

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, MAY 1, 1975

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 1911](#)]

CONTENTS

Oral questions

- Negotiations on cut-off lands. Mr. Fraser — [1911](#)
- Loss of grazing lease. Mrs. Jordan — [1911](#)
- Creston transmission line. Hon. R.A. Williams answers — [1912](#)
- Columbia permanent engineering board. Hon. R.A. Williams answers — [1912](#)
- Loss of grazing lease. Mrs. Jordan — [1912](#)
- Reduction of unpaid ICBC claims reserve. Mr. D.A. Anderson . — [1912](#)
- Beacon Body Shop appraisals. Mr. Phillips — [1913](#)
- Elderly citizens' accommodation. Mr. L.A. Williams — [1913](#)
- Additional ferry purchases. Mr. Morrison — [1913](#)
- Need for cold beer. Mr. Gardom — 1914

Committee of Supply: Department of Education estimates

- On the amendment to vote 38. Mr. Schroeder — 1914
 - Division on amendment to vote 38 — [1923](#)
 - On vote 39. Mr. Wallace — [1923](#)
 - On vote 40. Mr. Schroeder — [1938](#)
 - On vote 41. Mr. Schroeder — [1941](#)
 - On vote 42. Mr. Schroeder — [1942](#)
 - On vote 43. Mr. McClelland — [1943](#)
 - On vote 44. Mr. Wallace — [1944](#)
-

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MS. K. SANFORD (Comox): In the galleries today is another group of students from Comox constituency. This group is from Georges P. Vanier School at Courtenay and they are accompanied today by their teachers, Mr. Idris Hughes and Mr. Pete Sanford. I do hope you give them a warm welcome.

Oral questions.

NEGOTIATIONS ON CUT-OFF LANDS

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): A question to the Premier. With respect to the 130 acres of cut-off lands taken from the Capilano band Squamish people in 1922 and located around the Capilano River estuary in the area underneath the north pilings of the Lions Gate Bridge, could the Premier inform the House if he and/or other members of the cabinet will enter into negotiations with the Squamish people as has been requested by Chief Joe Mathias?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we had the delegation in our caucus today. I wish to tell the Member that we take the question as notice.

MR. FRASER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the past, when discussing the native people's cut-off lands question, the government has indicated it is deferring the decision on its position until the federal government reveals its position. Does the Premier believe the provincial government will now enter negotiations on this 130-acre piece of land in view of the fact that Chief Joe Mathias has been informed that the federal government is prepared to discuss and/or negotiate this question?

MR. SPEAKER: It really isn't a supplementary. It's a separate question which should not really be treated as a supplementary.

MR. FRASER: I have a last supplementary on it.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish the Hon. Members would agree on this proposal that we reserve supplementaries until the answer is given in response. We went into this difficulty. We take up all the question time delivering a barrage of questions to be answered on a subsequent day.

MR. FRASER: Well, this is the last supplementary; it's just short, Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier or any cabinet Minister undertaken any review of the legality of actions taken in 1922 to secure this 130 acres into the hands of the provincial government from the Capilano band in view of the fact that events surrounding this cut-off are part of recent history, are exceptionally well documented and, in the opinion of some, raise serious questions about the legality of the cut-off procedures used?

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. These 130 acres in Capilano, are, of course, entirely in government ownership, and the government could simply give them back. It's an easier question than the other lands perhaps.

But let me ask the Premier if the Hon. Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) has taken advantage of his time in Ottawa this week, or will take advantage before he leaves, to have an earlier meeting with the Minister of Indian Affairs than had been planned to resolve these questions at an earlier opportunity.

HON. MR. BARRETT: The date today, as I understand it, is May 1. He'll be meeting with the Minister on May 5, in four days.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on much the same subject with a different slant. Certain Indian leaders have taken action west of Prince George to interrupt the active functioning of the B.C. Railway. I wonder if the Premier could tell us what action the authorities on the railway have taken or are planning to take to re-establish normal service.

HON. MR. BARRETT: The latest report I have is that there is an attempt to meet with the native people concerned. There have been meetings arranged, and my information is that there have been meetings for years under Liberal governments too, Mr. Member. I think that it is appropriate for the House to recognize that it would be ill-advised for anyone to make this a party political issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BARRETT: I am suggesting to you that the BCR is attempting to negotiate.

LOSS OF GRAZING LEASE

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): My question is to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. Is the Minister aware that an action of the Lands department in taking away a long-term grazing lease from a rancher in the Oliver area is resulting in the breaking up of a viable family ranch?

[[Page 1912](#)]

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): No, I am not familiar with the particular grazing lease. If the Member would provide me with specific information, I would be glad to follow it up with more detail.

CRESTON TRANSMISSION LINE

There were two questions yesterday that I would like to respond to. One is the transmission line in the Creston area which the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) raised, and I would like to clarify that question. There was a major transmission line which was scrubbed, as I indicated yesterday. However, a 500 kv line is being considered by B.C. Hydro at this time and the matter will, because of the diverse interests involved in the proposal, probably be referred by Hydro to the Environment and Land Use Committee of cabinet. I think that covers that point.

COLUMBIA PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

The other question was from the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey regarding the permanent engineering board for the Columbia. I would note that it was established as a result of the Columbia River treaty and its purpose was to oversee the implementation of the treaty. It has been working on operational matters in recent years. The Canadian members are Mr. McNabb and Mr. Marr, the Deputy Minister of Water Resources provincially. They, in turn, report to Donald Macdonald, the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. There are two American members who report to Dr. Kissinger. They table an annual report in Ottawa each year and we have copies of that report.

There is a liaison committee for Canada and British Columbia, and the members are Donald Macdonald, Mr. MacEachen, myself and the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald). This committee has not met that I am aware of. The committee has an advisory subcommittee, however, which meets on a regular basis annually, consisting of Mr. McNabb and Mr. Clarke for the federal government, and Mr. DeBeck and Mr. Kennedy for British Columbia.

Interjection.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Your Member asked the question, Mr. Member. The subcommittee produces an annual report which has been received by my office just today.

LOSS OF GRAZING LEASE

MRS. JORDAN: A supplementary to my question.

MR. SPEAKER: This is on the grazing lease question?

MRS. JORDAN: Yes. Would the Minister please advise the House if he received a letter directed to him on April 17, 1975, re disposition of lot 106, subdivision 6, township 54, Yale district, from Mr. Henry Blazowski, secretary-manager of the B.C. Cattlemen's Association, regarding the family farm I asked him about — the 160

acres? Would he also advise the House if he received a letter on the same subject addressed to himself on April 17, 1975, from the White Lake Stockmen's Association, Mr. R.B. Coleman, secretary? Would the Minister advise the House whether he will look into this situation and, in so doing, would he advise the House whether this lease, which is put out for public auction, has an upset price now of \$150,526 to purchase or \$7,526 a year price to lease? Who appraised the land at this value and who set this upset price?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that's enough for one question.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Are you saying it's too high?

MRS. JORDAN: Unrealistic for a producer.

REDUCTION OF UNPAID ICBC CLAIMS RESERVE

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): To the Minister of Transport and Communications, responsible for ICBC: may I ask the Minister whether instructions were given to reduce the provision for unpaid claims for ICBC's 1974-75 financial year below that originally budgeted which thereby substantially reduced the indicated deficit of ICBC as found in the annual report?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): Not that I can recollect.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, then, could the Minister take the question on notice and assure the House at some future date that no such instructions were given and that ICBC followed standard insurance practices in establishing an adequate reserve ratio for unpaid claims, including those unreported at the end of the year?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's stated in the report itself. I think I was asked a question on this during estimates the other day and I explained that particular question with regard to the fact that we handle things much more expeditiously and rapidly than was the previous case.

[[Page 1913](#)]

BEACON BODY SHOP APPRAISALS

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport and Communications. I'd like to quote from an article in today's edition of the *Vancouver Province*, quoting Richard Bradford, vendor to ICBC of the Beacon Body Shop operation, as saying there were several appraisals made of the property and assets "and the figure we set ourselves was slightly under the lowest of the other appraisals."

The Minister said on Tuesday that he would check and provide the House with the information on appraisals done to determine the value of these premises and the business. Can the Minister now provide this information?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): I have it — I know I've seen it and the information was very good, actually. It's a reasonable answer. I'll get it for you tomorrow.

MR. PHILLIPS: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject. The check of the registrar of companies on the companies T.J. Investments Ltd. and Beacon Body Shop reveals that together these companies mortgaged property and equipment with the Industrial Development Bank in the amount of \$195,000. Could the Minister inform the House as to the status of this mortgage now?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'll check on it.

MR. PHILLIPS: A further supplementary with regard to the same mortgage: could the Minister tell the House if the IDB mortgage was current during the time of the negotiation with the vendors and at the time of the sale of the operation to ICBC, or was: it substantially in arrears?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'll check on it.

ELDERLY CITIZENS' ACCOMMODATION

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): A question to the Minister of Housing. With respect to non-profit elderly citizens' accommodation constructed with grants under the Elderly Citizens' Housing Aid Act, could the Minister advise whether or not his department assists or gives guidance to those non-profit societies with respect to the establishment of their rent structure?

HON. L. NICOLSON (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, this is done but the Central Mortgage and Housing actually sets the policy more so than we do. We make a grant of 33.3 per cent. It's Central Mortgage and Housing that has the long-term commitment that holds the mortgage and really has a more ongoing interest — not that we are disinterested, not that we are not concerned about some of the obvious shortcomings of the present set-up as regards rents. There is a tremendous disparity.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the government by order-in-council exempted such non-profit organizations from the limitations under the Landlord and Tenant Act with respect to rent increases, is the Minister considering establishing in his department a division which will make assessments and reviews of the rents of elderly citizens' accommodation?

HON. MR. NICOLSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, Central Mortgage and Housing still has control. There was previously political interference, trying to discourage any sort of an increase in rent. This led to poor provision for maintenance allowance and many of the projects today are in very poor shape as far as maintenance is concerned, or were as a result of that policy. Central Mortgage and Housing used to kick the ball to the province and it's back in their court as to controlling rents.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: A supplemental on that last, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's obvious concern for the maintenance of these elderly citizens' accommodation units, is the Minister not suggesting that it would be wise to undertake the matter in the Housing department rather than leave it in Central Mortgage and Housing, which is obviously doing a very bad job?

HON. MR. NICOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to know of some specifics that are of concern to the Member. I would certainly take this up, and I am sure it can be worked out between the departments.

ADDITIONAL FERRY PURCHASES

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): My question is addressed to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. Could the Minister advise the House whether there are any other ferries or any other international ferry companies being contemplated to be purchased? I'm not quite sure how they're going to put them in that Crown corporation that he said he was going to form but are you at the moment contemplating any other ferries or any other companies?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I'm not aware of any, Mr. Speaker.

NEED FOR COLD BEER

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): The Attorney-General hasn't been asked a question in many months and he deserves a question now and then, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Attorney-General this: in view of the fact that for the year ended March 31, 1974, the Liquor Control Board enjoyed profits of \$108 million and that to be added to that is the \$5 million tax, so there would be \$113 million profit, and in view of the fact that based on past experience we can anticipate profits of a minimum of \$125 million expiring March 31, 1975, I would ask the Hon. Attorney-General if he's prepared to take into account customer convenience and give his assurance that refrigerated beer — and wine, for that matter — may be purchased at government liquor stores.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, that matter, which has been raised by the Member for Kamloops (Mr. G.H. Anderson) — the refrigeration matter — is receiving consideration but I can't make a commitment about it.

But I had out some other questions that I took as notice. Very briefly, the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) in his question was completely right, as he always is: \$195,000; open in 60 days; CCC Terrace.

In answer to the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) about the Cornat Industries takeover, the investigation has been completed, as far as we're concerned. We put 200 man-hours into the thing. We've looked especially at the short tendering of shares, as well as any relationship, and we find that within the Securities Act, which isn't too satisfactory, the whole thing is as regular as we can see it to be, and the investigation has been terminated.

Orders of the day.

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

ESTIMATES: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

Vote 38: Minister's office, \$124,447 — continued.

On the amendment.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): The Minister is aware and knows that one of the reasons for the motion of non-confidence is the fact that one of the two major concerns of the parents in the home-and-school associations, one of the results out of the surveys that we're taking both in Surrey and in

Richmond and in Prince George and in other areas, tells me that the two concerns were: No. 1, discipline and No. 2, special education. In some instances, the frequency of concern reversed the two. Sometimes it was special education as the major concern, and discipline fell second.

We heard some debate last evening on the question of discipline, but my concern today is special education. The ones in Surrey — home-and-school — and one in Richmond, the same home-and-school — and also in Prince George.... Now I don't have copies of these surveys here. All I have are the recorded results, and I know that the results were that in some instances the No. 1 complaint was discipline and the No. 2 complaint was special education. They have a press release from the Minister herself stating in most instances that the report of the home-and-school associations was that special education was the No. 1 concern, and this is the one I have in question today.

The Minister asked last evening, just at closing time, whether or not we couldn't come to the end of the non-confidence motion last evening. Yet I needed to have some explanation from her as to the direction we're going in special education.

