chairman, doesn't have direct authority to do very much about this, but she is respected and her position is a responsible one. I gather that local school districts can choose to leave substitute teachers out in the cold when it comes to negotiation of salary agreements.

I have a newspaper clipping which demonstrates the fact that some substitute teachers have had a substantial reduction in their payment throughout the greater Victoria area. I wonder if the Minister would like to comment upon that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I always am delighted to listen to the Member who just took his seat. He's most sincere in his remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's the accent.

HON. MRS. DAILY: And it's the accent, right. He says you're not; it's just the accent. But I'm married to a Scotsman too so I think I know, Not only are your remarks sincere but you obviously have been thinking a lot about education philosophically and you've done your research. It's a pleasure to be able to sit here as Minister and listen to this.

Your philosophical remarks, while I admire listening to them, I just don't happen to agree with them. But you and I, I think, would realize that we do have some basic philosophical differences there. I think you yourself, when you talk about more discipline in the schools, perhaps are a little inconsistent. Because at the same time you point to the society around our children today, which is full of violence, which they see every day on television. It's a society where they see irresponsibility. They see hypocrisy, not only on television, but right around them, unfortunately, sometimes in their own homes.

I don't think the answer is simply to say, "Let's just tighten up that discipline in the school and perhaps we'll solve it." It goes much deeper than that. As you say, I think parents have a great responsibility here and we as adults certainly have too, as Members of the Legislature.

When we talk about permissiveness, I do think there is often so much misconception about that word. As far as I'm concerned, it's very important for a child to develop a sense of responsibility. I think that perhaps you and I would agree on that. I think it's the method of how this responsibility is instilled in the child which often creates controversy. That's why I feel very strongly that the use of any violence, the use of corporal punishment — and I know you do too — is simply not the method. I think it's a hypocritical method, for one thing, to use when at one time we're telling our children about the violence out there and we deplore it, and then — as I said earlier, whether people agree or not — we inflict violence upon the child. But this argument could go on and on.

I do want to point out, though, Mr. Member, that I did consult with the B.C. Teachers' Federation and the B.C. school trustees at numerous meetings we've had since I came into office — not as many as I would have liked to have had, but more than they've had the opportunity of having in prior years. They knew that I felt very strongly about this. You made the suggestion that perhaps I should have waited for briefs. I'm afraid that if we had waited we'd be here another 50 years, if you and I were here, and there would be no consensus on this. That is why I feel that as Minister I had to make a decision on this.

You say it's very similar to the capital punishment debate. Actually, I get a number of letters congratulating me on removing capital punishment from the schools. You know, it might eliminate a lot of our problems. However, I'm not advocating that.

I enjoyed listening to your philosophical remarks on education and how you feel about it. Actually, this is why we're setting up this commission, Mr. Member. Many people, including yourself and many in this chamber, have been wanting to get down to this for many years. I think it's been a great lack in the former government that we haven't been able to discuss these things or haven't had the opportunity. We've had the Chant report, but I don't consider that the type of commission that we want to see today, in 1973.

That's why I'm setting up these commissions. The very sort of discussion which you and I are having here across the floor, we hope to stimulate right out there, in Victoria, in every part of our province, and get a feedback from the consumers and everyone who is involved. I've mentioned that before in my speech, so I don't want to bore you by reiterating. But that's the whole idea of this commission. Let's try and find out how people feel about this and what steps we can all take to move in a better direction in education.

Now, some of your specific questions. The Beacon Hill school: Yes, I would, like to visit it. Our superintendent in charge of special services has certainly filled me in on the fine work that's going on there. We're aware that they're on a LIP grant which will expire. As a matter of fact, there are quite a number of very exciting, good projects going on across the province being supported at this time by LIP grants. I've asked our departmental officials to

[[Page 1133](#)]

keep track of these.

People write to me constantly about them. I think the department should look at this seriously. If it's benefiting the child, if it can be in some way under the administration of the board without impeding its own unique method of operation, I think that we must show flexibility in this department and see if we can continue to finance a programme that is helping the students. This is a direction I'd like to see us moving in.

The matter of school referendums: Yes, you know our party is on record. We are against this policy of referendums but it's the old story. We can't do everything at once, as you know, Mr. Member. We have removed the capital referendums for community colleges. Hopefully, in the near future — I can't say when as this will be a Government decision — we can move into the public school referendums. We are on record as saying this is not the way to finance our schools — through the referendum procedure.

The marine college: I would like to straighten this out. Yes, I met with the Merchant Seamen's Guild. I have an open door if a group wants to come in and talk to me seriously about their concerns, which these people were — that we're not producing enough qualified seamen, particularly master mariners and mates, et cetera. I was willing to listen to them. I think this is the only way to operate as a Minister. However, at the same time, I also had communication from the chairman of the Vancouver City College, who did express concern. You know, rumours fly — you've been meeting with one group. I assured the chairman that no decision had been taken by this Government. The only decision we know we are going to make is that we do need to expand and move into a much more expanded marine college for the Province of British Columbia.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: There's no question about that. The Government realizes...

Interjection of an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It's just a matter of where, right. The Government certainly realizes that this is essential for our province. Have I left anything out now?

Oh, yes. Another point you mentioned was that matter of transfer of pupils. Yes, that's something that has really often bothered me too. People are paying school taxes and the child goes to another district. That's something I agree would have to have an amendment to the Public Schools Act. I'll be interested in seeing your bill. Whether we can put it in this session or not, I don't know. There's always the fall session, but I'd be interested in seeing your bill on it.

Also, the matter of substitute teachers. Yes, I remember many times being approached by substitute teachers who did feel that they didn't have any bargaining power and were being discriminated against. As you say, this is really a local decision to be made. I don't know what assistance basically I can give here, except that if there's any group out there teaching in the Province of British Columbia that is being discriminated against; I'd like to see it remedied. I haven't had any direct representation from the substitute teachers, but I am aware of the problem. I hope that the school boards themselves will face up to this problem. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's certainly a pleasure for me to stand in this Legislature and discuss with the Hon. Minister of Education her estimates. It's a very large portion of the budget. I'm rather disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that there aren't more Members of that Government in the House. There are three or four cabinet Ministers. A moment ago there were only two. Your Members were down to eight a short time ago. I'm surprised that when we're discussing this amount of money, the Members aren't in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member get on with his discussion on the estimates, please?

MR. PHILLIPS: O.K. Mr. Chairman, we're discussing, as I said before, a very large sum of money here this afternoon. As a matter of fact, there hasn't been too much discussion on just how much education costs the taxpayer in British Columbia — how much it costs the farmer and how much it costs the ordinary labourer.

I'd like for just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to point out to the Minister of Education what has happened in British Columbia in the past 11 years with regard to the cost of education in British Columbia. In 1965 the spending for education was \$141,618,733. That was 1965. In 1970 it was \$322,142,677 — over double in five years. In 1974, the estimate for the Department of Education spending is \$495 million — \$495,544,000 — that is what is anticipated will be spent on education by this government in this province in 1974.

[[Page 1134](#)]

That is a 251 per cent increase in the cost of education in nine years — a 251 per cent increase in the cost of education to the taxpayers of this province. If we have the same percentage increase, by 1985 we could be spending in excess of \$1,250 million on education in this province. That figure is approximately 72 per cent of the entire budget for this coming year.

The increase in educational spending from 1965 to 1974 was during a reign of the Social Credit government, where there were reasonable controls on educational spending in British Columbia. What is going to happen now that many of those controls have been taken off?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well I know the Minister, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), has

attacked me before in this House when I've discussed unemployment and spending of money and he's another one; his estimates are coming up, and that's a healthy chunk too — a very healthy chunk.

But if the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health and the Minister of Rehabilitation are going to spend the money, somebody has to provide it, and it's the taxpayers of British Columbia that have to provide it and make no mistake about that. The taxpayers in this province, the working man, the little man, the man that you're for, that you're supposed to be for — he's the one that's going to have to provide the tax dollars for this Department of Education and the Department of Health and the Department of Rehabilitation. The little man, the taxpayer.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. PHILLIPS: In 1965, there were approximately 414,643 pupils enrolled in the public school system. In 1972....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well it's all right for the Members opposite to make jokes about the cost of running this government to the taxpayers of this province, because they don't care. They have no concern for the taxpayers in this province. It's a big joke when you start talking about taxes in the Legislature. It's a big joke. I'll tell you it's not any joke to me. I'm here in this Legislature to protect the rights of the taxpayers in this province, to see that they get value for their money.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not joshing at all. You're the one that's joshing. You're the ones that are making fun of the taxpayers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I wish you would call your Members — all the Members of the Government to order, Mr. Chairman, so that I can get on with my little short talk that I have here this afternoon. (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would remind the Members on the Government side of standing order No. 17, part 2; not to interrupt the Member while he's speaking please.

MR. PHILLIPS: Don't only hear it, pay attention to it.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. PHILLIPS: You'll get the message very shortly, my friend, when the taxpayers of this province speak. You'll get the message loud and clear. You'll hear it. You better believe you'll hear it. And you won't be asking them to speak any louder, my friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk), because you'll hear them. You'll hear them when their taxes start going up. You'll hear them loud and clear, my friend.

In 1965, there were 414,643 pupils enrolled in the public schools. In 1972, it is estimated that there will be 949,000 pupils. Well, I see the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) is back in the Legislature. Welcome back, Mr. Minister and you should pay attention to what I'm saying here this afternoon, because you are another one of the big spenders over on that side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PHILLIPS: In nine years, there has been a 129 per cent increase in enrolment and a 251 per cent increase in the cost of education. Projected to 1974, there should be over one million pupils enrolled in our public schools system. The projected increase in the enrolment on the same basis, from 1965 to 1972, would be an increase of 161 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to point out to the Hon. Minister of Education is that the cost of education is increasing disproportionately to the number of pupils enrolled in the public school system. If this gap continues to broaden, the taxpayers of this province will not be able to stand the burden.

Now this points, Mr. Chairman, to two things. I'm sure that the Minister of Education will give me her

[[Page 1135](#)]

comments on these two points. Number one is: it points up to me that the cost of education has gone up in a far greater ratio than the number of pupils. The second point is that the cost of post-secondary education could be the greatest contributing factor to this fantastic increase in our cost of education.

This has all happened, as I said before, with a government in power that was interested in the taxpayers of British Columbia and who maintained very reasonable controls of the spending of the Department of Education. I might add this was done without damaging education in any way, shape or form in this province.

The controls were there. Money wasn't squandered. The pupils got educated and, during that term, literally hundreds of new school buildings were constructed to keep pace with our fast growing population, brought on by a government which made the province a great place to live in.

Interjection by an Hon. Member,

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, that's the Minister of Health's (Hon. Mr. Cocke) own view, but it wasn't the laughing stock of the taxpayer in this province and that's for sure. Their rights were protected.

Last fall the Minister of Education alluded to a new era in British Columbia. A new era of cooperation among people involved in education. I would like to know what happened, Mr. Chairman, to that new era.

Last October the lid on educational spending in this province was blown off right here in this Legislature. The lid was blown off. The sky is the limit. By doing this, the Minister of Education said that there will be a new era of co-operation between the teachers, between the school boards and between the government. What happened to that era?

When the settlements came last fall between the various school boards in the province and the various teacher organizations, how many of them settled without going to arbitration? Very few. Very few indeed.

There was no more going to the taxpayer for the extra money for those extra cameras, for the extra projection equipment, for the extra stereo equipment, for the extra movie camera. No, that decision could be made by the teachers and the school boards. No more going to the taxpayer for the extra wages. A new era of co-operation.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that that era lasted very long. It didn't last very long, Mr. Chairman, The spirit of co-operation was to be the climate in British Columbia between the government and the teachers and the school boards. Less than two months later we saw the co-operation go out the same way it came in.

Out of the 89 school boards in the province, only some six settled themselves without going to arbitration. Where did that new era of co-operation go, Mr. Chairman? We blew off the lid and we blew the era of co-operation.

Because there were controls by the previous administration, they were branded as being against education.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Legislature that there are empire builders in every profession. This Minister spends close to 30 per cent of the total provincial budget. I would like the Minister to tell me what controls she is going to place on the empire builders in our teaching profession and in our school boards in this province. There must be checks and balances in all departments, Mr. Chairman.

Our fine new Hon. Minister of Education is a lovely woman, but I'm afraid that her attitude is not hard enough when it comes to controlling the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that she controls.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, you'll "ooh" and "ah" when the taxpayers speak out.

There must be safeguards. If the percentage of costs increases, what will it do to the higher salaries? It could break this province.

Education is the most critical cost in every jurisdiction in North America. Whether you go to Ontario or to the United States, the cost of education is top priority in spending in those jurisdictions.

The point is, are we getting a better product? Where are we going in the future?

I would like to quote from a pamphlet on the higher cost of higher education which as I said a moment ago is one of the reasons that the budget for education is going up. This is a pamphlet by Dr. Adel Czulowickowski who is a professor of economics at the University of Alberta. He has some good ideas and would like to recommend some of them, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister.

"The last decade saw an unprecedented expansion of higher education in Canada as well as in most economically developed countries of the world. Student enrolment in post-secondary education has almost tripled during the 1960s, reaching a figure of over half a million in 1970. The rate of increase ranged from 10 to 15 per cent annually.

"In the Province of Alberta, the expansion of enrolment in higher educational institutions has been the greatest of all. It soared from 10,000 ten years ago to about 37,000 in 1970.

"Although the rhythm of enrolment increase in higher education has somewhat moderated recently, it is still expected that by the end of the current decade about a million persons will be

[[Page 1136](#)]

enrolled in universities and community colleges. At the present time about one — fifth of our young people in the 18 to 24 age group is attending post — secondary institutions. It is estimated that in 10 years this proportion will rise again to reach almost one — third of the above age groups.

"Whereas the major portion, about 60 per cent of the total student population, goes to university, a sizeable and rapidly growing part are students attending community colleges and technical institutions. Despite slight moderation in the rate of expansion, full-time enrolment in the non-university sector may attain about the quarter of a million mark in 1975."

As I pointed out, I feel that one of the reasons our cost of education has skyrocketed recently has been not only the increased costs of salaries and materials and buildings and so forth, but the increased emphasis on post-secondary education. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Education will agree with me when I say that education in the post-secondary field is the most expensive part of our educational system.

Enrolment is going to grow and as enrolment grows so will the cost. I would like to quote what this learned gentleman has to say with regard to costs:

"Hand in hand with the growth of enrolment, the expenditures of post-secondary education have been rising at an exceedingly high pace to reach a \$2 billion mark in 1970. That is to say they amount to little less than 3 per cent of the national income gross national product.

"As a matter of fact, expenditures of universities and other post-secondary institutions have been rising twice as fast as their enrolments due to increasing costs per student. There are few signs that they will subside in the foreseeable future."

Mr. Chairman, I'm pointing this out to the Hon. Minister of Education because I think it's very important that in our long-range planning we be aware of where the heavy burden, the heavy cost to the taxpayer is going to be in our educational system. It has been said that our post-secondary educational institutions should be free to all. I'll just take another short moment to give this man's views on this very important subject:

"Finally the report touches on a delicate point of the student's share in carrying the financial burden of university

instruction. Contrary to popular demand for higher education free for all who want it, the authors firmly assert that this postulate is neither feasible nor justifiable from the standpoint of fairness.