The Minister has stated on various occasions, particularly in her release in November, that every child has the right to be educated and that this right should be extended both to children who have special educational needs and to children who do not have special educational needs. However, I have drawn it to the Minister's attention on at least two other occasions that there are three categories of education. There is the normal range, the normal capacities. Then there is the special category on what we might call the negative side. Then there are the special education problems of children who have greater than normal capacity. In my opinion, this is as much of a handicap to those children, and as much of a concern to the teaching staff, as those who have learning disabilities. It all comes under one great heading of special education, and my concern is — and one reason for voting this non-confidence motion — that I have not seen the type of concern we would like to see from the department concerning special education.

Now that the research and development is not functioning, it seems, at least for the next year and perhaps two years, that we will not see any major advancement in special education courses. I am concerned that we, in our teacher education, have stresses in classroom time for those teachers on learning about handicapped children. Have them learn to recognize what a handicap is and how to cope with those handicaps. Those handicaps are as specialized as the individuals themselves and perhaps need to be dealt with as gingerly as possible. Each child has his own capacity and his own disability. It needs to be

[[Page 1915](#)]

analyzed and assessed, and teachers need to be able to handle these situations.

Now sometimes these disabilities are obvious; they're apparent. But when you analyse them, lo and behold, these are not children who are disabled by having their capacity to learn impaired, but they have a handicap by virtue of the fact that their capacity is greater than normal. As a result they are bored in school and they become almost incorrigible in the classroom. They have capacities to learn far greater than the teachers can cope with.

I would like the assurance from this Minister, Mr. Chairman, that this area is also being researched or that at least it is within the frame of reference of the research and development department so that we can capitalize on the abilities of those children, who have perhaps the greatest capacity of any of our students, and develop from those people perhaps the greatest leaders in our land. At least we can give them the opportunity. I agree with the Minister when she says that everyone has the right to be educated. Those with the greatest capacity also have that same right and we in our educational system must at least try to provide for their capacities as well.

I would like to hear what the Minister has to say. This is not a short subject. This is not something with which we can deal in just one or two minutes. I would like to know first of all what the Minister's philosophy on handicaps is and what steps have been taken already to be sure that handicaps are recognized and what steps are being taken to make sure that these are dealt with. I would like to hear what the Minister has to say.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Member brought this particular subject up because he is quite right: one of the most important challenges any Department of Education faces, particularly today, is the area of handling children who have learning disabilities. We can also include in that, of course, as you say, the gifted child.

This is an area to which, I may say, I have given very special attention. I am glad I have the opportunity to point out what we have been doing in this area. As you know, for years one of the problems has been that many of these children, when you and I were in school, Mr. Member — maybe about the same time — weren't even diagnosable. People didn't even have the testing procedure to diagnose the children. This has been one of the areas in which I have been trying to emphasize the great importance.

First of all, you have to set up the facilities and the qualified teachers to be able to diagnose whether you have a child with a learning disability problem.

MR. SCHROEDER: In our day they just accelerated the gifted ones.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: They just accelerate the gifted. That's right, yes.

Often the child who sits very quietly in the classroom and says nothing is the child who is overlooked. That child can have a very serious problem emotionally or a very serious learning problem which sometimes does not come to the forefront because he sits back very passively. It is in this area that we have to start.

This is the area in which I have been encouraging discussions with the faculties of education. We must ensure that the young teachers coming out of our faculties are given courses in this. My feeling is that it should be a mandatory course.

MR. SCHROEDER: Right.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The joint board of teacher education is working with the faculties of education on this. I don't think any teacher should go out of the faculty of education without having taken a course in at least being able to diagnose a child. That is one area that we have moved on and are moving on right at this particular time.

Of course, once you diagnose them, the next step is treatment. In this particular area, the one thing that, of course, I find of concern is that there are so many people with so many ideas on how to treat a child with a learning disability. As the years go on and the months go on you are always being presented with some new quick way to teach a child, for instance, how to read if he seems to have a great problem with learning to read. Yet in the recent international conference on education, which I think I mentioned before, it was conceded by a group of top educationalists that no one has yet found the absolutely perfect way to teach a child to read.

The one thing we can do is that when there is a child discovered with a specific learning disability, we have to ensure that the class sizes are small enough so that the teacher is given more time to actually spend with the children in a room so she can diagnose them. Of course, our government is very proud of the fact that since we came into office, we have brought an appreciable decrease in the class size. In talking with the teachers of the province, one thing they say to me is: "Mrs. Dailly, since the classes are lower, it certainly gives us a much better opportunity to deal with the unique problems of the children in our classrooms." So there are two very specific areas we have moved on re teacher education.

We also have financed the Jericho Summer Workshop, which I attended just briefly last summer. I would hope that other Members would get an opportunity to go this year. We are again funding teachers to go to this workshop. At this workshop teachers, parents and students are brought together to discuss primarily how to treat and deal with children

[[Page 1916](#)]

with learning disabilities. They live and work together right on the Jericho campus. We initiated this with the help of school trustees and the B.C. Teachers Federation and, of course, the Association of Children with Learning Disabilities has been very active in this. We as the government have encouraged this positively and are going to again this summer.

I have tried. I have already sent out a letter to all the teachers of the province informing them of this important workshop and saying: "Take an opportunity to go to this workshop. We are ready to finance it for you. We feel that what you learn there you can bring back to your own district and help other teachers."

The Ben Chud report. As you know, we commissioned a report on Jericho. Out of that came some very fine recommendations from Ben Chud. He is now working with the assistant director of supportive services in my department. They are working to present to us a plan for an overall board which would deal specifically with the whole area of children with special learning disabilities.

One thing I've discovered in speaking to the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities on a provincial level and on local levels, which I've done, is that the parents themselves want to be involved in this. There are many parents who on their own, through frustration over the past years because they didn't know where to turn for help, have become very knowledgeable in this area. The parents themselves, as you have suggested, Mr. Member, should be used here. That's why we're planning to set up this provincial board where the parents will be involved. That, we hope, will be started very soon.

I want to emphasize again that there is no one specific answer; every child is unique and different. But we must enable the teachers to diagnose them, we must provide the resources for the teacher once they have diagnosed them, and we must ensure that there are constant training workshops for teachers so they know where to turn for specialized help.

Also, on top of that, we have put in since we came into office, I believe last year, \$20 million into just supportive services. I have here a book, Mr. Member, which I'd be pleased to send over to you, as you expressed a special interest in it, which outlines from pre-school right on through what is being done in the whole area of

supportive services by our department. John Walsh and Frances Fleming in our department have just completed a complete tour of every school district in this province where they have met with parents and teachers and school boards to specifically talk about the whole area of assisting children with learning disabilities. They are just reporting to me now the results of those meetings.

To add to that, in essence then, another principle I endorsed that is being acted upon is that we're getting the people in our department out into the field to talk with the parents and the teachers in this area, which is one of the most vital areas we face today.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): I'd like to ask the Hon. Minister a couple of questions dealing with dollars and cents. I wonder if she could inform me of the number of elementary students in the province and the number of secondary students in the province, and the average cost of educating a child in each case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think this question is of a general nature. Perhaps we could dispose of the amendment and then deal with the vote as a whole in a general sense.

MR. GARDOM: Well, maybe....

HON. MRS. DAILLY: What does that have to do with the amendment? Am I going to be...?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I could put the vote on the amendment and then we could get onto the vote.

MR. GARDOM: That's satisfactory with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment pass?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound on the amendment.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a matter which deals with education and finance. I think that because of the nature of the comments that I would like to make, it properly belongs in the discussion of the amendment.

I share with the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) the concern about special needs for the children in the school. It brings me directly into the matter that I would like to engage in debate with the Minister. In the West Vancouver school district, the board of school trustees is recognizing the significance of the problem of children with learning disabilities, as the Minister has. It provides, in addition to what is accepted by the department as appropriate in the educational programme, an additional 4½ teachers and 12 aides, which is entirely outside the basic education programme recognized by the department and, therefore, paid entirely by the local taxpayers.

This assists the teachers in identifying children who do have problems and therefore do need some special assistance. But as this programme has developed, Mr. Chairman, it is becoming obvious that, as well as identifying the problem, it is increasingly

[[Page 1917](#)]

necessary to provide facilities and trained personnel who can deal with the children who have special needs. It is disturbing to recognize, as I advised the committee a few days ago, that in West Vancouver, so far as a remedy for emotionally disturbed children in the schools is concerned, out of an 8,300 school population there is only one teacher — one male teacher — who is employed on an itinerant basis, travelling from school to school to deal with children who have emotional and learning problems.

This teacher, spending all the time that is available to him in this highly specialized task, is able to deal only with elementary boy students who have emotional and learning problems. This leaves all of the girl students without

anyone who directly assists them in the solution of their problems and without any similar assistance being available to those students who are in secondary schools and who during the course of their school life may, indeed, have developed emotional and learning difficulties, whether as a result of their own action or family problems or whatever the case may be, and an inability to move into the more senior grades.

It seems to me that this brings us fully into the problem which is facing my school district and all the school districts in British Columbia.

I would like to determine whether or not this Minister of Education, in approaching the major responsibility which is hers, is looking seriously at where education is going in British Columbia. Unfortunately so much of it depends upon the ability of this province and the ability of the local taxpayers in each of the school districts to finance the need for special programmes such as those I have mentioned and all the other programmes which are currently in our schools, or which should be in our schools, and are being recognized day by day by teachers, parents, school trustees and departmental officials who realize that the educational system in British Columbia must progress.

Yesterday the Minister reminded the committee that again this year her department, to assist in a financial dilemma being faced by school districts, has made supplementary and special grants amounting to \$25.5 million. I know that the school districts have now received notice of these supplemental grants.

I would like the Minister to advise the committee as to the basis upon which those grants are made, because I suspect that the secrecy which surrounds the division of this special fund is part of the problem that indeed led to difficulties with Dr. Knight and the research group. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, unless we can identify the formula that is applied by the Department of Education in allocating these additional moneys, that we are left with perhaps the conclusion that decisions are made within the department as to whether or not a particular school district should receive a grant or not, and how much that grant should be.

Now let me give you some examples. The total net budget for the school district in West Vancouver is \$12.7 million. The provincial share is \$4.1 million, about 32 per cent, the balance being raised locally. West Vancouver has received a supplemental grant of \$174,000, and no one seems to know why.

On the other hand, I find that School District 63 in Saanich, which has a smaller budget and a smaller number of students — its budget is only \$7.2 million — has received special grants of \$328,000, almost twice as much.

The other school district in my constituency, the Howe Sound school district, has a budget this year of \$4.4 million, and its grant is only \$49,000, of which almost half is because of additional classes which have had to be added in the September-to-December months of 1974. It is impossible, comparing these figures.... I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the department has used gross budget figures only in determining what these special grants should be. But when you consider that you have large school districts which are receiving less money than small school districts, and when you compare small school districts with other small school districts of similar size, there seems to be no comparison. I think we should determine, if possible, the formula that is applied in allocating these special funds.

Now that brings me to another matter, also dealing with the Minister's administration and the financing of education. I have obtained a copy of a letter, dated September 18, 1974, addressed by the Minister of Education to the Premier of the province. It is addressed to the Hon. David Barrett. It begins: "My dear Mr. Premier;" it deals with the subject of education and finance.

The letter says, in its opening sentence: "I seek your approval in principle to finance education out of general revenue, as in the case of other public services." Then follow four pages of very carefully reasoned argument for that proposition. Included in her reasoning, Mr. Chairman, is this one paragraph which I think is very significant, and one with which I agree:

"Sound educational programmes must be based on long-term planning and projection. The mounting resistance of taxpayers to accept the continuing growth of school taxes has rendered the local sources of school revenue unpredictable. The

government recognizes the apparent anguish of the community when mill rates have to be increased. Accordingly, the government in 1974 further contributed to the educational costs through supplementary and special aid grants totaling \$21 million."

The Minister then goes on to say:

[[Page 1918](#)]

" Ad hoc financing arrangements make it difficult for a school board to plan effectively. Furthermore, any restraint that the department could exercise is severely impaired by such an arrangement."

I repeat the last phrase, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, while being concerned about the ability of school boards to plan effectively, says: "Furthermore, any restraint that the department could exercise is severely impaired by such an arrangement."

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from what has happened in the past few days, with the announcement again of \$25.5 million in supplementary and special aid grants, that the Minister of Finance, Mr. Premier, to whom this letter was addressed, has not responded in any positive way to the principle which the Minister of Education has put to him — namely, the financing of education out of general revenue.

I would like to know from the Minister whether or not the Treasury Board and the cabinet have indicated to her that there is to be a positive programme for the financing of educational costs out of general revenue and, if so, what positive steps are being taken by the Minister to carry out that worthwhile objective. The Minister, in her letter, speaks of decisions in the courts of the United States, and she quotes them favourably. In the body of her letter, and she actually attaches copies of the decisions, she says:

"United States Supreme Court decisions declare that financing education from local property taxes denies children equal protection guaranteed under the law, because funding of education through property taxes discriminates against the poor. It renders the quality of a child's education a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbours."

I would like to know whether the cabinet and the Treasury Board have accepted the view the Minister obviously holds that such is the case in British Columbia.

In the letter she also questions the equitability of the present finance formula as between school districts. She questions, in a very serious way, the disparity that exists on a regional basis in this province and she says, discussing the basic programme of education in British Columbia...the following words I commend to you, Mr. Chairman:

" However, the grants for the basic programme do not recognize regional disparity, geographic location, social injustice or variation in costs for the provision of the basic programme."