"It is not feasible because it would impose a very heavy burden on the taxpayers who already grumble about confiscatory taxes. Unless enrolment be severely limited by high admission requirements or otherwise, it is unjustifiable and objectionable, for it would lead to a larger subsidization of the middle and well-off classes of society whose children make up a vast majority of student population in this country. Free higher education would not necessarily change this composition to the advantage of students from poor families. General subsidization is not a rational way of financing post-secondary education."

In other words, of this increased cost, the student is going to have to bear a portion. I don't think the taxpayers of this province will stand for the entire increased cost.

How can we get the best out of our tax dollar when we spend it on education? This is the point that I think we should all address ourselves to, Mr. Chairman.

I realize the tremendous responsibility, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Education has in this regard. Maybe we should look at cutting out some of our professional students in the universities. Maybe in our professions some of them can be taught how to utilize information from a computer and it will not be necessary to spend as long learning their profession.

I think that a medical doctor with a small computer in his office would be able to ask it a question and what he should be taught is how to interpret the answer in relation to his patient. Certainly engineering data today is largely stored in computers, guide rules et cetera. It is not impossible for lawyers instead of spending time learning the laws as well as they do, learning what is in the books, it could be stored in computers. There again, when they have a problem they could get the answer from the computer and they should be training in interpreting the answer in relation to the client.

AN HON. MEMBER: No horse sense any more?

MR. PHILLIPS: You need ordinary horse sense. I'm talking about technical data, Mr. Attorney General. I think we could get more value from our dollars spent if we utilize the existing facilities more. We have buildings that are not utilized as much as they could be. We have equipment that is not utilized as much as it could be. The reason, Mr. Chairman, I am pointing these out to the Minister of Education is the same theme that I have been talking about and that is the increase in cost of education to the province, and naturally, to the taxpayer.

I would like to leave that subject for just a moment, Mr. Chairman, and move on to another subject and that is the subject of discipline in the schools. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) this afternoon when he talked about discipline, I don't necessarily agree with the Member for Oak Bay in his political philosophy, but I must say I agree with

[[Page 1137](#)]

many of his remarks in this Legislature this afternoon with regard to discipline.

I would like to read to the Members, Mr. Chairman, a letter to the *Vancouver Sun*. It's entitled: "Kids themselves vote for the strap." I think this letter is the feeling of a lot of school teachers in this province.

"The Minister of Education, Eileen Dailly's recent order-in-council re corporal punishment is a personal dictatorial decision which is an affront to every citizen of a democracy, Perhaps her conscience won't allow her to preside as Education Minister over a school system that condones and permits strapping of students.

"By the same token, neither does our conscience permit us to submit silently re this edict which prevents corporal punishment of students who commit serious misdemeanors."

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Do you think students should be allowed to vote on whether or not they want teachers?

MR. PHILLIPS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I will continue on with this letter because as I said before, I think it is agreed to by a lot of teachers in British Columbia.

"Some questions come to mind." this author says, "Why were teachers not polled re their performance in this vital matter? Why, when we have a BCTF, PTA, curriculum directors and ad infinitum, were we not allowed discussion or dialogue on this important issue? Why should the school system be subject to the whim of a personal decision? Why was no reasonable alternative given?"

This lady continues:

"I have had an interesting, informative and intelligent discussion with my grade 6 students re the reasons of strap retention. Another staff member held a debate with his grade 7 class. A reporter..."

Maybe he was a reporter from the *Vancouver Sun*.

"...interviewed members of a grade 6 class in a Vancouver school and the programme was on TV. The majority of the children condoned corporal punishment. We polled the students in our school from grade 4 to grade 7 on strap retention and approximately..."

Approximately. Guess how many?

"...85 percent of the 260 pupils opted for corporal punishment. In one class of 38 children, 38 students voted not only to retain the strap but also said that their family, their parents believed in physical punishment for severe misdemeanors.

"In the family unit, spatulas and wooden spoons are often the instruments used for spanking."

Some of the comments from a grade 6 class.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. PHILLIPS: These are from the students:

"Boy: 'There will be more problems now.' Girl: 'Kids will get into trouble all the time because nothing will happen.' Boy: 'What is to stop me throwing a rock through the window? I just feel like it.' Girl: 'If the kids feel like doing something, they will do it.' Girl: 'What will Mrs. Dailly put in its place'"

I think that is the question that we should have answered here in this Legislature. What will Mrs. Dailly put in its place?

"In a special class for learning disabilities in our school, 11 to 13 wished strap retention. Their reasons show intuitive insight into problems of learning discipline and self-discipline. Girl: 'He'll bully me if nothing happens.'"

Is the safety of some of the girl students in schools going to be in jeopardy because this method of punishment has been withdrawn by the Minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. The answer is no.

MR. PHILLIPS:

"Boy 'Kids do bad things and they should be punished when they do them.'"

"The strap is there, just there, not to be abused through misuse, but to be used as the *Public Schools Act* states. Similar to that of a kind of firm and judicious parent for common good. The school is a society of students and like society at large, needs rules and regulations for law and order to be retained and maintained in a world that is shrinking due to urbanization, over-population and ever increasing proximity.

"Schools are accountable to that society of children, parents and taxpayers. And stop-and-go signs, green and red lights and rules of the road are ever with us. More so than ever before."

This lady continues:

"The school is the place for the pupil to learn to respect these time-honoured humane principles, procedures and priorities in order to honour the rights of the majority as well as to consider the wishes of the minority in a democracy."

I think this lady who wrote this letter had her wits about her. She knew what she was talking about.

"Teachers are not child beaters. Some may have strapped unwisely and unfairly but life often treats us unwisely and unfairly. It is human to err. Children perceive and have strong sensibilities. They seem to know that erring classmates need to be checked from wrong desires and doings.

"The common good must be uppermost in the minds of all. Children have that commonsense

[[Page 1138](#)]

approach through conversation, dialogues, debates, and discussion. Some tried and true sayings from the world's most read book reveals: 'Spare the rod and spoil the child.'

'A little child shall lead them.'

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would the Hon. Member be seated. State your point of order.

MR. J. RADFORD (Vancouver South): Yes. I can't follow the tenure of what the speaker is getting at. Is he for child beating or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. There is no point of order. Would the Hon. Member proceed.

MR. PHILLIPS: That is about typical of the Member for Vancouver South. Had he been in the House...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would you confine your remarks to the estimates, please.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think this letter is very well written and I think it states very clearly the views of many school teachers in this province and the views of many parents in this province and I am sure, the views of many clear-thinking school children in this province.

What did the Hon. Minister of Education say last fall — on September 22, when she was interviewed — a profile. Headlines, Mr. Chairman. The *Vancouver Province* Friday, February 22, 1972: "Meet the Education Minister — profile."

What does it say at the very top of the page? In large letters: "Corporal Punishment"

"I will consult teachers, although it's one of the first things I'd like to see eliminated."

"Mrs. Dailly said she will move gradually on several issues about which she has strong personal views. One of these is the removal of corporal punishment as a legal method of discipline in the schools. 'I will consult with teachers who have to deal with students.' "

Where was the consultation? Mr. Chairman, our Minister, of Education used the usual dictatorial manner of the socialist government to push her ideas on the teachers in this province. We have had far too much of that from this socialist government.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I was disappointed in the Hon. Minister of Education, that she would use such a dictatorial method to foist her own personal ideas on every child in this province, on every parent in this province, on every taxpayer in this province and on every teacher in this province.

Where is that new era of co-operation that the Minister of Education told us about last October in the mini-session?