The Minister uses statistics to exemplify and establish those words and the appropriateness of what she has said to the Premier.

Also in the letter, Mr. Chairman, is the clear indication that the Minister believes that the matter of the financing of education should be taken out of the hands of local school boards and that local school boards should then be freed to direct their energies with respect to the other needs of education in the particular district. Her conclusion to the Premier is significant:

"This department believes that responsibility for raising educational revenues lies with the province. No longer can the provincial government avoid the responsibility of leaving decisions to the school districts as to how much revenue is to be raised in each. This position is consistent with the objective stated in my White Paper — to strengthen the central relationship in education between the teacher, the students and the parents.

"Centralization and decentralization are not contradictory concepts. It is possible to have centralized financing and decentralized policy making. School board trustees would have more power to shape the ends of education in their districts under provincial assumption of education financing. It would seem that a much-to-be-desired situation would then prevail where school boards would be free to concentrate on purely educational matters with time formerly spent seeking necessary resources."

I think that we should hear from the Minister with respect to those far-reaching statements. I wish she would explain to the committee and to the boards of school trustees and to the parents how she will place in the hands of school trustees the policy-making decision, and yet control entirely within the provincial government the financing of the educational system which those policies will make essential.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister is going to control all of the money available for education in British Columbia, then she also puts the school trustees in the invidious position whereby having made policies as to the direction education should take in their local districts, they are left without sufficient funds to carry out those policies. Indeed, earlier in this letter, the Minister makes it quite clear that the current programme of financing does just this, only in a different way.

The niggardliness of government in financially supporting the basic educational programme throughout the entire province has cast upon the local school trustees the almost impossible task of raising those moneys locally. That extinguishes the amount of funds available to them and thereby interferes with their policy-making powers.

The Minister and the government have proudly proclaimed the fact that they are increasing to 40 per cent the amount of educational grants to reduce taxes this year. But when you look at the figures on a

[[Page 1919](#)]

province-wide basis, you find from the Minister's own department the statement that the average assessed value of residential property is \$20,000 and the increase in the mill rate on an average is 7.15. On the average, the taxpayer in the province is going to pay an additional \$140 of school taxes this year. But the most that the grant can ever go up under the present formula is \$40. Therefore, the average taxpayer in British Columbia who enjoys the full grant made available by this government for the reduction of school taxes also enjoys the privilege of paying another \$100 more for school taxes than he did a year ago — and that's the average.

In the West Vancouver school district I can tell you that you enjoy the privilege of paying another \$120 in school taxes for the privilege of getting an additional \$40 grant from the government towards the reduction of those taxes. For those who can afford to pay, it's great. But the educational opportunities for the children in the province suffer to the extent that their parents, their parents' neighbours and their school district cannot afford to pay.

There's another aspect of financial control mentioned by the Minister in this letter which I think bears comment. In speaking about the various elements of costs, the Minister says:

"Teacher salaries are negotiated between the school board and the local of the teachers' association. Yet considering the homeowner grant and education grant, the province pays approximately 60 per cent of the costs of elementary and secondary education. Thus the province is in the position of paying a significant portion of the costs of education without participating in the determination of those costs."

I would like to know from the Minister whether, as part of this centralization of financial control, it is her proposal that the negotiation of teacher salaries should also be taken away from the local school boards. Teacher salaries are the major portion of the school costs in British Columbia. Will negotiations for teacher salaries and other staff in the schools be conducted between those teachers and the provincial government and not as has been the case heretofore?

Last night there was tabled in this House the report of the select standing committee dealing with educational matters which recommended that the collective bargaining system presently enjoyed in the Province of British Columbia be continued. I think that it is important, in view of the tabling of that report, that we ascertain from this Minister whether or not she and her government are forecasting a change in those bargaining relationships when she brings about the change in fiscal control.

Mr. Chairman, there's one other aspect that I think the Minister touches upon in her letter that I would like to raise with her: the determination of what the basic education programme in British Columbia should be.

She has said, in response to questions put to her earlier in debate, that her department is concerning itself with this particular matter. I would like the Minister to advise the committee who in her department is making such an examination. I would like to know whether her department is engaging the services of educators in the Province of British Columbia who are currently involved in our educational system; if she is consulting with Members of school boards; if she has, as part of this study group, representatives of parents' groups; and if she has, in this study group, representatives of the business community who can perhaps give some guidance as to the quality of students who must come from our schools in order to assist the economy of this province. I would like to know whether the trade unions are involved.

I think the Minister should clearly indicate just how she and her department are going about the revision of what comprises the basic education programme in British Columbia. I happen to believe that is the first step that must be taken — the very first step in resolving the finance mess that we have in British Columbia. When I say finance mess, I am not criticizing this Minister, because she didn't create it. It has been the product of lack of concern for the education system over decades; it is the product of what was believed to be an equitable education formula which has not been carefully tended; it is the product of governments who have failed to recognize what is happening to the education system. But it is this Minister's responsibility at this time to do something about it.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this problem is so important and so immense that it should not be dealt with by the Department of Education through committees established by this Minister. I think that the whole subject of the basic education programme in British Columbia, the financing of education in British Columbia, and the extent to which the moneys made available by British Columbia taxpayers, whether at the provincial or the local level, can be directed to education should be resolved in a public way.

I think that this Minister and this government should announce the establishment of a royal commission into education and education finance. I think that there should be a thorough and exhaustive study, free from the controls of government and partisan politics, into what must surely be one of the most pressing subjects facing British Columbia today. It affects the parents; it affects the children; it will affect the children who are coming into the school system next year and the year after that and the year after that. It is something to which we must direct

[[Page 1920](#)]

our attention. We have had royal commissions into such worthwhile matters as workers' compensation. We have had royal commissions considering what we should do with respect to automobile insurance. We have had royal commissions dealing with the problems of the forest industry. Surely anything which is as important to every person in this province as education and education finance should be accorded at least equal treatment.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I would think that this should be the No. 1 priority of this government at this time, because this Minister in her attempts over the past 32 months has not been able to solve the problem. This Minister must now recognize that neither she nor her advisers in the department can themselves, doing the job that faces them in the day-to-day administration, solve this problem. We need to bring the best minds, the best brains that we can possibly encourage to come to this province, to dwell on this topic and get it resolved. Mr. Chairman, if the educational system continues to go in the direction in which it is presently headed, the system will suffer, the costs will grow, the resistance of taxpayers, of whom the Minister speaks in her letter, will intensify and we will have problems throughout the province, as we have had in individual school districts, where taxpayer revolt can result in the dismantling of the educational system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the Hon. Member is embarking on a subject which is not strictly relevant to this amendment. The amendment, I think, would deal with a lack of confidence in the administrative capability of this Minister. I would ask that he confine his remarks to that point.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: I thank you for that timely operation. I was almost finished, if you'd waited one more second.

I think that I can't say anything more. I feel very strongly about this particular problem. If government cannot meet this difficulty, then not only government and the Minister will suffer, but thousands and thousands of children

and, therefore, the future of this province.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We'll start right back with the very first questions asked by the Hon. Member. He was expressing basic concern about his own district at the time, and the non-availability of money for special services. I think he should be aware that this is certain: we can never get all the special services that we want. I discussed with the Member who spoke from the official opposition what we're doing in that area to assist school boards, and West Vancouver certainly gets its share in that area. I'd also like to point out that there are a number of integrated community resources which I believe are being used and are available for the West Vancouver school district.

As far as West Vancouver goes itself, you were comparing it, I believe, to one of the smaller districts like Saanich, and your basic question was: how are these supplementary grants allotted? First of all, I want to point out to the Hon. Member that assessed values per pupil, comparing West Vancouver to Saanich — I think that was one of the areas you used — West Vancouver's assessed value per pupil is \$26,000 and Saanich is \$16,400. So you can see the variance there between the two districts, which all ties into the basis upon which we hand out the supplementary grant. I'll go into detail on that in a moment.

Also, at the present time your mill rate is approximately 1.74 in West Vancouver — above the average mill rate — and your per pupil cost is \$1,303 where the average provincial cost per pupil is \$1,202. So I just thought we should put those figures into perspective: \$1,262 on the average compared to \$1,303 in West Vancouver.

How do we apportion out the supplementary grants? If the Hon. Member would have time to read the school Act, Part X, under finance, section 180(5), it outlines there the basis upon which any department must hand out supplementary grants. I'd just like to quote to you the section that's relevant:

"Where in any calendar year, as a result of circumstances which in the opinion of the Minister of Education are beyond the control of the board, there occurs an increase in the operating expenses included in the budget of a school district, as finally approved, which causes such expenses to exceed the cost of the basic education programme in such amount that notwithstanding the payment of a basic grant, in an amount determined under subsection 1, there would result great public inconvenience, or public hardship, or grave injustice to taxpayers in that school district, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize, whenever deemed right and conducive to the public good, a supplementary grant" — and this is the part I want to bring out, Mr. Member — "payable by the Minister of Finance up to an amount that bears to the increase in operating expenses the same ratio that the basic grant bears to the cost of the basic education programme."

So you see, it's laid out by statute.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's right, district by district. So therefore, to begin with, the Department of Education must work from that particular statute. Also, you must realize that in handing out the

[[Page 1921](#)]

supplementary grants we must first of all work within that statute, and the grants are also based, of course, upon the variance in the assessed values in the different districts, and also the number of pupils in the district. So I can assure you there's not subjectivity involved here. We are trying to put out those supplementary grants in the most equitable way possible, based on what we are told to do in the statute and also including the variance in assessed values and the number of pupils in each district. That is the basis upon which they are done and that's why you see that variance from district to district.

You quoted at great length an interdepartmental letter. I'm not sure how it came into your hands, but the fact is you have it and you quoted from it, and I'm glad to have an opportunity to reply to you on some of the points.

The first thing I wanted to say is that I feel that it is my duty as Minister of Education to communicate, on a fairly continuous basis, with the Department of Finance on my concerns as Minister of Education with financial problems. Some of those problems which are listed in that letter I have said here on the floor of the House concern

me. The letter, of course, goes into much more detail. We are simply doing our job in the Department of Education, with the help of the officials here, to provide to the government alternative ways of trying to solve the present inequities in the school system. That particular letter is one suggestion from me, as Minister, to the Minister of Finance. It is not government policy; it is not written in stone, it is....

I know you are expressing the concern, and I know that I have had this argument for years with many people in the teachers' federation and in the school trustees' association.

Centralized financing — no, I do not believe that it's going to mean there will be no opportunity for decentralized control within the school boards. Many school trustees have said to me that they want to get on with education. If a certain sum of money is handed out, then it is up to the school boards to make their own priority educational decisions so they don't have to spend hours and hours on the whole area of financing. Their prime job, then, is to decide how to allocate those funds. It's very similar, of course, to the way the universities operate. A certain sum of money is handed down every year and then they have their complete autonomy in how to distribute those moneys within their university. They pride themselves on that autonomy and never at any time would they suggest that they not have that autonomy.

I know that this is a debate that could wage between us for considerable time; but I am confused, Mr. Member, because I thought yesterday that one of the Members of the Liberal Party seemed to endorse centralized financing. I thought that that was in your party platform. I seem to recall from your last campaign literature that the Liberal Party endorsed centralized financing.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): They're split in caucus.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I am sure that it could be found stated in your campaign literature. Maybe you individually do not.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: No, I do.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Oh, you do. Oh, well, I thought you were expressing great concern that the school boards wouldn't have autonomy. So then you agree with me that they could maintain autonomy under centralized financing.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Provided the basic education programme is established at a level that is acceptable to the local school trustees.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That naturally follows.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Now you are coming to the main point.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, but you and I know that at no time, Mr. Member, will we ever be able to give the amount of money that everyone desires. Across Canada we do have some provincial jurisdictions which are centrally financed. I find it most interesting when I am meeting with the other Ministers of Education to talk to those Ministers and see how it is operating. That's why I find those meetings very helpful. It's very interesting to ask them specifically what problems they are running into. I must say, though, that it makes the job easier in many ways.

You mentioned that you were concerned that out of that, then, would follow centralized teacher-salary negotiations, yet you agree yourself that that's the route to go.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Well, I'm not sure about that.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, that's your implication. May I just say that you know the all-party committee has just completed its all-party report, and the NDP Members of that committee soundly endorsed the main recommendations of that report — which certainly did not endorse provincial bargaining. So I think that that speaks certainly for our party's stand on that.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: And yours?

[[Page 1922](#)]

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, and mine.

Oh, yes, you were concerned about who sat on the finance committee at the moment. You are right: it is simply at the official level with trustee officials and BCTF officials and department officials. The intent is to expand it — certainly to bring in the community, the parents, the teachers and the elected officials. But I must say that your suggestion of a royal commission on finance is a most interesting suggestion and one which I personally would like to give consideration to.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Too big a job?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: A big job, that's right.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: It's taking all your time, Eileen.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: You're right.

MR. SCHROEDER: The debate on this particular motion is now in its fifth day, Mr. Chairman. I would like the Minister to be assured that this motion was not made on the opening day because of any flippant decision. The motion was made because of the pressure that was brought to bear upon the official opposition by various segments of society — the teachers' federation, the school trustees' association. All of these various groups in their approaches to the official opposition expressed these concerns, and I would have been very, very irresponsible if I had not made this motion of non-confidence.

I think this debate has been a healthy debate with, perhaps, two or three outbursts to add a little spice and give the scribes something to write about. Basically, the debate has been philosophical and perhaps a little hard to report. As a result, these five days have not been the ones with the greatest lustre. My prayers have been with the poor people who have to report these things. Nonetheless, today I would like to summarize the reasons and perhaps put into succinct form why this motion had to be put.

The non-confidence motion was born out of these concerns — the pupil-teacher ratio which, it was clearly announced, was going to be dropped 1.5 students per teacher each year for a period of three years. The plan has been dropped. Cited, the budget did not provide for it. In a year when we have the greatest single increase in revenues in the Province of British Columbia in the history of the province we have had to abandon the plan that was announced just a year and a half ago. The pupil-to-teacher ratio has affected the number of teachers who were hired. Teachers were hired without due regard for spaces — teaching areas — in which they were to work. Something in addition to 2,000 teachers hired and only about 750 teaching areas provided. As a result, there is grave concern out there in the land of education. As a result, the motion has to be put.

The motion had to be put because of the disintegration of the research and development branch which was the backbone to provide the hope for new directions in education. The very clear directive which the Minister gave at the onset of this administration taking power in which there were going to be two ongoing commissions for primary-secondary and for post-secondary education has been non-functioning. The commissioner is gone; the entire research and development branch is in a shambles. As a result, we would be remiss if we didn't draw this to the Minister's attention and put this motion.

Then there were the directives of the White Paper which have also gone by the board. Three have received some note; two have received extensive study. The remainder of the directives of the White Paper have received no further attention.

The slowness with which bargaining procedures for 1975 were introduced.... I recognize that this was committed to a committee; I recognize that the committee's report didn't come in until last evening. But the slowness

with which the new bargaining procedures for 1975 came into effect left the teachers and the B.C. school trustees alike out there in a state of fluctuation, not knowing what the terms of arbitration were going to be for the new year. We had to put the motion of non-confidence.

The fact that school construction was supposed to be following a catch-up programme and the fact that the catch-up programme really did not represent increased construction over any other given year taken on the average over the past — say, 10 or 12 years — makes it necessary.

Interjections.

MR. SCHROEDER: How many classes? The right figure was \$91 million, by the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member address the Chair, please?

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Through you to that Member over there, \$91 million was the amount that was announced, but that was the approved expenditure. The actual expenditures are not in yet, so don't you come to me with the \$91 million.

Not only that, but the \$91 million represents \$40-per-square-foot construction costs, whereas in 1971 construction costs could perhaps better be computed at \$20 to \$25 per square foot. You're not getting the same number of classrooms for the same number of dollars. Don't give me the fog.

School construction is not on a catch-up

[[Page 1923](#)]

programme, and that is the reason why the motion had to be put.

The removal of taxation from property has been a sham. We are going on phase 2; two-fifths of the taxation is supposed to be removed this year. Lo and behold, taxes are up on the average. Somebody's going to have to pick up the extra \$100, whereby \$40 is remitted and an extra \$100 is taken. You take with one hand; you give with the other. We had to move no confidence.

There was an area that we didn't get to discuss: the area of vandalism and the concern for property losses out in the school districts. We talked about special education. What about teachers' training? What about post-secondary financing? We get telegrams from the various regional colleges that say: "Hey! We're not getting enough money to carry on the programmes that we had designated for last year." Then there was a great discussion last evening on discipline in the schools. The fact that the teachers have not been given an alternative requires the official opposition to put this motion.

Then there was the debate on family life. I suggested again that if parents' councils were assigned to local schools, those parents' councils could make a decision as to whether or not that 5 per cent of the family life programme which pertains to sex should be taught in each individual school. Let the parents' councils make that decision. Allow that flexibility at the local level. You talk about local autonomy; let's have local autonomy, particularly in the area of curriculum. We had to move the motion.

The Minister's administrative ability has been under review and under attack by people in her department — the department that has deteriorated — by people in the B.C. School Trustees Association, by people in the B.C. Teachers Federation. Her administrative ability has been under attack, and I would have been remiss if I hadn't moved this motion.

The Minister has been reticent to move. Lack of confidence has been expressed from various areas. I've tried to be specific; these are not general statements. I've tried to be specific.

The Minister has failed to recognize a very obvious alternative to the monolithic education system which we have, the very obvious system which already exists: the independent schools.

She has failed to recognize and acknowledge that the system does not exist and that it does lend the flexibility which the people of the province are asking for. We had to move the motion. There are other areas, but enough to say that this summary should be convincing to any and all who listen that this is not a frivolous motion. It was incumbent upon us to move this motion; and since the speakers are concluded, I move that the motion now be put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Closure! Closure!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the question now be put.

I want to clarify what has happened. The Hon. Member for Chilliwack intended to move that we vote on the amendment. The question is called on the amendment, and the division is on that vote.

Amendment negated on the following division:

YEAS — 15

Jordan	Smith	Phillips
Chabot	Fraser	Richter
McClelland	Curtis	Morrison
Schroeder	Anderson, D.A.	Williams, L.A.
Gardom	Gibson	Wallace

NAYS — 32

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Calder	Brown
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Lea	Young
Radford	Lauk	Nicolson
Nunweiler	Lockstead	Gorst
Rolston	Anderson, G.H.	Barnes
Steves	Kelly	Webster
Lewis	Liden	

Division ordered to be recorded in the *Journals* of the House.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I ask that two votes be negated from the other side — two Members in their wrong seats. They did it on purpose; they were just laughing, and they were making mockery out of parliament.

Vote 38 approved.

On vote 39: general administration, \$6,312,017.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Chairman, vote 39 deals with the very important subject of general administration. I think that this side of the House has had a fair bit to say about administration and the cost of

administration and the increase in the number of civil servants employed by various departments of government. This vote certainly is no exception to the general rule. In particular, we have an increase of administrative staff from 177 to 270 and an increase of \$1.75 million in vote 39.

I wonder if the Minister, who has already referred somewhat to this criticism when we discussed the

[[Page 1924](#)]

budget speech, would answer a few questions.

This vote, as I look back on it, used to be divided into sections. Now all we have is executive, supervisory and administrative. Previously there was a much greater breakdown of the several parts of the cost of administration. There used to be administrative services, field services, financial services, instructional services, post-secondary services, special services, vocational services and general. Now we find that it's all lumped together into just three main parts: executive, supervisory and administrative.

Again, I would like to suggest that the more that government expense is broken down, the better opportunity for the opposition to both understand and perhaps come up with constructive criticism. But under vote 39 on this occasion we've got an added expenditure of 63 per cent. We've got an increase of staff of almost 100 individuals under the title of administration. When we are hearing the Minister state that we cannot continue to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio because we can't afford to pay more teachers, it seems as though we're quite able to spend another \$1.75 million on administrative staff under vote 39.

I wonder if the Minister could answer these two particular questions: why is there not the same kind of breakdown within different branches of this vote; and, more specifically, if the department administration has been reorganized, could she relate the increased sums of money and the increased personnel to the specific functions to be carried out by these individual people? I notice that under the executive part the Deputy Minister has a 19 per cent increase and the Associate Deputy has a 9 per cent increase. One is 19 and the other is 9. Perhaps we could have the Minister answer why the distinct difference in the increase given to two approximately equal levels of authority.

Another question I'd like to ask in this vote, Mr. Chairman, is on the fact that I believe there are allocations for three Associate Deputy Ministers. At the present time it's my understanding that there are only two that have been appointed. I wonder if the Minister could comment on whether we can anticipate an appointment of a third Associate Deputy Minister.

Under supervisory, an establishment of 27 positions is called for as opposed to the existing 18, which is a 50 per cent increase in personnel under supervisory. We would like to know again specifically the explanation of these new positions.

Under expenses of vote 39 there are some staggering figures, if I might say so. Advertising and publicity goes from \$100,000 to \$0.25 million. Again, I just have to ask the question: what is the primary purpose of the Department of Education? Is it to provide well-qualified teachers to teach our children, or is it to spend a fair hunk of money on administration and advertising? The more a government advertises in any department, it falls very much into the error which this party so soundly criticized the former administration for doing — namely that more and more of the taxpayer's dollar was spent on various forms of advertising which was nothing but a very obvious attempt to glorify the government's own achievements or to use the taxpayers' money in a way which is much less important than using it for specific, direct educational services. Some of these expenses, I think, the Minister is obligated to explain to the House.

Travel expenses increased by 33 per cent. There's an increase in office furniture of 100 per cent. Advertising and publicity I've mentioned. Incidentals and contingencies go from \$68,000 to \$130,000 — almost double.

We've got a relocation expense of \$40,000. Who's relocating where, for what reasons, and what is involved? If part of the administration is moving, could we know if, perhaps, it is moving into one of these empty buildings that we hear about? Finally, incidentals and contingencies show an increase of 90 per cent. I wonder if the Minister

could answer also that specific question as to what the incidentals are going to be spent on?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like to point out that there is, as you pointed out, a suggested increase of 93 staff. Out of that at the present time, as of February 28, 1975, there are 88 positions not filled. The present establishment of the Department of Education is almost equal to what it was when we came into office.

Out of that 93 for which you've expressed concern, I'd like to point out that 30 of those vacancies are the professional vacancies. I was very concerned when I came in that there were so few in that area. We did not have enough professional teachers in the department. The idea of putting in these 30 people in this area primarily is to get them out into the field to meet all the demands for services which we have. The rest of the staff will break down, of course, into clerical support staff so I just want to point out that that is not all new, additional top administrative positions.

When I found out that we had fewer professional people on our staff than even little Prince Edward Island, and yet we were expected to contribute to all these demands for services out there, it was a ridiculous situation. So I'm quite satisfied that if we're going to provide the service, which the BCTF and the B.C. school trustees and all colleges, universities, et cetera are asking for we have to have the staff so they can move out there and give that help.

You also had distributed to you a restructuring

[[Page 1925](#)]

sheet which showed the direction we were going in the breakdown. In the next year's estimates, I agree, it would be much clearer for you to have it broken down, and it will be for next year's estimates. But as we were in a process of restructuring the departmental staffing and the configuration of that staffing, there was not time to get it in for this year's estimates.

You expressed concern over the amount allocated here for advertising. You seem to imply that the majority of that is going to be spent on government advertising. I want to give you a breakdown. Almost \$200,000 was spent, actually, last year; and you can see it's \$250,000 this year. In that expenditure was advertising for scholarships and advertising for student aid. The student-aid programme, as you know, is an immense programme and the government has the responsibility to advertise so people will know where to apply and how to get their student aid.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Student aid? I don't know. We'll get it for you. Student aid advertising for the exams for grade 12.... All I'm trying to point out is this is not just governmental advertising. This is necessary money that must be spent so that the students and the citizens of this province know where they can go for their services and know what scholarships are being given out and where they can get student aid.

Also, as the Member knows, we have had a number of college task forces moving around the province. You yourself commended the department yesterday for the "Towards a Learning Community College" report which was produced. Those moneys, to advertise that the task force was going into different communities were provided by the Department of Education so that it could be publicized in the local papers and, I believe, some radio spots also that the task force would be coming to their community. I haven't the breakdown here but we can give it to you later.

I just want to point out that you have to realize that, in the Department of Education, which has to provide all these services, we must have this kind of a budget so we can tell the people where to go for the services.

MR. WALLACE: We just want to know how you are spending it all.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's right. That is a legitimate question.

Relocation. I can understand that word does suggest that we are relocating the department people. The

relocation expense of \$40,000 for this coming year strictly applies. Mr. Member, to the relocation of school district superintendents to assist them. We have, as you know, over 54 superintendents in the province. They are moved from district to district. This money is in here to assist in their relocation moves. Did I cover what you asked there?

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Right.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Don't despair, Hon. Member for Vancouver–Point Grey, I am only going to be a second.

I am at somewhat of a loss, Madam Minister, because I don't quite know where to ask you these two questions. I think they might relate to vote 39(019). I've asked you about them before and I've made a number of statements on them. I wonder if I could have some answers today.

The first question relates to the committee that was set up under the Minister's administration to investigate the need and feasibility of providing hot lunches in the schools. I have asked and asked but I would like to repeat it again, if I could. I understand there were three people on this committee. I wonder if we could have their names, when they were first appointed, when they first met and how many meetings they have had. Have they filed a report with the department or the Minister? If so, would the Minister make that report available and, if possible, the expenses related to this committee?

The second question relates to the problem of teachers possibly suffering deafness as an occupational hazard through the use of the new band rooms that are scientifically designed for a better teaching environment but may well be producing this major occupational hazard of deafness for music teachers, particularly band teachers. Again, I have asked about this on a number of occasions; I have written to the Minister and she has kindly answered. All the correspondence indicates an attitude of suggesting other people should initiate an investigation of this. I am asking the Minister if she would assure the House today that her department will take the steps necessary to initiate a study into this possible hazard.