That session was called especially, Mr. Chairman, to get this new era of co-operation off the ground.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Are you a masochist?

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, the Premier knows the answer to that question.

AN HON. MEMBER: I know the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I want to state again that I was very disappointed in the Hon. lady Minister of Education, very disappointed. I didn't think that she would follow the lead of her ruthless cabinet Ministers in foisting their ideas, following their dictatorial lead. I didn't think she'd do it. Well I hope, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that she uses the same dictatorial powers when it comes to keeping down the cost of education for the good of the taxpayers in this province.

The Minister said on the floor of the Legislature the other day, "Have you ever seen the sight of a child being dragged from the floor screaming 'Do not discipline me'?" Nasty sight.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Education should spend more time teaching the teachers how to discipline their children. It's not a nice sight seeing a youngster defying his teacher either, is it? That's not a nice sight.

Have you ever seen a teenaged boy defying a lady school teacher, enraging his teacher by taunting her, insulting her? That's not a nice sight either, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can shoot him.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am sure that there will be cases far worse than the one I'm alluding to here.

Some of the young female school teachers in this province will not be safe from some of the bully teenaged kids.

HON. MR. BARRETT: What's on your mind? (Laughter).

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): What's on yours?

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, the Premier sits there and he makes light of a very serious situation. He hasn't been in the House very much this afternoon. I'm glad he came in to listen to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon.

[[Page 1139](#)]

Member return to the estimates, please?

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, just tell the Premier to leave me alone and let me continue with my few remarks that I have left.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I'm not threatening you with the strap.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, testing authority is part of growing up. What are the children in the schools going to do when there is no authority to test, when there is no final limit, when there is no stop sign?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education took that stop sign out of our schools by her dictatorial order-in-council. Just having that disciplinary object in the drawer was the deterrent. The Minister should have consulted with

the teachers of this province like she promised to do.

What did one of the friends of the Government, the controversial Mr. Young, have to say about the rules in schools? It's very interesting. I'll just read you this article...

AN HON. MEMBER: Isn't he going to be appointed to the Government?

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, he'll probably be appointed a deputy Minister of Education. It wouldn't surprise me at all, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Assistant deputy.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, assistant deputy or maybe the public relations man.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Will you get on with your point, please?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm just discussing the Minister's estimates, Mr. Chairman. If you'd quit harassing me and let me continue, I'd finish a lot sooner.

Mr. Chairman, this is an article out of the *Vancouver Province*, a great paper. Mr. Young says: " 'Most teachers are frightened of their students,' controversial educator John Young told a University of B.C. audience Monday."

AN HON. MEMBER: John Young?

MR. PHILLIPS: This is from your friend John Young. I guess, Mr. Chairman, that this John Young will never be appointed deputy Minister of Education, because he disagrees with the Hon. Minister of Education.

"Young said, 'Evidence of this fear shows up in the rules and regulations teachers make to isolate themselves from the students. The rules allow teachers to hid behind an unthinking, impersonal bureaucracy instead of dealing with the students' individual problems,' he said."

The removal of discipline from our public school system means that our teachers are going to have to hide further away from the problems of the pupils. All because the Minister of Education wanted to ram through her own personal views.

I'll admit, Mr. Chairman, that some children in our educational system are O.K. They don't need discipline. There are cases probably where they've been disciplined by the wrong method by the wrong teacher. But I think these cases, Mr. Chairman, are in the minority.

Look at any young, energetic pupil. We certainly have lots of them in British Columbia because it's a good place to live, it's a good society and these young fellow are full of energy, vim and vigour. What are they going to do, Mr. Chairman? They're going to do like any ordinary, normal, human, young child is going to do. They're going to experiment, Mr. Chairman. They're going to test and they're going to experiment, Mr. Chairman. They're going to attempt to do things that they shouldn't do. They're going to put out feelers to their teacher. They're going to send up trial balloons to see how far the teacher will allow them to go.

Now there is no stop sign. They're going to gamble on just how much they can get away with before they're expelled. They're going to speculate, Mr. Chairman, as to how far their teacher will let them go.

If there is no check in school they keep right on checking. When they go out into the world they start testing the police force and they start testing every other human being in our society.

By removing these controls, Mr. Chairman, we are not equipping these children for adult life. By the permissiveness in our society we have practically ruined our police force today. Now we remove the barriers in the very critical learning stages of the people who are some day going to rule this world. Some of them will probably be

sitting right here in this Legislature.

It's a permissive society and now it's one step closer to becoming completely permissive. Our police force has no backing from the public. Now our school teachers, who try to teach discipline, have no backing from the Department of Education.

Well, it's done. Like many other things that have been done in this province, the damage is probably already done. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Education if she would consider withdrawing that dictatorial order-in-council.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I've never seen a socialist who took an idea from anybody in my life. They have all the answers. Why must a democratic society go ail the

[[Page 1140](#)]

way to the bottom, ruin itself with permissiveness, and then have to fight its way back up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member relate his remarks to the estimates.

MR. PHILLIPS: The Hon. Member, Mr. Chairman, is talking about education. A society is basically judged by the amount of its education, the way it educates its population. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. I would like to hear what the Minister of Education has to say.

I have just one other point that I would like to bring up, but I won't bring it up at this time. I'll reserve it for a little later and maybe the Minister of Education would stand in this Legislature and give me some answers to some of the points I have brought up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I didn't want to interrupt the Minister if she was going to answer those questions. As a matter of fact, I got so involved in the Member's speech I almost forgot what I was going to speak about myself.

I think I'd like to start, Mr. Chairman, in the vein of the removal of the strap from the school because this was one of the other Member's main points. I recognize that the Minister meant well in this area. I think we have to recognize that there may well have been areas in British Columbia in the schools where strapping could have been abused and where it might have been used for the slightest infraction. But I would think in that instance there could have been another method used such as the opinions of other teachers or the teachers who served under that principal.

The fact that this responsibility was housed in the hands of the principals makes your decision somewhat questionable. We put a great deal of trust in our principals and we expect them to accept a great deal of responsibility. To my knowledge, this responsibility in relation to corporal punishment, if that's what you want to call it, has been used judiciously. I for one feel that if we have people in this position, we must respect their opinion.

I don't think there's a principal in the province, really, who would ever enjoy strapping. I would think that 99 per cent of them would only use it as a means of meeting a situation that had been well thought through. I think if you talk to the principals, Madam Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that you would find that they felt there were occasions when this type of quick, clean and just administration was effective in helping a child turn around and alter their view and not get into any more serious trouble.

Now the alternative is very much in question. The Hon. Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) brought this up. I think this is important. The alternative, as it stands now, is expulsion from school. Surely there has to be, in all society, a limit or a hot-stove reaction at times for the benefit of the individual. This hot-stove reaction, which was strapping judiciously applied, gave the child the opportunity to reconsider. It didn't destroy the relationship

between the principal and the child, and it left ample room for supportive assistance in the future.

But now, if the child is expelled, then he's off down the street. The chance of helping him or getting him or her back in the fold, I think, is very much more difficult. I think, Madam Minister, if you had spoken to the principals about this, you would have found this to be their reaction.

I'd like to talk about school district 22 for a moment. We're very fortunate. I'm sure the Minister is aware that we have excellent teachers. We have a very fine school board and we have very fine citizens. Our students do well. I would suspect that we have a lower incidence of emotional problems in our schools. This is essentially a well disciplined school district, by contrast to many others. I attribute this partly to the nature of the families and the people who live there, but also partly to the approach that has been taken by our teaching staff and by our principals.

By and large, it's been a very open-minded approach, but there has been an element of discipline running through it. In consequence, we're not an area that has been heavily plagued with delinquency problems or expulsion from school. We've had our share of drug problems but even then there has been a good relationship generally between the teachers and the principals and those who have been caught up in this, both the students and the parents.

But these principals are concerned. They've noticed no discernible change in attitude of the students, but they are worried because they see that they have no alternative in the end but this route of expulsion.

I know the Minister will probably want to get up and say, "Well, counselling...." I recognize this and so do they. But I'm sure she must be aware that there comes a time in every home, in every situation, when you need that instant hot-stove deterrent or reaction.

We found in our area that the strap was very seldom used in the elementary school. About the only time it was used was in the junior secondary area. I suppose this is reasonable. These young people between the ages of 13 and 15 are pretty flexible. They want to rebel a bit, yet they're still malleable enough that sometimes an instant reaction has an effect.

It's been seldom used in the senior high school. The assessment of this is that this is likely because

[[Page 1141](#)]

these students, if they're rebellious, are more determined in their rebellion. They're physically stronger and a strap doesn't have any effect of deterrent for them; it's a much deeper problem.

I would suggest, Madam Minister, that in one of your previous statements you said you had consulted with parents and teachers on this matter and this is where you had gotten your guidance. Did you consult with the principals? My questions related to this are: What percentage of the teachers in British Columbia did you consult with, and the parents? What area of geographic distribution? How many principals did you consult with?

I polled the principals in our area. Of 13 of them, nine favoured the retention of the strap. I don't know whether your own Members have told you, but in the Salmon Arm school district they favour the retention of the strap. This shouldn't be misunderstood. This is not as a means of corporal punishment. It's a means of an assisting tool that may well be used wisely in certain situations.

In Kamloops the majority favoured the retention of the strap under the system as it was — at the discretion of the principal and with the other protective avenues there were.

I don't want to be unkind but I do feel that the Minister made this decision emotionally. I think probably her maternal instinct was very strong because no one, and particularly a mother, likes to punish a child physically. But I suggest, Madam Minister, as the chief educational officer in the Province of British Columbia, you cannot afford the luxury of emotional decisions and maternal decisions. Certainly these feelings will come into play but they must come into play, if we're concerned about the students and education in this province, within the framework of what education is supposed to be all about.

I would not make these suggestions without offering a constructive alternative. Instead of backing yourself in a corner, give this programme six months or eight months, whatever is a reasonable period of time. Let's see what happens around British Columbia. Then, as I understand you didn't do before, go back and have more dialogue with the principals in this province who essentially have carried this responsibility.

Assess it then. Has it been effective? Has it been detrimental to discipline in the schools? Has there been any benefit? Weigh these pros and cons with them and then reassess your decision in light of that information.

I would, after suggesting this, put it in the form of a question of whether the Minister would consider doing this and give me an answer on it. I suggest, with all due respect, that you did make an emotional decision but you left your chief support, your chief officers — your chief warriors, if you want to call them that — your chief people with responsibility, the principals, right on the firing line. They are the ones that have to cope with this problem. They are the ones who should be making this decision in co-operation with you on a sounder basis than we are led to believe you did under these circumstances.

Again I would repeat my question: Will the Minister give this a trial period then discuss the effect of it with her principals and be guided by them? As I said, they are the ones who are on the firing line. They're the ones who need the confidence of the parents and the students and they're the ones that set the tone in the schools. They're the ones who are deeply concerned about your decision.

I have another area where I must disagree with the Minister. If I recall correctly, in the previous debate the Minister said that we must protect our children from the experience of failure; they must not feel failure. I disagree with you, Madam Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, and I think that's a wrong philosophy to have in our school system or in our society.

What I suggest is that children must learn to accept failure, learn how to cope with failure without losing their self-esteem and without losing their confidence.

Failure in one situation is success in another. I don't know whether the Minister has ever lived on a farm, but if you first start to milk a cow by hand and you get half a bucket and there are three experienced milkers next to you, you're a failure — especially if you kicked over the stool. But if the fellow next to you just starting only gets three drops in the bucket, you're a success. So success and failure really are, in part, relevant to the situation in which you find yourself.

We've experienced this in the House. You get up and you make a speech here and you sit down and everybody's been nice to you; they've maybe heckled a bit to help you along. You got a good hand and you feel you presented it well. You think, "Man, that was a success."

Two minutes later, your ego is down on the floor because a better speaker gets up and makes a more colourful presentation. Maybe they have more ability for that particular subject.

But were you really a failure? You were expressing yourself in your own ability and as you felt, as you represented people. So was the other person. So how do you really measure success and failure?

I suggest that when you analyse life that it's a series of checks and balances. It's a series of successes and failures whether it's in your career, or your school life, or sports, or your marriage. It's how you react and interreact in this situation that counts.

There can be little question that all of us, including children, have to learn to accept and understand their own limitations, their own abilities, and what areas these lie in. Surely the intent of the

school system is to help them assess this and utilize their abilities, and develop their abilities, and build on these. Not on the basis of fear of failure, but on a confident approach of understanding what their abilities are and if they have

failures, why they take place. We must never get to the point where we feel that failure is a disgrace, because it isn't.

I wouldn't suggest for a minute that children be inhibited from trying something in which they are obviously going to fail, because surely part of life's pleasure and part of the development of children is the interest one puts into trying, the stimulation, that one gets from trying — just the very experience of doing it, learning to handle it and then perhaps learning to handle that ultimate defeat. I feel that rather than saying, "Protect our children from failure," you should be emphasizing the need for personal emphasis on satisfaction and input.

When you analyse it, as I mentioned before, all life is a series of checks and balances, successes and failures.

You can get up, Madam Minister, the Premier can get up one morning at seven o'clock — he's got a sore throat. Somebody phones to say the Sukunka deal's gone sour. His breakfast is cold. He goes out to get in the car and it's got a flat tire. He's had four failures before nine o'clock.

The failures themselves may well be not that important, but it's how he reacts as an individual to them that counts. How he interreacts when he gets into contact with other people in the light of those failures is what counts. This is what I believe we must make children understand.

Madam Minister, as much as probably we as women — and I might be more personal about this, through you, Mr. Chairman — would wish to protect our children from failure, and we do this. We try to protect our children in many ways even though we want to give them latitude; there's still an element of protection. There is just no way we can protect them. If you develop too protective an environment in the school, what is the child or the emerging adult going to do when they really have to face the realities of life? You can't protect them too long.

In this area, I would also like to suggest to the Minister that we should make a very strident attempt to cut down over-competitiveness in schools. I think in terms of sport, certainly many children need this avenue to express hostility or energy for many reasons. But I fail yet to see the great value of what I call this over-emphasis or over-professionalization of athletic activities or other activities in schools as well as in the recreational area.

In my opinion, there's far too much emphasis on winning. The emphasis should be on participation.

There's far too much emphasis on turning everybody out in a shiny new uniform. What's great about seeing four teams out battling each other in shiny new uniforms when you have 80 kids on the sidelines who want to participate, but they are not good enough. There isn't enough money for extra balls. There aren't enough coaches to just encourage them to take part because the emphasis has gone on winning and the emphasis has gone on equipment.

I would ask the Minister if she will undertake to examine this very carefully in the schools. If she wants to make strong edicts, this is an area in which, with co-operation with the teachers, you might take a serious look and perhaps bring in some very strong ideas.

I'm not against competition. As I say, one of the problems with young people today is that there is no socially acceptable avenue through which they can exert pressure and fight pressure. They sometimes run around wanting to champion a cause and can't.

At the risk of being misunderstood, I would say, while I don't approve of war — I think it's terrible — I think in history at times, if there was ever any benefit to war — and I question it seriously — but it was the fact that at a certain age in life, young people, young men particularly could exercise this burning energy they had. They could release their hostilities. They were challenged beyond their capabilities really, or their accepted capabilities. Furthermore, they got paid for it and they won national acclaim. I wouldn't want to see that day return. But I think we must understand that this is part of the youth problem, if you want to call it so, that we have today. Young people have energy. They want a cause and they do need to be tested. They do have to have a wall to bang against, whether it's in athletics or in some other area.