There are a number of teachers involved. Since I have been talking about it in the House, from time to time as I am around the province, music teachers have come up to me and have written to me suggesting that they feel there is much merit in the thought and that they would support such a study. All are willing to take part and do anything they can to define this as a fact or not. Of course, if this is defined as a fact, it should be known in order that it can be part of the negotiating procedure and in order that these teachers who suffer this occupational disease or handicap will receive proper compensation. Also, we might well

[[Page 1926](#)]

have to re-examine the design and the technical application we are using at this time for these band rooms.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: On the first one, I remember when the Member did express her concern about hot lunches, which I share with her. We both realized that we had to start by examining just where to start. I think at the time I said I would do a survey on the whole matter. That would mean cafeterias in our schools right across which, as you know, we don't have. We have them in most senior high schools and many junior but not in the elementary.

All I can say to you at this time is that just the department officials did a survey, so there is no cost involved outside of the time which they spent on it. I asked them to give me a complete survey of the present status of the cafeterias in this province. That is with me now. Actually, from there on in, it is up to the government to decide whether they can actually work with the school boards in the financing of a comprehensive programme. We haven't made that....

MRS. JORDAN: I think we are on the wrong wicket. I am referring to a committee that I believe you set up by public announcement. This, if I recall correctly, was either in the fall of 1972 or the early spring of 1973. I believe a Mrs. Hattie Lackey, a school board trustee in School District 22, was one of the appointees, and a Mrs. O'Neil,

from the school district of Salmon Arm, was the chairman, if I recall correctly. This is the committee that I am interested in, along with the other comments the Minister has made.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We are going back quite a bit there, but if my memory serves me correctly there was no actual formalization of that committee. I do know those particular members, those trustees you mentioned, had a specific interest, and I know that the BCSTA had some of their own members do a specific thing, but I must say to you at this time that I don't believe I made a public announcement of a public committee on this because at no time did I formalize that committee. I just moved in the direction of examining and serving the cafeteria needs of our province. At the same time, I have received a number of briefs, as you can presume, asking for this. Interestingly enough, though, the parent home and school brief which came to me has not emphasized this at this particular time. That committee was never formalized.

The second part you are asking about; after the concern you expressed we did ask our staff here in the department to bring to the attention of all school boards the fact that concern had been expressed in the Legislature over the acoustic hazards in music rooms. What they did was, up to this date they have asked all school boards, in their construction and also in looking at renovations, to give particular attention to the acoustic problems of the music rooms. That's as far as we have gone at this time.

MRS. JORDAN: Do you not think, Madam Minister, that on this subject it might be a very good idea to be running an occupational study? There are actually practising physicians in the world of occupational preventive health who could undertake such a study and set up a committee so that all music teachers in British Columbia would take part in this study and any audiological changes that take place would be recorded. I think its the actual hearing factor that we have to be concerned with, and that is going to dictate what, in fact, should be done on the technical side of the construction of these rooms.

Would the Minister give consideration.... In fact, I'll ask her if she would set up and take steps to initiate this type of research project in B.C.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We'll talk with the music teachers.

MR. GARDOM: A couple of questions to the Hon. Minister. I started to raise them a bit earlier today. Surely this must be one of the most masochistic avocations known to contemporary man. We are in a beautiful spring day, May 1, the grass is green, the flowers are popping, the birds are birding. We should be practising open school and having these estimates on the front lawn.

I would like the Minister, maybe if her staff could look at her report, page 149.... I am dealing with the operating costs per pupil which, based on a daily average attendance, comes out at \$847.74 for the year 1973 to June 30, 1974. Of course, that figure is going to be tremendously increased for the period that will next be reported in the House.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister why the debt charges of \$54 million are deducted, and why that does not come into account in determining the cost per pupil. I am unaware of the accounting practices that are being utilized.

Secondly, I would ask the Hon. Minister if she has available a figure for the amount of insurance that is required for the school structures in the Province of British Columbia and whether that is reflected in the expenditure by school districts for the calendar year as referred to on page 151 of the annual report. If so, where? Does it fall within plant operation or auxiliary services? That deals with insurance, and the first question is why the debt charges are not taken into account in determining the operating costs per pupil, which conceivably would increase that figure a great deal in itself.

The third and last question to the Hon. Minister: I

would like to know what financial formula is being utilized by the Department of Education for educating children who live on Indian reserves in this province. Is it correct that the children who live on Indian reserves in the Province of British Columbia are totally funded by the federal government? The service is provided by the provincial government, save and except a few isolated situations, but the total cost is paid for by the federal government and comes to the provincial side as a grant, conceivably, from the Department of Northern Affairs and Indian Development.

If the Minister has the answers to those three questions, it would be appreciated.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I missed your second question. I may have to ask you to repeat it. Would you...?

MR. GARDOM: Surely. The second one was dealing with insurance. Did you get that one?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No.

MR. GARDOM: Well, the second question I asked you, Madam Minister, was referring to page 150 of your annual report. Is there a figure in there for the cost of insuring the plan, the premium cost of insuring the 89 school districts? If so, where is it located and how much is it?

Interjection.

MR. GARDOM: I'm obviously talking about fire insurance, casualty, general.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, the first question was about not including the capital debt charges when we talk about how much the per pupil cost is. We do not think it would be fair to include that in the per pupil educational cost because they vary from district to district and year to year. You would not really get what we consider an accurate, balanced picture every year of the per pupil cost.

MR. GARDOM: But it is a cost of operation.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Oh, it is a cost, but we don't think to include that would actually give you an accurate cost because of the great variance from year to year and district to district in the expenditure. Some years, as you know, the capital expense is up; another year it is down.

Insurance? It's included in the plant operation.

MR. GARDOM: How much is it?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I don't have that figure yet.

Do you want to get that?

MR. GARDOM: I'd appreciate it if you'd get it. I'll take your undertaking on that.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: All right, we'll get that if we can.

As far as I recall now, the education of the native Indian children who are not on the reserve.... Do you mean those who live on a reserve but go to our schools? Right. The federal government does pay the same per pupil cost for that child in the district, and they are matching it completely. That is the way it operates at this time.

MR. GARDOM: Does the hon. lady Minister know the number of the Indian children living on reserves who are in the B.C. school system, and does the Minister have a figure of the amount of dollars that is placed by the federal government into the provincial school system to take care of this?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We don't have that right here.

MR. GARDOM: Could you obtain that for me?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We have the answer for you, though not on your last question. Approximately \$3.3 million of insurance. That's the answer to your cost question.

MR. GARDOM: Dealing with the Indian children, would you be able to obtain that figure too?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We'll get that for you.

MR. GARDOM: Thank you very much. Also the number of Indian children.

My understanding is correct. There's not a cost to the provincial government for educating Indian children who live on Indian reserves.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, but we cover only average costs per pupil. There's no question about it, the provincial government does find themselves bearing some costs.

MR. GARDOM: Well, do you charge the federal government this \$847.74?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's what we do, but it does not cover the whole cost.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, I see. That's the amount you charge.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That's right, and it does not

[[Page 1928](#)]

cover the whole cost of educating that particular child. The provincial government is having to put in extra funds.

MR. GARDOM: Do you know what those funds are?

Interjection.

MR. GARDOM: Okay, but it's an interesting point. I don't think the public has been aware of the fact that the Indian children who live on Indian reserves and attend British Columbia schools are funded by the government to the extent of \$847.74 a head, be they in elementary or secondary or in between.

Interjection.

MR. GARDOM: Thank you very much for those answers.

[Mr. G.H. Anderson in the chair.]

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): I look to you for direction or to the Minister for her wishes in this regard. I would like to discuss briefly the problem of supply of education facilities.

During her salary vote we spoke about the publication by the British Columbia School Trustees Association. Mr. Chairman, would you like it here or under vote 47 — grants to school districts?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Chairman, it's fine with me if he wishes to bring it here because the administrator mentioned here is in charge of all those approvals.

MR. CURTIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Madam Minister.

We talked about this earlier or in the discussion relating to your salary, and you acknowledged at that time that, in fact, the process was rather tedious. I hope that this afternoon you could take just a few moments. Surely we could devote a few minutes in committee to discuss a problem which obviously takes a great many months on the

part of school districts as they move towards the provision of a new facility.

In their release, which carries the title: "Problems in the Supply of Educational Facilities," and was dated March, 1975, at the bottom of page 3, specifically, the B.C. School Trustees Association says:

" Where the time goes.

"It is our opinion that the present procedure to build a facility is inefficient, uneconomic and far too cumbersome. The process involves needless checks in Victoria which cause major frustrations.

"The 51 steps involved are...."

Then, as the Minister knows very well, they're set out, starting with firstly: "The school board approves the proposed project. The board and department discuss and agree on enrolment projections of school capacity." Fair enough. "The board and department discuss and agree on capital needs" — the 135 programme. "The board may make a submission for special cases and obtain departmental approval. The department approves capital needs programme" — et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. A full page on this submission is given over to steps 3 to 35 inclusive, and carrying over to the top half of page 5 of the submission, steps 36 to 51 inclusive.

Step 46: "BUILD" — in capitals.

Step 47: negotiate extras.

Step 48: submit extras to the department.

Step 49: the department approves extras.

Step 50: building accepted.

Step 51: final payment is made.

There should be 52, I would think, which would be "Hallelujah" on the part of the school board.

What steps, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, are being taken to shorten this process? With inflation affecting construction, as we all know — the brief touches on that fact — surely this should be shortened, not only in the interests of getting the facility from the original concept, planning stage, design, construction and into full use — not only, therefore, in terms of providing the facility — but in trying to build it with present-day dollars, rather than, as we might be doing now, 1976 or 1977 dollars. I would hope that the Minister could take just a few moments to discuss that.

The other point wasn't appropriate for discussion, perhaps, in the Minister's salary vote, but I would like to speak on behalf of the handicapped of British Columbia — as I'm sure other Members would — who have campaigned with a fair degree of success recently concerning easy access to public buildings for those in wheelchairs and those who are otherwise handicapped. As we see the development of schools in a community sense rather than in purely an educational sense — a 9 to 3 or a 9 to 4 operation — I would hope that there could be even greater emphasis on this.

I was very sorry, as an example, Mr. Chairman, to learn that probably because of tremendous increased costs — this relates to the point I made earlier — the Spectrum Community School (Secondary) now under construction in the greater Victoria school district does not have the basic facilities to accommodate paraplegic students, or paraplegic adults, for that matter. I understand that no facilities have been deleted. In other words, when the school board and the Minister's department were examining the final

[[Page 1929](#)]

drawings for this building and finally said "go" with this, those items were not deleted. But rather emphasis has been

placed, as I understand it, on some \$63,000 to provide for ramps and other special design work to accommodate paraplegics at the future Lambrick Junior-Senior Secondary School in Saanich in School District 61.

This is on the other side of the greater Victoria area, as the Minister knows. With the great deal of interest on the part of the community and with the enthusiastic support of so many people with regard to a community school at Spectrum on the Trans-Canada Highway in what could be called the western section of greater Victoria, it just isn't good enough in my view to see that at some level the decision has been made that we can't have handicapped facilities in all these schools so we're designating the Lambrick building, and Spectrum will have to go by the board.

The paraplegic association has made enquiries of a number of us, I think, concerning Spectrum; also, I'm sure this information has reached the Minister or her Deputy. I do know that the greater Victoria school board is very sorry that because they had to cut costs to the bone on a new school which exceeded estimates by a considerable margin something as vital as this to a relatively few people — but underline the word "vital" — has been overlooked. I would appreciate the Minister's comments on both those points.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I'll first comment on the matter of the 51 steps. Some of those steps, you know, are not sequential. In other words, as you go through it you can see that there are about four paths there where some of them could be processed in a matter of a few hours.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It's still too many. I agree. I'm trying to work with the department to break down wherever we can. But at the same time we have to keep control. It's our responsibility there, too.

But you asked what we have done to date. Well, as I said, I met with the trustees to hear their concerns and ask the department to see if some of their suggestions can be brought in.

I think it's very important to remember that the elimination of the referendum, Mr. Member, has been one major thing that has speeded up the process.

Provision of general funding for minor reconstruction, which is generally approved in bulk and does not any longer require detailed submissions for each project. That's another step.

Provisions of pre-planning funding a year ahead of estimated start of construction for larger projects. I think sometimes some school trustees forget about some of these other changes which have speeded up this whole area.

Acceptance of needs on a three-year projection. That is, a building to be constructed in 1976 will be planned on 1978 requirements. That's certainly causing a basic speedup.

New elementary school construction is based on an overall square footage per pupil, eliminating many delays in detailed examination of plans. That's another major item which I think is often forgotten. I am not particularly blaming the trustees, but I think sometimes we don't put together these things in a package.

All I am saying is that as far as the actual steps, if I can find any possible way to speed it up, we will. I just want to point out that I have looked at other provinces to see if they have better ideas on this, but we still can't find one. They all seem to have major problems in this area. For instance, Alberta shares only a very limited extent for equipment — a maximum of \$1 per square foot per school, and only if the building cost is low. So there is a great variety all across Canada. We are struggling to try and meet the school boards' objections where we can. I am sure we are not going to be able to meet them all.