When I suggest over-professionalization of amateur athletics and amateur sport in the school, I think in terms

of the uniform bit, where the money goes, not in terms of depriving them of this need to expend their energy and have some acclaim.

I would like to see not only a cup for the winner, but I'd like to see the cup for the one who participates most, or who contributes most to the team environment — rather than singling out the best goal getter or the best batter. This personality is going to do that through their life. It's the fellows and the girls who are lagging behind that we have to help develop their self-esteem and accept the fact that in failure there also is a great reward.

Perhaps in counselling people to win, we might well counsel them how to share winning and make being g on the losing side more attractive. And I would put that in the form of a question.

I would like to mention just one point about family life education. As I understand, the Minister has brought it to the fore. I recognize that I haven't been here in all the debate, but listening to recalling the previous debate, you mentioned consultation with teachers and parents and students.

[[Page 1143](#)]

But I feel that you must bring into play the health people and the public health units. I would say quite frankly, and I am a nurse myself, married to a doctor, so I think I can express this with a fair degree of confidence, that even in the medical field, even in the nursing field and certainly in the teaching field and many other fields of life, there are very few people competent to teach this subject and even fewer people who are comfortable teaching this subject.

If you are going to stimulate this programme in the schools, and I certainly favour this, you've got to go right back to the teacher training, the medical training and nursing training and there must be a very, very well designed programme of family counselling and family understanding.

If you talk to many doctors they'll tell you that they spend their time in family counselling. If they could solve their own problems at home as easily as they can those of their patients, it would be much simpler. Most of them will admit to you that they're very uncomfortable in this situation.

You have to recognize that really if ever there is a generation gap it is in this area where there is not yet a generation in these professions which has been free of the inhibitions or the moral standards or whatever you want to call it that anyone under 25 has. So they're not into play in these fields.

I would urge you to start a programme this summer for teachers on family planning and family counselling or family living, whatever you want to call it. I think that you'll find very few authorities on this subject in British Columbia.

In dealing with this subject in the schools, I suggest that the parents still have a right to exercise their view on the moral standards. I can think of many teachers who I would be quite happy to have discuss this subject with our children — and really I don't suppose we have any particular hang-ups as a family in this area — but who would be acceptable to many other parents.

I can think of some teachers who are very fine teachers, very fine people, but who have a standard of living or a moral code, an action code, that is just not acceptable within society as we see it today. I think that this can have an influence on the child that may not be the influence that the parent wants.

I'm not suggesting that a parent with a rigid code should overbalance this. But there are swingers and there are swingers. I think you should have a right as a parent, if your child is going to be in one of these courses, to suggest that that teacher's mode of living, while it's fine for them and you don't object to it, is not the environment that you want your children exposed to.

So one of my questions in this relationship is: will you consult with the universities in British Columbia...?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: You missed my point, Mr. Member. You've got to have the proper people to teach the course. You're a parent. I know some people...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Member please address the Chair?

MRS. JORDAN: I'd rather send my son down to the barn. Sorry. He's just so irresistible. Especially on this subject.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: The Premier says "no one's innocent."

Will you undertake a programme this summer for teachers who are going to be involved in this teaching programme next year?

One small point on athletic first-aid. I am sure the Minister is aware that this is a matter of great concern to parents around the problem that most of our teachers do not have first-aid, let alone athletic first-aid. The B.C. Medical Association, I believe, has an excellent programme developed for athletic first aid or is working on one. I would strongly suggest that the government pick up the tab and that from every school in British Columbia there be a physical education teacher taking a programme this summer, and that you make it mandatory that there be at least three teachers on a staff who have not only up to date first-aid certificates but athletic first-aid.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: My speech writer says, "and mouth-to-mouth resuscitation." Through you, Mr. Chairman, I think that's an excellent suggestion. As you know, this is sometimes brought into play with epileptic seizures and coronaries. Where we have handicapped children moving more and more into the mainstream of schooling which is an excellent programme, this may only happen in one school once a year, but it may mean a life.

Athletic injuries are not like other injuries. You can do an awful lot of damage in the first few minutes. We have had several incidences in British Columbia — I'm sure no higher than anywhere else — where there has been loss of life in the athletic fields of our schools and universities. It might not be totally prevented but at least we would know that the best possible protection is being taken.

It should be mandatory. I'm not a great one for compulsion, but it should be mandatory in all these "puppy" hockey leagues, where there are soccer programmes, going on, that one person be present

[[Page 1144](#)]

who has this experience.

The question is: will you undertake to do this?

Another point I'd like to bring up is that I feel that many teachers who are good teachers get to the point where they've worked in the same school or they've shifted around the school district, but they've been teaching similar subjects, and they don't necessarily want to go back to university and take more training but they want to refresh themselves. I would like to ask the Minister if she would undertake to bring in a programme whereby a teacher can leave teaching for a year — and I don't even think that it's necessary that they get a salary, so it's not a sabbatical leave — but they shouldn't lose their pension rights and they shouldn't lose their seniority rights. But let them go and let them work in any field they Want to.

Maybe some of them would like to go into the forest. I know a teacher who went and worked as a janitor and thoroughly enjoyed it because he met different people, he found it relaxing, he found it stimulating and he went back to teaching a much richer person.

Maybe teachers who are teaching consumer affairs would like to go and work in an office. I suggest that it well may not be beyond the realm of possibility that you need to set up an information centre within the Department of Education where businesses would say, "We would be glad to have a teacher for a year," or forestry people would say, "We have openings for teachers for a year." What about the Parks Branch? There are many areas. Let them leave the opportunities there and let the teachers say, "Well, we would like to take a year off and we think we'd like to work in the outdoor area." You might be able to arrange this with other provincial governments so that teachers would have a year in Quebec or the Maritimes. Maybe they'd like to go fishing.

There'd have to be a centralized area too, I think, until this programme gets off the ground.

Kindergarten. I did caution the Minister before and I will caution her again that while I certainly favour making the opportunity of kindergartens available — it was available before in the discretion of the school board — I would strongly oppose any attempt to make kindergarten compulsory.

I think that we're in danger in North American society today of just pushing our children too far. We've been intoxicated with the view that our children must work to maximum motivation. If the Premier is tired, Mr. Chairman, maybe he'd like to go and lie down.

We're preoccupied and intoxicated with this maximum motivation of our children and I suggest that we have an obligation to just let our children be children. If you can't be a child when you're five and under, when can you? It's a long, long time to wait until you get back to that second childhood. There's strong evidence to support the fact that in being over intoxicated with the intensive education of young children, intensive social situations with young children, they're burnt out by the time they're 14, 15 and 16.

There's something a little overwhelming about going into a school with a lot of people when you're four years old. There's something overwhelming when you think that you've been playing with people or working with — people for 10 years by the time you're 12 or 14 years old. We must guard very carefully against this danger of pushing children out of the childhood that they have a right to enjoy.

I recognize there are some children who very definitely need a more intensive learning situation, but I also feel very strongly that there are many children who can learn just by being in their own environment, by being in an informal environment, and who are happier when they're not overpowered by people.

I'd like to ask the Minister some specific questions One is: do you intend to make kindergarten compulsory in British Columbia by way of attendance? I hope the answer is "no."

The next question I'd like to ask, in view of the fact that you've made it mandatory for the school district to provide this programme by September of 1973, is: what busing programmes have you organized? I'm sure that the Minister can appreciate that there are great difficulties in just the area of transportation. If you're going to make it available, you must remember that some of us represent people who live 40 miles from the school.

I'll cite a local example. We have people in Cherryville, which is 45 miles from Vernon and 30 miles from Lumby, and it's a great concern to us now that our high school students and secondary school students spend as much as two hours, morning and night, on the bus.

This surely would be an absolutely unacceptable situation for little children. They come to school later, and they leave early. There's an acute problem as to how you're going to get there and how you are going to get them home again.

There's great concern about where kindergartens' are going to be housed. There's a lot of resistance to having them housed in schools, and I know that you can say it's very nice for Mary Jane to walk to school with her brother or friend, but on the other hand, even though they have isolated play areas, there is still the noise factor and let's face it, we're only just now becoming conscious of noise pollution. There's the excitement factor, as well as the overwhelming factor of just having so many people around.

We would like to know what provisions you have made for transportation, and we'd like to know what is going to be the role of the current kindergartens. There are a number of private kindergartens or public

[[Page 1145](#)]

kindergartens, whatever you want to call them, which have been established by church groups, by fraternal organizations, and just by interested people. They're not in schools. They're housed in church halls, they're housed in basements, and they've been doing an excellent job. They are dedicated people. There's been a very personalized approach to the children. They're concerned what their role is going to be.

I'd suggest very strongly that the Minister and the Government, through you, Mr. Chairman, must acknowledge the role that these kindergartens have played and that you must not centralize them in schools. If these have been in service, if they've been serving the children well and they're dedicated people, they must be assisted to function on a continuing basis.

The teachers in this area are very concerned. What are the qualifications going to have to be? Are we going into an era where we feel that no one can work in a kindergarten unless they have this and this degree? If we are, I suggest this is very dangerous, because we need a maternal humane response in our kindergartens.

I suggest that the learning situation is not important in this area. It's secondary to the child's ability to relate with the people and the people's response to them. If you are going to require certain qualifications for those in charge, I suggest you make it very flexible for those who can assist, that you make it quite proper for parent aides to come in and assist in the school, and that you keep a close watch to see that kindergartens don't become regimented and don't become intense learning situations, rather than child social orientating situations.

My questions again are: will you give assistance to current schools or kindergartens, regardless of whether they're church kindergartens or private kindergartens or public kindergartens; will you allow them to stay in their current premises and to utilize these halls that have a much more personal relationship than any form of school housing; what are you going to do about busing?

The next point that I'm going to bring up has been canvassed provincially. That is on regional colleges. I want to talk about the Okanagan Regional College.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MRS. JORDAN: Would the Minister like to answer those questions up until now? Mr. Chairman, will I have my place tonight? I just don't want the debate to be closed off, because I want to speak about this under your salary vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: There's six questions and I'll just try to run through them briefly:

1) The strap is not removed on a trial basis. It's the policy of this government not to have corporal punishment in our school system.

2) It was not based on an emotional decision. Mr. Chairman, I sat for six years over on that side of the House and I watched so many emotional decisions being made on this side. I will never fall into that trap myself. It was done on a great deal of research and I wish some of the people over there, particularly the Member for Peace River, would do a little bit of research before they speak.

3) Yes, I completely agree with you when you mentioned about the competition in sports being de-emphasized, I completely agree. I think this has gotten completely out of control in many of our schools. Anything that I can do to help I will, and any suggestions that you have I'd be pleased to hear, so that we can encourage boards

to de-emphasize this competition. As a matter of fact, I had a student newspaper sent to me with an excellent article written by a student who was saying very much the same things you were. It's a well taken point.

4) Very quickly, certainly we won't move into family life programmes without working with the health department and health people. It's very essential.

5) First aid. The Hon. Member was with me when we met with the PTA. They were concerned about teachers having first aid qualifications. I agree with you, every teacher should have it if possible. If we can't get every teacher, each staff must be well covered with teachers who have first aid. We will be discussing this with the faculties of education.

6) Kindergartens. I'll be bringing that legislation in very shortly, and attached to that will be regulations which will, I hope, answer many of the questions which you brought up, if you'll wait until then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. B ARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

Leave granted.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move we proceed with public bills and orders.

[[Page 1146](#)]

Motion approved.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE ACT

(continued)

HON. MR. BARRETT: Adjourned debate on Bill No. 35, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Highways.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I take that thunderous applause from across the way to indicate approval of the principle of Bill 35. I thank the Member for Columbia in advance for that very clear demonstration...

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Columbia River.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Columbia River, down the river without a paddle...for that very clear public demonstration of his tremendous support for this legislation.

MR. CHABOT: Ho hum.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: He says "ho hum" and it'll be ho hum.

I listened with interest to the comments which were made by the Members across the way on this legislation. They had some trouble being critical of it. They didn't want to be too hard on it because they know it's popular

legislation, and they kept striving desperately to find some handle they could crank up to indicate that there was something desperately wrong with this automobile insurance proposal contained in Bill 35.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I observed it here first hand, and you were the prime instigator of that dismal display from across the way, my friend. But the Member who just spoke, the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) is in the insurance business himself. He is a life underwriter, and that whole speech he made the other day was trying to underwrite, promote and maintain the life of certain aspects of the private insurance industry in the Province of British Columbia.

They raised the matter of the fact that this bill didn't say this, and this bill didn't say that and this bill didn't say something else. "What are the rates? What are the rates? Is it going to be this?" Question after question.

Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have been in this House, at least 50 bills have gone through this House to set up insurance companies. Never once did I hear the Member ask a single question about the rates that were going to be charged by that company, the coverage it was going to give, what protection the policy holder would have or anything else. The only comment I ever made about those bills was, there was nothing this province needed less than another private insurance company.

As the bills went through year after year, it becomes obvious to me they are trying to caucus, the whole Opposition here, to determine whether they're going to vote "yes", "no", or try and find a fence to sit on. You'd love to find a fence to sit on on this one. wouldn't you?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Once those bills went through the House it became obvious to me that while we didn't need another private insurance company in the Province of British Columbia, it was long overdue for us to have a publicly-owned government operated insurance company in the Province of British Columbia.

We heard the whine about competition. "Why don't we just go in competition with the existing insurance companies?"

AN HON. MEMBER: You're not proud of your programme, that's why.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I want exactly the same opportunity as the private insurance companies have had in this province for 50 years. **For 50 years the private insurance companies of this province have had the whole market to themselves. I suggest it's now our turn. It's the people's turn now. After 50 years of publicly operated automobile insurance in this province, then the people can decide whether they want that or to go back to the system that's existed up until now.**

Now that's being fair, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's being fair. That's equal time.

After this bill was introduced into the House, I received some comments from individuals and insurance companies. They said, "Well, we didn't think it was going to be a monopoly. We thought it was going to be the same as Manitoba and Saskatchewan." This is what they told me. "We're disappointed."

But look. Here's the pamphlet that the Insurance Bureau of Canada put out in November of last year About Manitoba. What did they say? — "On

November 1, 1971, competitive private car insurance in Manitoba was replaced by a government monopoly." Replaced by a government monopoly. O.K. They wanted a monopoly. They say that Manitoba's was a monopoly. We have one here. But they say they want the same as Manitoba.

Before that bill was brought in they were putting out material saying it was a "monopoly," that it was "terrible," that "we want no part of it." Now they say, "Why can't we have it like it is in Manitoba?"

You've talked about the agents. I have every sympathy for the agents.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Liar!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: But some of you just don't know how the agents have been operating.

Here's a letter I got from one agent:

"The insurance industry from the agent's point of view is in a very difficult position."

This was before, under these great days that you talk about of competitive free enterprise —

"Commissions are low, cost of operation is high, and it would make only about 3 to 4 per cent return net if we could collect the premium at the time of issuing the policy. We changed our system about four years ago to cash and carry basis and it still does not work and some of the worst offenders are high income people — doctors, lawyers, et cetera."