I agree with you. I was very concerned when I received the letter which you did from the physically handicapped that there was a community school without being available to the handicapped. So I did what I am sure you would expect me to do. I immediately asked for a reason why Spectrum was not going to be available to the handicapped, physically. The answer I received was that it was because the layout of the site, where this school is being constructed, does not lend itself to this. I simply was not ready to accept that. I asked the people in my

department to go back to the Greater Victoria School Board and just see whatever possible means can be done to ensure that the handicapped can get into that school. I feel as strongly about this as you do and I am sure the school board themselves must realize that a community school must be a community school. I can assure you that I don't intend to let this one drop. I think we all have a responsibility here.

MR. CURTIS: I understand the Minister to say, therefore, that the matter is not closed as far as she is concerned with respect to easy handicapped access to Spectrum. Although the building is now under construction, provision for a ramp or ramps may well be provided. I am pleased to hear the Minister express that concern.

On the 51 steps, which I realize sounds like a movie title, would the Minister be frank, perhaps, and indicate if some of this delay occurs at the other end? I raised the matter in this context this afternoon not simply to be critical of the department but

[[Page 1930](#)]

presumably there is some delay at the school board level awaiting the next regular meeting of the full board or a meeting of a committee of board which is given the responsibility of construction, the transfer back and forth of correspondence, the transfer of plans and related material between a school district and the offices here in Victoria, Is this a factor? If so, has the Minister pointed that out to the various districts of the province?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I'll be quite frank with you. I think that the blame rests more with the department than the school board in this area and that's why I am trying to make some changes there. I did forget to mention to you, although I think I did in an earlier speech, that one of our problems has been the shortage of staff in that department. We need more staff. That's one of the reasons for this increase that you see here.

MR. SCHROEDER: Three short questions. One has to do with the examinations. section 035 is \$320,000 this year whereas last year it was \$280,000, but the dollar value is not the major concern. The major concern is the policy of the department now regarding the preparation of these examinations. I understand that examinations are made available — that is, grade 12 equivalent examinations — but has there been any change in direction at all in the department on the concept of providing examinations for students in grade 12? Is there any plan to make these examinations available, for instance, to independent schools so that we could all write the same examinations? How many new people have we had to involve in the preparation of the examinations? It seemed to me that the policy announcement a couple of years back was one of trying to eliminate examinations and yet we see an ongoing expense. I'd like to hear about the number of people involved and where we are going in the direction of examinations.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think primarily the same number of people are involved. I will be announcing shortly a new policy re scholarship exams. It just isn't prepared yet but certainly we will let you know first thing about it. We are always looking at that whole area of the government scholarship exams.

Regarding the independent schools, they have always had those exams made available to them.

MR. SCHROEDER: Continuing, then, in the preparation of the revised curriculum, there is quite an increase in expenditure there. Is the revised curriculum suggested to the department from teachers — do teachers have input into this revision? Do trustees have an input into this revision? Does most of this revision take place within the department itself? Does the research and development department have a major input into this, and, if so, how has this particular section been operating in this last year in the absence of the research and development department? Some questions.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, first of all, R and D has never had anything to do with the preparation of the curriculum. That is an ongoing thing. Under your former administration, too, teacher curriculum committees were established to advise the department on this.

Changes in curriculum: yes, I believe that on the major ones there is trustee input. The increase in cost is primarily because we're moving into decentralization of curriculum and it is going to require assistance to those

regional and local curriculum committees. When they set them up they need assistance. It's amazing; even though people have been saying: "Look, we want an opportunity" — teachers, et cetera — "to get involved in designing our own local curriculum outside the basic subjects," when they're actually given the opportunity, it becomes quite clear that they need help. There's a certain amount of financing necessary to set up the in-service training.

Actually, we're discussing with the universities assistance for special curriculum advisors because, as you know, to draw up a new curriculum is not a very simple thing. It requires a considerable amount of professional background. But we want to spread this around the province so that more teachers will have an opportunity to feel they're part of it.

MR. SCHROEDER: One last question. Last year, during the discussion of the estimates, there was quite some time given to the number of new personnel that had to be added to the department. I made reference to it again here today — lack of performance in some given area because of not enough personnel. But last year we had quite a catch-up programme in the number of personnel who were up into general administration. Now this year I see again 93 new people, 140 people overall in the department, and this comes after the announcement just before the turn of the calendar year in which the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) asked all departments to hold the line on expenditures and in hiring new people. I would like the Minister to justify these 93 new people in this department.

HON. MRS. DAILY: First of all, despite the figures that you saw last year, it's quite obvious that we didn't get all those people. We're back again to working on the specific areas of immediate need, and I think that all Ministries have to prioritize those needs, especially today. If you want the areas where I

[[Page 1931](#)]

feel specifically we must move, it's certainly in the capital expense approval department — that's one area — and also in finance.

You know, when there's a budget over \$700 million and our superintendent of finance here has how many staff — five accountants and he's the sole superintendent with no other immediate assistant, right? You can imagine the job that the superintendent of finance, Mr. Fallen, has in handling the complexities of not only the public school formula, but the fiscal arrangements with the federal government, all the community college budgets, and of course the university budgets are not quite the same problem now since we formed a university council. So those areas specifically need help. I also want to ensure that we can move on the hiring of our director of native Indian education. I don't know if I've answered your question, but that's the way I prioritize it.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): Just a technical inquiry of the Minister at the outset. I want to ask a question at some point about the grant to the Education Research Institute of B.C. Would I be right in thinking that's under research and development? It's not specifically listed there.

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: Fine, I'll wait until then.

The other question I wish to canvass briefly, Mr. Chairman — I think it's appropriate under this vote of general administration — is the education report of the Committee on Health, Education and Human Resources which was tabled in this Legislature yesterday and is not otherwise set down for debate and did not have the term of reference of inquiring into aspects of the general administration of departments. I'd just like to speak very briefly about that.

The first thing I'd say in a general way is that there was clearly a great interest around this province. There were, I think, in excess of 60 briefs received and many of those persons presenting testimony, in my view, would have liked to discuss education in ways considerably beyond the administration of the department, so I would again make a representation to the Minister that it would be a useful thing for her to have that committee hold hearings in a more general way and on a continuing basis.

As to the report that was filed, the first recommendation related to school district amalgamation. The recommendation of the committee essentially was a cautionary one, that amalgamation should be approached with a great deal of care.

A question that I've has asked of me since that report was made public, and on which the Minister might have some comment, is: how should school districts or persons who feel that amalgamation should be made initiate consideration of such amalgamation? I take it that they should approach the department and the department would itself initiate hearings of some kind if it thought fit to change the law. Perhaps the Minister would confirm that. I believe, for example, that that relate to some of the school districts around Victoria, though I am not an expert on that. That's where the inquiry to me came from.

The second general comment of the committee is related to the subject of the administration of collective bargaining in the educational system in British Columbia. Mr. Chairman, if I might give my view — and I emphasize I am not speaking for the committee but simply as one individual member of the committee — the background to this is that this situation was brought to a head by a disagreement between the BCSTA and the BCTF as to how collective bargaining should proceed in this province, whether it should be province-wide or whether it should be local.

As the committee heard evidence around British Columbia in several locations, the message that came through to me was that what was concerning the trustees was their belief that their primary duty was one of getting on with the educational process in cooperation with the teachers, not in confrontation with the teachers, and that they saw the messy business of labour relations as something that made it more difficult than ever to get on with the positive education job.

Many of the trustee groups didn't feel competent in labour relations, didn't feel that they were experts in this matter. They wanted to hand it off somewhere else. That was one trustee motivation towards seeking a centralized bargaining system in this province. The other was the fear or the allegation that local teachers' groups were whipsawing individual school districts and pyramiding one settlement on top of another, using the highest previous settlement as a springboard for an even higher settlement as each district came into the process.

The teachers' concern, on the other hand, was for preservation of local autonomy. They believed that local conditions varied sufficiently to give good cause for the negotiation of local contracts. They didn't want to give up their own individual autonomy to an umbrella group like the BCTF.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

With these two different views, the two groups coming to different conclusions, the committee was put in a position where we were almost asked to choose between one and the other. Again, just speaking for myself and not for the committee,

[[Page 1932](#)]

because the committee does not elaborate on this point, I would suggest that the recommendations that were arrived at favour neither one side nor the other. The attempt, rather, was to say that we believe that there is here an Act which has worked pretty well in the past which, if properly administered, can continue to do so in the future with certain changes in practice, perhaps.

One of the changes in practice that we thought would deserve emphasis would be a greater shift towards zonal bargaining on a voluntary basis. This would permit a smaller number of negotiations throughout the province. It would permit a greater bringing of labour relations expertise, both on the part of the trustees and on the teachers, to the smaller number of negotiations. It would permit a better amalgamation of information and a quicker settlement of the outstanding issues in the various areas. Where it could be determined the areas had a sufficient community of interest, individual contracts could be quite similar. We suggested, however, that it was essential that this be entered into in a voluntary way. The committee had no wish to impose our views on a labour relations situation that has fundamentally been working well. Therefore, the exercise of local autonomy was insisted on.

In pursuance of the objective of encouraging zonal bargaining, the committee proposed that the Minister should establish tentative zones prior to September 1 in any given calendar year. I would like to ask the Minister if she would not give consideration to bringing that date a good deal further ahead than September 1, surely sometime in the summer, rather than getting into the fall. The bargaining deadlines are so tight as set out in the Public Schools Act and zonal bargaining is going to be sufficiently difficult that I would hope the Minister could immediately start the consultation process with the BCTF and the BCSTA in the hopes of having those potential zones set up by the early summer. I would appreciate her response on that.

The next section of the collective bargaining recommendation suggested that both trustees and teachers take advantage of the opportunity which the Department of Labour extends of training in labour negotiations. Mr. Chairman, I want to underline that, because it seems to me that one of the reasons for the difficulty which brought this term of reference to the committee in the first place was exactly that — a lack of expertise in the collective bargaining process. That is something which can be remedied by the taking of time to learn these things and to learn how to bargain, which, as I pointed out earlier, I believe was one of the difficulties in the breakdown of the system according to the hearings we had throughout the province.

The report goes on to reaffirm the thought that arbitration, as provided for in the Public Schools Act and as amended by the interim arbitration Act, should continue to be the standard settlement practice in this section of labour relations in the province. I would say in passing that it's one that's worked very well over the years and one which other sectors might well look at.

The final recommendation was that the scope of bargaining should be as is currently defined in the Public Schools Act. Just to explain briefly the background of this, Mr. Chairman, the Public Schools Act is not at the moment, as I understand it, providing for the bargaining of so-called working and/or learning conditions. Nevertheless, working and learning conditions are obviously of considerable concern both to trustees and teachers. It was my understanding of the recommendation we made that we leave the scope of bargaining as defined in the Act to salary and bonus conditions, but that the teachers and the trustees, being independent agents, are free to enter into agreements with each other on a strictly voluntary basis on these other elements so that their freedom to enter into those kinds of agreements is preserved.

I will not take any more time in committee on that point now, Mr. Chairman, but this did seem a good opportunity to elaborate at least on my position as a member of this committee on the report that was tabled yesterday.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, since this perhaps is the appropriate time to comment on the committee which so seriously impinges upon the success of the school system — namely, the success or lack of success in bargaining — I would choose to make a few comments at this time also.

I have to say — and I say this with some regret — that for the time and the effort and the money which was spent on this committee's function, I think the report is a very pathetic attempt to report what we heard. To cover some of the very important issues which the Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) has just touched upon: the report is five and a half pages long, and the first four are really just defining the people who came before the committee and spelling out where we went and when.

I think that something which has the tremendously serious potential in terms of causing serious disruptions within the system, when all these MLAs travel to all these different centres, and teachers and trustees and many other people came before the committee, I have to say with regret that I think a page-and-a-half report is little short of an insult. I take great exception to the very short and flimsy way in which this report has been brought before the House.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Why didn't you criticize it when you were on the committee?

You had all the opportunity in the world.

MR. WALLACE: The committee chairman asks why I didn't criticize in committee. I made it plain in committee that I would not be signing the report. I'm making the point, Mr. Chairman, that this is an example, in my view, of where we're falling short as Members of this House in giving a more....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am allowing a certain amount of latitude in this matter, but I would ask the Hon. Member to relate his remarks to the administration of this department in this vote.

MR. WALLACE: This report, Mr. Chairman, has the most intimate effect on the exercising of the Minister's responsibility. What's more important than teachers and trustees getting along together and being able to bargain? Let's use some sense of perspective in this House. There are some ridiculous decisions, with respect, coming from your Chair in this session, and I'm getting a little sick of it. There are very few things more important to the administrative responsibility of this Minister than the capacity of teachers and trustees to bargain.

Why did the committee get this job in the first place to go around and listen to what the interested parties...? Isn't this the collegial approach that we're all supposed to espouse?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. WALLACE: I resent that particular correction from the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the Hon. Member may not be aware that we moved from vote 38 to vote 39. We're dealing with the general administration of the department.

MR. WALLACE: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you could even be consistent it would help. The Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) spoke for the last 10 minutes on the same subject; you didn't say anything to him. So let's have a little consistency.

Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the biggest worries this Minister must have in the administration of her department...and vote 39 is entitled "General Administration." I can't think of anything more important under general administration than keeping employer and employee happy. This has to be one of the biggest worries on the shoulders of this Minister. We noticed that from the fact that she had little alternative but to bring in emergency legislation last year to cope with an impasse.

Since I approve of the committee system and the initiatives which this government has taken in asking committees to go around the province and listen to the people most affected by these issues, the least we can do is to try and give some pretty serious attention to the outcome of such a committee in terms of its deliberations, its recommendations and any other import that comes out of the deliberations.

The committee had many points of view and many people. I would just like to say how much I enjoyed the appearance of many of the people before the committee who were obviously very sincerely trying to find solutions to some very difficult problems. Unfortunately, they appeared to be pretty much at opposite ends of the spectrum. The teachers, by and large, were almost unanimous that they want to continue local bargaining and the trustees were almost equally unanimous in determining that they wanted to centralize bargaining by some mechanism or another. I don't want to go into all the details of these two differing points of view, but I do think the function of a committee of the House is to show a substantial amount of leadership in trying to suggest where a good solution to the problem might lie.

One of the reasons why I prefer not to sign the report, apart from the fact that I think the report is too short and lacking in some of the substantial detail that I think should have been included, is that I don't think we really achieved very much by the kind of encouragement we offer to the parties to set up zonal bargaining. Leadership often involves making some statements or decisions that you know are not going to be popular. I don't think it's the function of any committee of this House which is given the job of going around the province to hold hearings on some pretty important issues to come back with a report which, to say the least, is very neutral.

Like the Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson), it is purely my personal opinion that as a

committee we should have taken a stronger position in recommending that zonal bargaining be attempted. The language in which the report is written encourages that we move in this direction, but I personally would have preferred to see the committee take a stronger position and go beyond the stage of encouraging the move in this direction, if only on some kind of pilot-project basis within certain specific zones. We might have picked one or two, such as the Okanagan, where it had already been tried. While it hadn't continued to succeed, it had shown some signs of success over a certain period of time.

I certainly agree with the Member for North Vancouver–Capilano as to the attitude of trustees to the bargaining procedure. They would just like to imagine that it's some kind of responsibility that they could avoid as a trustee — the whole process of collective bargaining. I look forward to a proposal by the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) that educational facilities and personnel will be available in the future to assist trustees to become better

[[Page 1934](#)]

trained in the actual art, if it is an art — I'm sure it is — of collective bargaining.

It also interests me that when negotiation fails in respect to teachers, we have under the Public Schools Act what in effect is compulsory arbitration under this legislation, which is so completely rejected by this government in any other field of management-labour problems. The teachers have no other option, once voluntary efforts to negotiate have failed, but to go through the arbitration process, the results of which are binding. I don't think it serves any purpose to indulge in semantics on the use of the word "compulsory." The fact is that it appears to be an inevitable last step in solving the employer-employee problems in the field of education. Yet this same approach is not acceptable to this government in any other area of employment. I find that both interesting and contradictory.

The last point that I would like to make is that I don't believe this committee's very mild report is going to solve anything. I think it is very significant that the committee suggested that the interim legislation that was brought in last year be incorporated in the Public Schools Act. I think that was a tacit recognition of the fact that we know we haven't solved anything, that we may well run the risk of coming to the same impasse as we did last year. The only hope we have is for the interim legislation to be written in as an integral part of the Public Schools Act.

I just feel that for these several reasons, this committee put in a lot of effort and a lot of time and spent a lot of taxpayers' money, and we came up with a very disappointing result.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words on behalf of the taxpayers here this afternoon. We have an increase in the general administration of the Department of Education from \$3,962,616 to \$6,312,017. Again, it is the taxpayers of this province who have to bear the burden of this increased expenditure.

Now I don't mind, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants to spend money on education, but I do want to see that value for those tax dollars spent is also received in the Education department. I have my doubts about this particular vote. Just a few moments ago we had the Minister of Education telling us that an increase of 250 per cent in the vote for advertising and publicity was necessary. I don't buy her argument, and I'll tell you the reason I don't buy it.

She said that she had to advertise in the newspapers and on the radio for the students who wished to receive aid, and where to pick up their scholarship money, and what aid was available. Well, great Scott, Mr. Chairman, in any of the modern schools I've been in, they have spent a lot of money on PA systems when building those schools. They've got printing machines in there, Gestetner machines, and all kinds of other reproductive machines so that these messages could be given to the students in the classrooms.

I think it is a waste of the taxpayers' money that we have to have an additional \$150,000 just for advertising. I'll tell you what that advertising money is going to be spent on, Mr. Chairman. It's going to be spent on a propaganda machine to sell and to cram down the throats of the taxpayers in this province. That Minister of Education is trying to sell the people on the good job that she is doing when she is not really doing a good job at all, as I pointed out yesterday afternoon.

We get \$150,000 here and \$50,000 there and another \$100,000 here, and pretty soon you are talking about millions of dollars. The Minister in her own words in her press release said: "In a year of recession we have to cut back on the teacher-pupil ratio." She recognizes that we are in a recession, and yet you would never know it by this budget for general administration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers' backs are being bent under the burden of taxation in British Columbia today. They are being bent to the point where they are almost breaking, like the straw that breaks the camel's back. Well, I don't think they are broken yet, but I'll tell you, the taxpayers are bending severely under the burden of taxation in this province, taxation that has increased since this administration came into power.

We don't mind you spending money if it isn't wasted. But what we are sick and tired of is waste and extravagance by this government not only in the Department of Education but throughout every department. Waste and extravagance runs rampant in practically every department of that government, and it is right here before us in this vote of \$6,312,017 to administer the Department of Education.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why the advertising and getting the information to the students cannot be done through the existing school system. These children are in school. Why cannot these messages be given through the regular means of communication?

The Minister didn't explain to me what we mean by "relocation expenses." After seeing the Department of Consumer Services spending \$92 for a stacking chair, we realize that these estimates must come under scrutiny. I want the Minister to explain to me where and how this relocation expense of \$40,000 is going to be spent.

Incidentals and contingencies. Maybe some of this money is being spent for vacant offices here in the province. We've had a scandal of vacant offices by the Department of Public Works. We just have to question the expenditures by this Minister.

[[Page 1935](#)]

Just what is the increase from \$68,800 to \$130,000 — nearly a 100 per cent increase in incidentals and contingencies? This committee would like the Minister to give us a detailed explanation of exactly what is in this vote for incidentals and contingencies.

You go into the school system today and even in elementary schools the classrooms are furnished with expensive movie cameras. I think that this is going a bit far. In the high schools we see television cameras. Is this necessary? Is this providing these children with something they are going to need when they go out into the world? Or is this just some pipe dream of some teacher in the classroom? I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, in the elementary schools there are tape recorders, movie cameras....

AN HON. MEMBER: Trident aircraft....

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, they're not Trident aircraft, but to my way of thinking this is just a little bit too lavish. If the student wants to go and take a course in television, he is going to have to go on to post-secondary education anyway, so just what is the purpose of these TV cameras in our secondary schools? Is this really necessary or it is an extravagance? Not only do they have to be purchased but when something goes wrong they have to be repaired. The way that some of the supervision goes on, particularly in the resource areas, I wonder if the equipment is being properly supervised in its use. As I say, it is not only the original cost of these cameras, but they depreciate and have to be replaced, and if they are broken or malfunction, they have to be repaired. And the same is true with tape recorders and some of the other modern gadgetry that exists in classrooms today.

MS. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services): It's not 1935, it's 1975.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, there goes the Minister of Consumer Services with her \$92 stacking chairs. Oh yes, it's 1975. You'd better believe that 1975 will go down in British Columbia as one of the greatest taxation years to date. I'll tell you those taxpayers' backs are bending — bending under waste and extravagance by this government!

I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder about the use of this modern gadgetry. A lot of it is not necessary to provide a basic education; a lot of it is not necessary at all.

Is it necessary to teach a grade 5 or a grade 6 student how to use a movie camera? I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, I never learned how to use a movie camera and I haven't got one today. I never learned how to use a camera, period, until I had to go out and buy my own.

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Economic Development): Did you learn how to read?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'll tell you something I did learn in school, though, that the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) hasn't learned, and that's the value of the taxpayer's dollar.

HON. MR. LAUK: I went to the same schools you did.

MR. PHILLIPS: Waste and extravagance in the classrooms, and the taxpayers of this province are getting sick and tired of it. If any trustee tries to stand up and ask if this equipment is really necessary, the teacher says: "Are you against education?" To stand up and question the expenditures by school principals and by school administrators today is like being against motherhood. They always seem to be able to justify these expenditures.

I think that a lot of these goings-on in the schoolrooms — the buying of films and so forth — are not teaching these students respect for the taxpayer's dollar. They're getting the attitude now that money grows on trees, and they are learning it in the classroom, Mr. Chairman. They are learning it in the classroom. I think it's time we got back to some basic in the classroom, teaching the basics of education. It's fine to provide expensive buildings, and most of the school construction in British Columbia has been functional. But some of the extravagance in the classrooms is being questioned today by the taxpayers of this province.

I sometimes have to question whether we are getting a better education today. The Minister of Consumer Services says: "Oh, it's 1975, we need all this gadgetry." And yet we have a task force. We are going to have a task force in British Columbia to see where we are going in education. That's why we have to question and I hope that this task force, when it goes around British Columbia, finds out if we are teaching the proper things in the classroom and if we are really getting value for our dollar.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): You're living proof for the need for modernization.

MR. PHILLIPS: So are you, Mr. Minister of Labour. I think you got your education in a classroom without all of this gadgetry. You learned your basics. Are you to tell me that you didn't get a good education?

I am not trying to live in the early 1900s, Mr. Chairman. I am merely trying to point out that extra expenditure, these extra tax dollars we are paying on education today is not doing the trick and the Minister realizes it. That is why we are having a task force — to find out where we are going in education.

[[Page 1936](#)]

All of this gadgetry and all of this waste and extravagance of the taxpayers' dollars in the classrooms has not done the trick. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, I think we have got some empire builders in the classrooms today. As I say....

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you go to Mason Gaffney?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, Mason Gaffney — I won't get on that this afternoon.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder where it will all end. What do we need next? You know, schools, for instance, being built with full motel units, complete with bed, kitchen, and the whole issue. Well, maybe this is necessary, but wouldn't it be a lot less expensive to take the children in the class out and show them a motel room and let them learn how to make a bed at home?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to try to be more specifically relevant to this vote.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I appreciate your remarks, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your remarks. But the problem is, Mr. Chairman, that if anybody has the intestinal fortitude to question the expenditure on education today or to question the necessity of some of the equipment that goes into some of these schools, he is immediately tagged as being anti-education. I think it is time people did stand up and start questioning it because, as I said before, all of these extra expenditures have not given us better educated pupils in British Columbia today.

It is time that somebody had the intestinal fortitude to stand up to some of our educators and start questioning these expenditures. It is the Minister's responsibility to not only question these expenditures in our schools throughout the province, but to analyse and to scrutinize the expenditures in her own department. That is where it has got to start.

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, they say that charity begins at home? If the Minister of Education wants to set an example to the school districts and the school boards and the administrators in our schools throughout the province, she has to start cutting her own budget and making sure that there is no waste and extravagance in her department.

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, this government was going to take the school tax off land and homes? I sometimes have to wonder about the poor farmer who is trying to get the last few miles on those threadbare tires. What does he think when he goes into some of our schools in this province today? When the farmer is trying to squeeze that last egg out of the chicken to pay his school taxes, trying to get that last quart of milk out of the cow....

AN HON. MEMBER: He doesn't squeeze the chicken!

MR. PHILLIPS: He doesn't? Are you not a chicken-squeezer? But, I think that you understand what I am trying to say.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): Nobody does!

HON. MR. LAUK: Do you?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I wouldn't expect you to. I wouldn't expect you to, Mr. Minister of Highways; no, I wouldn't expect you to.

HON. MR. LEA: If I hadn't said it, I would know you are right.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I wouldn't expect you to.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is that the taxes are going up. As that government moves to remove taxes from farmland, the taxes go up. We are in a year of recession but certainly you would never know it by that government. The Minister says we are in a year of recession and yet the spending goes on, gay, free. Let her go! No concern whatsoever for the taxpayers.

As I say, those poor farmers who are just trying to get that last ounce of milk out of the cow and the last egg out of the chicken to pay those school taxes.... I'll tell you, as these very same farmers send their children off on those expensive buses into those expensive classrooms with their TV cameras and their moving-picture cameras and their sophisticated tape recording equipment, they just have to run out to the barn or out into the garden and try and get that last turnip. (Laughter.) Mr. Chairman, this is no laughing matter.

HON. MR. LAUK: We're not laughing with you.

MR. PHILLIPS: It is a very serious matter. As you travel throughout rural British Columbia, and you talk with the farmers, they are concerned. They are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I also have to think about all those students who are receiving a very good education in the independent schools of this province. Independent schools that don't have all of this gadgetry, all of these luxuries, are turning out students equal to or better than our public school system without all of this lavishness, without all of these TV cameras, movie cameras, expensive gadgetry, turning out students equal to and in some cases better than the students we're turning out of our public school system.

[[Page 1937](#)]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. This would be a very good speech for vote 47, but I would ask the Hon. Member to try to be more specifically relevant to vote 39.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'll have to bring it up under vote 47, but I just want to finish, Mr. Chairman. I just want to finish by saying that those parents who send their pupils to the independent school system are paying for all this waste and extravagance. Yes, I say a lot of it is waste and extravagance. They have to pay for their independent school system as well.