Now this is what an insurance man tells me, that they went on a cash and carry basis because the doctors and the lawyers and other high income people wouldn't pay the installments when they came due.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to go through the notes I made when the debate was taking place. They want to know who is to be the commissar. They want to know how many people I consider necessary to be appointed as agents.

It's an open forum. All anyone who wants to become an agent has to do is just make application.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) who led off for the Opposition, quoted what he claimed was a royal commission report. He says: "Let me refer for a moment to the study done by a royal commission in Nova Scotia, published January, 1972," — a royal commission on automobile insurance for the Province of Nova Scotia, Then he goes on about loss ratios and so on. This is the book he was quoting from.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's the book you were quoting from. The royal commission in Nova Scotia hasn't made a report yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: This is a submission by the Insurance Bureau of Canada to the royal commission. That's what this is. (Laughter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Shame!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's what he was quoting, the submission of the Insurance Bureau of Canada to the royal commission in Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Naughty, naughty!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Now what does that do to the rest of his speech? It was based on what's in this

submission by the Insurance Bureau of Canada to the royal commission in Nova Scotia.

Then he says, "Answer my question." What was the question? No, Mr. Speaker...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, I don't believe the Member deliberately misled the House. He just didn't know what he was talking about, that's all.

A question was asked during the debate about where the risks would go and whether or not the good driver would be penalized for the bad driver. It's obvious that the Member who asked the question had not only not read the blue *Hansard* but he hadn't even listened to what I said. Because a quote from what I said was:

"Both the drivers and the owners of vehicles will be required to contribute to the cost of the programme. The owner will pay a basic premium, having regard to broad risk considerations related to the particular class of vehicle. Each driver will pay a base premium for the class to which he belongs and the penalty points on his record are material in establishing the class."

Obviously there's not going to be an imposition on the good drivers to make up for the bad drivers. I made that very clear. But the Members across the way just didn't want to listen.

Someone across the way said, "How much?" I said that there isn't an insurance company in the world that will tell you 12 months ahead of time what the rates will be.

Somebody said, "That's not true. Three years ahead of time."

Any insurance corporation that bases its premiums in automobile insurance on the record of three years ago is asking for trouble. Maybe that's why the insurance corporations of B.C. have been losing the money they claim to be losing.

You must have the up-to-date figures. Look at Saskatchewan. A 20 per cent increase in their accident record in one year. Now you can imagine what would, happen to a company that based its

[[Page 1148](#)]

premiums on three years ago faced with that.

It's obvious the Members across the way just don't know what they're talking about at all. They don't know anything about the insurance business, how it's operated or anything else.

Then I think it was the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) who said:

"It is possible to slide some of the costs out of the plan and therefore make great reductions. Could it be that some months in advance of election there'll be an announcement of reduction of premiums for certain classes of drivers, you know, is that a possibility? That is a possibility which would not exist if the government merely exercised regulatory power over private insurance companies and private insurance agents."

Time and again I got the inference from across the way that in the kind of jungle in which they're used to operating, evidently, this sort of underhanded sort of procedure goes forth. It happens all the time — people slipping money from one account into the other. The legislation makes it very clear that there will be a separation of accounts and I also said the other day very clearly that payments will be made through the various agencies of government where any costs are incurred on behalf of the insurance company.

Mr. Speaker, I've been getting some of these cards that the insurance companies sent out with this pamphlet.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, the question they are asking is: "I believe that competition and freedom to

choose are the best safeguards for the consumer." You're supposed to sign this card and send it to your MLA.

I've been getting a lot of them. I guess they didn't send them to their MLA's. Here's one from Victoria. He says:

"I believe safeguards for the consumer are the best against insurance company rip-offs." That's from Victoria.

Here's one from West Vancouver: "I am in complete favour of the government takeover."

Victoria: "We are in favour of government-operated auto insurance."

Langley: "We are 100 per cent in favour of the government insurance."

Victoria: "I support government operated auto insurance."

Wells, B.C.: "I believe it is high time for government insurance." That's Wells, B.C. You know where Wells is. Well you know.

"I do not believe...." Where is this one from? This is from Chilliwack. The Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder), I think it was, got up and said: "No trouble of arriving at a rate. All you have to do is...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I just made a selection from the different towns. The Member for Chilliwack the other day said, "There's nothing to arriving at a rate. You know how many vehicles there are in the province. You know what the insurance income is on the basis of this year. You divide one into the other and it comes to, I think, \$147." \$136.20? Whatever it was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do your research.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I am looking for the exact figure, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, it is around \$140. Some figure like that. If that is the figure and if that is the way the Member would operate the automobile insurance...

AN HON. MEMBER: That would still be lower than what the private companies charge.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: \$136.72. What he failed to realize was that when you take an average like that, that can be very nice for the owner of a \$100,000 logging truck. He would love to get insurance at \$136. So what the Member for Chilliwack is saying is that the average automobile insurance driver in this province should pay a premium to subsidize the owner of the large fleet trucks in the Province of British Columbia. That is what he is saying. You bet your life. That's what the Member said.

AN HON. MEMBER: They've got to do better than that.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I will not be a party to that kind of Social Credit operation of automobile insurance in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba the Auto-Pac system there puts out a card and every person who comes in for a claim is asked to fill out this card. The returns show that 95 per cent of the people are favourable to the operation and the service they get from the Manitoba automobile insurance scheme after only a year or so of full time operation. Ninety five per cent.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's what they would have to do had you been trying to operate anything like that.

The Member from over there said, "It's the responsibility of this Government to govern." He says, "This Government passes law to implement their Government policies."

We cannot govern unless we have the legislation that carries out our policy. I repeat to you, the final recommendation of the Wootton royal commission said very clearly that if the privately operated insurance industry in this province didn't carry out the reforms that the Wootton royal commission recommended, then the Government of this province should move in and take over the sole control of automobile insurance in this province. That's exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. Since the legislation came in, I have met with the insurance agents and discussed this operation with them.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The representatives of the whole insurance agent group. I'll be speaking with them next week, but I have already met with their representatives and discussed it with them. I have met with the representatives of the Insurance Bureau of Canada and the other insurance companies operating in the province of British Columbia.

MRS. JORDAN: I bet you said "trust me."

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I don't have to say it, they do trust me. At least they trust me because we said what we were going to do and we did it, unlike the shareholders of the B.C. Electric Co. who supported you in your election because you said you wouldn't do it, and then you did it.

We didn't stab the insurance companies in the back. We met them face to face in an election and we won. But you stabbed the B.C. Electric in the back. That's the kind of politics this province has been used to. We'll be no part of that kind of politics in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this bill, second reading, yes or no, do the Members of this House believe that the operation of a government-operated insurance scheme is in the best...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Certainly. No question about it. It's right in the legislation. Nothing hidden. Everything on top of the table. You vote "yes" or "no", no fence to sit on, no desk to hide behind. If you're quick you can get out the door now. Because the time has come, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and be counted, for or against the people of British Columbia and government automobile insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that Bill No. 35 be read a second time.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 35

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan,	Nimsick
Nunweiler	Nicolson	Brown
Radford	Sanford	D'Arcy
Cummings	Dent	Levi
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke

King	Hartley	Skelly
Gabelmann	Lauk	Lea
Young	Lockstead	Gorst
Stupich	Rolston	Anderson, G.H.
Barnes	Steves	Kelly
Webster	Lewis	

NAYS — 14

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	Morrison	Schroeder
McGeer	Anderson, D.A.	Gardom
Wallace	Curtis	

Bill No. 35 read a second time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for committal at the next sitting after today.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

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