They're being double taxed, and the first set of taxes is waste and extravagance — waste and extravagance right here in this budget.

There's an increase of almost \$3 million in the administration of this department, an increase of almost \$3 million in a year when, by the Minister's own words, we're in a year of recession. I tell you that it's very difficult to come to grips with reality and realize that we are in a recession, and that not only are we in a recession but our basic industries are being driven out of this province and reducing the tax base by the policies of this government. I'll tell you that if it continues, the taxpayers' backs are not only going to bend from the burden of taxation; they're going to break.

I would like this Minister to once again tell me: why the increase in advertising and publicity? why the relocation expense of \$40,000? why the increase in incidentals and contingencies? what is "National Education Memberships," which are up \$23,500?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, to repeat, the advertising for student aid takes a large part of it. The Member keeps saying "why not just give it to them? They're in school." Many of these young people we're trying to encourage back into school are out of the working world. Those we want to get back into community colleges and to increase their training in vocational schools you can't get to in school. So I'm just pointing out that that argument of yours is not completely valid. We're trying to reach a large spectrum of students and adults.

Interjections.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Also, the advertising is for the task forces and the visiting around the province of these forces. Generally speaking, we also have a number of brochures, which I'll be glad to show you, which you can see are absolutely essential. There's no point in putting up colleges, universities and increasing adult education facilities if you don't tell the public where they are. That's all part of the vote.

Relocation expenses. I've mentioned that before, but I'll repeat it again, Mr. Member. That is for the relocation of the district superintendents as they're moved around the province. As you know, we have 54 and they do have a relocation expense. That is what that is for.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No, they didn't have it. You're quite correct. This is a new one this year.

MR. PHILLIPS: Did you not pay their expenses before?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We did have under, I think, our general expenses. But this time we have it specific now that there's a certain amount of money allocated to them for relocating their homes.

MR. PHILLIPS: In a year of recession you'd better leave them where they're at.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, maybe you don't think that that's necessary, but when these people suddenly find that they have to move, say, from somewhere in the Fraser Valley up to Prince George....

MR. PHILLIPS: No, I didn't say that. I said that in year of recession maybe you should leave them where they're at.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Oh, well, you've got to think of the educational needs, too. That's a matter where priorities come in. I think that in your own area, Mr. Member, your own people up there get quite concerned about who their district superintendent is. We have a fine one right now, but as time goes along he himself has a right to succeed and perhaps move into a larger district. So there's no alternative. I don't think you'd want to hold him back from that.

I agree with you. I think messages should go up everywhere. This is the time to keep administrative costs down. When you look at this budget, it doesn't look as though there's much attempt to do that. But I can assure you, as I pointed out, that although it does look a large increase here, when we did come into office we were operating with a professional staff less than Prince Edward Island's Department of Education. The services and demands on us are increasing because the system is becoming more complicated. Out there they're asking for these services, and we're trying to provide them.

I also pointed out — they're listed here — that at the moment there are still 88 positions not filled. Last year many of those positions were not filled. I'm just saying to you now that I'm going to exercise great priority decision-making in what areas should be filled this year. I mentioned that our superintendent

[[Page 1938](#)]

of finance certainly needs assistance, and there are several other areas. I can assure you that I appreciate the point you're making about administrative costs.

The other area I am very confused over. You spent 30 minutes yesterday berating me and the government, saying: "It's terrible; this Minister's low on the priorities. She doesn't get enough money for education." In 30 minutes today you say that we are spending too much money. I give up, Mr. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just let me explain something to the Minister. I just want to explain to the Minister that I'm talking about money for education, but I want to make sure. The amount of money is fine, provided we're getting value for our dollar. What concerns me this afternoon is value for the dollar.

You didn't talk about the extravagant equipment and gadgetry in the classroom. I'd like to have your comments on it. Is it necessary in grades 5 and 6 to have a movie camera, and for the taxpayers to be buying film for it? Is it necessary to have sophisticated tape recorders and...?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think these questions would be more appropriate under the appropriate vote.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Look, as the Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young) said: it is 1975. It can't be the same as it was when you and I went to school. You may question the fact and consider a movie camera a frill. You have to realize the local school board has an option in making that decision. They probably let some input come from the principal and maybe the students and the parents of the school, as your other Member has been asking for himself. Now maybe that community decided that that's an area they'd like to see expanded in their school. We only share in it. The initiation for that kind of equipment has to come from the local area.

Now if you're really concerned, if you've seen that in your own district, you go to your own school board and you express those concerns to them. Perhaps they can tell you why they consider it educationally desirable. The department shares in that; they don't initiate it in those particular areas.

My own feeling is that if the school, the principal, the teachers and the students can show that having those film cameras in the room is beneficial to the students, okay. Perhaps they have a particularly good teacher who is very, very good at film-making. The students can go out and they can learn about their environment by taking pictures themselves and making pictures of their environment. They can go out and study community projects and take films of them. Then they can come back and show them to their students. There are a great many enriched values that come from producing your own films. But I think you had better go and argue that in your own district where they have their own local autonomy in those areas.

Now National Education membership fees. In National Education there is a grant there for the Canadian Education Association. Our Associate Deputy, Mr. Phillipson, is president of that association this year out of interest. The council of Ministers does take the largest grant here: \$123,000. The council of Ministers is involved in a number of programmes, including French language programmes and trying to cooperate on the distribution of videotapes and films across Canada. One province may be producing a number of videotapes which can be used by another province. There are many areas where I think the Province of B.C. benefits extremely well from participation in the council of Ministers.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver–Little Mountain): First, I would like to congratulate the Minister for the excellent job she's done. I'm a little bit like the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips).

Interjection.

MR. CUMMINGS: When is the hockey game? There must be something important happening today.

Anyhow, like the Member for South Peace River, I am very concerned about the taxpayers' dollars. May 1 is a very important day. That's the day you all have to pay — and it hurts, doesn't it? Budgets are very important.

There's a budget called the B.C. School Trustees Association budget. We're proposing to spend \$1 million of the people's money. These are public funds. What check does your department have on this budget? I think the purpose of this organization is to negotiate with the school teachers. It's 0.01 per cent of the total budget. This is very high. I feel, Madam Minister, that this should be watched because it doesn't belong to anyone. It's never-never land. The school trustees don't really check it close enough; the Education department doesn't check it close enough. I think a \$1 million budget is too high. Thank you.

Vote 39 approved.

On vote 40: provincial education media centre, \$1,401,917.

MR. SCHROEDER: For clarification, is this the vote under which we would discuss the multi-media resource centres? For five days we have been asking the Minister to explain this and explain that, and over the five-day period there's been very few complimentary remarks, particularly from this corner. I would like to remark that the multi-media

[[Page 1939](#)]

resource centres perform a good function out in the school districts.

I don't know if the Members of the House have ever had the opportunity to visit these centres, but books are available that would not be available in an ordinary library. Books, for instance, that would cost \$18, \$20, \$25 apiece and that couldn't possibly be provided for each library in each school. They're available through this multi-media resource centre and serve a fantastic function in the school district.

Not only is this kind of a thing available, but provided for in those resource centres are experiments — chemistry experiments, scientific experiments, other kinds of experiments which provide materials that couldn't possibly be afforded on a per school basis. But on a resource centre basis they are made possible.

I think that I would encourage the Minister to expand this particular programme. I am not sure that every school district has one; I wish the Minister could clarify if they do. I visited the resource centres in a couple of the areas. One, for instance, in Vernon, is not only beautifully located but beautifully equipped. It's in the administration building which is a little distance away.

I met the individual who is responsible for filling the kits when they go on out and are assigned to the schools. He's a fellow enthused with his job; he knows he's providing a service.

There is another resource centre — the location doesn't come to me just right now. It's in a basement of a building. It's not as well equipped — the lighting isn't there, the equipment isn't laid out because of space. It's sort of put together in closets and corners. But I would like the Minister to inform the House how many school districts have these resource centres.

What does the expansion programme look like in this area? It looks to me like a valuable, worthwhile function.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I agree with the Member. When I'm moving around school districts those multiple resource centres are the ones that impress me greatly, too. From what I can gather from my own travels I would say that most school districts now have some form or other — some share them, as you know, with other districts. But I think we can pretty well say that the majority of the school districts now have them. They're good.

MR. WALLACE: I'd like to just ask the questions relating again to the expenditure of the moneys under this vote. I notice the staff is destined to increase by two but the total salary goes up by 50 per cent from \$156,000 to \$235,000, with only two additional staff. That seems like a bigger jump in salaries when you're only adding two people to the staff.

The other item is under 034: the production expense goes up from \$400,000 to over \$1 million. It may well be that there's some very positive and useful way to account for such a large increase — that's one and a half times what it was last year.

The third question I would like to ask is this: is this the appropriate vote to ask questions about educational television, which is a form of the media we've heard quite a bit about in recent sessions in this Legislature?

I wonder if the Minister could give us some statement on her department's policy about educational TV in a broad way. I don't expect a whole breakdown of specific parts of the programme, but I wonder if the government has reached a point of having decided just how and to what degree it is going to use educational TV.

There was great discussion, which has been given a lot of public attention and rightly so, regarding the last VHF channel available to the Vancouver-Victoria area. The government is on record as having strongly supported the concept that it not be just another commercial channel with many of the disadvantages which many of us feel are unalterably associated with a commercial channel. I wonder if the Minister has reached the point within her department where she has some specific outline of policy in relation to the wider use of educational TV.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The increase in the salaries are normal increases, Mr. Member. I may say that I'm very pleased that I do have this very sizeable increase in production expense.

I'll tell you why. We have a tremendous amount of demand from the school districts for the services that are coming out of that area. The present libraries in the audiovisual section of it have 3,000 films. This will help us to increase it so that we can meet the demands of approximately 25,000 teachers — as you know this is the total number in over 1,500 schools. In addition, this will allow us to increase the videotape catalogue which now has 500 titles. They can't keep us with the demand from the teachers and students and districts of the province for these services provided by this centre.

This centre also is doing some excellent production of films. We're very proud of the staff there. For example, we've had Pat Suzuki doing a science series. May I say to any Members who have not visited that centre that it's very

well worth visiting. That is an area which we believe very strongly can serve the educational system very well.

In the area of educational television, as you know, we have a Department of Transport and Communications. However, naturally, the Education department is very much involved in this and where we're going in this area. First of all, we have worked on an expansion of the BCIT media centre, which we

[[Page 1940](#)]

feel should be expanded to serve more of the community. We believe it should be expanded to serve the regional colleges and perhaps on a regional basis. However, we have an educational communications authority on which sit the representatives of education, I believe the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) and the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan). Those Ministers, with their officials, are charged with developing the future role for educational television development in the province. We're pulling together the research from our department, from the Hon. Minister of Transport and Communications, so we can develop the best route to go for the province. But as you know there have been some very definite statements already made by the Hon. Minister to my left on this already, and I think you could perhaps go into this further with him at that time.

But I just want to say that Education is very, much involved, particularly at the media centre, where we feel that we can produce video tapes and get them out to the schools. That's what they want.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I trust as she continues exploration in this connection that the Minister of Education will use the Ontario Education Communications Authority as a guide on what not to do. In the happy days just after the last provincial election when we were all fresh new Members here, the present Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young), the present Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea), the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) and I were on a subcommittee examining television with respect to this House, as you may recall, Mr. Chairman. We had an opportunity to look at the OECA establishment — and I underline the word "establishment" — in Toronto. Everyone is concerned, surely, about dramatically increased costs. We surely have a case in point as to how budgets have just run away with themselves in the Ontario example. Presumably and admittedly this authority is doing a good job in the remote sections of that province, but the head office staggers the mind when one visits it for the first time in terms of plush offices and staff looking after staff — just a proliferation of, well, perfume as gifts to visitors, as an example.

Some members of the government party tell us about multinational corporations and fantastic head offices. Well, I think that those are pikers compared to what we saw and experienced and commented on as an all-party committee, in the Ontario situation. So please, Madam Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, don't let that get out of hand. I understand what is being attempted here, and the comments you've made. The chief critic for education, the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) has spoken about media centres. But I would urge upon the Minister the degree of control that is necessary if this province is to avoid an extremely expensive, unnecessarily expensive operation such as we've seen.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Just a comment. Yes, I know when I was over there, I was making the same point to the government of the day that they not get themselves involved in that, what I consider a monster of.... The point that concerned me most about it was that I didn't see where it was getting to the end product — what was really getting to the students, you know. So we certainly have that as an example.

Also the conference of Ministers gives me an opportunity to see what each other province is doing. Our desire is to get the communication out there in the least expensive but most educationally desirable way. So we have a lot of areas where we can learn from as to what not to do.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): I'll be very brief too, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to add to the comments made by the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis), and the Minister, for that matter, in this concern.

I was happy to hear the Minister say that she is in consultation with the Minister for Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) on this matter of future policy for educational television, but I wonder whether or not we'll ever achieve the goal that we're looking for if we don't change our approach very early. In fact it may be

too late now.

The Minister mentions that we do have an educational communications authority, which we do have, and which was set up by the previous government, but it's the wrong vehicle for approaching the federal government for an educational television outlet. The federal government will not give this province access to a television channel as long as the authority is controlled by the government, as it is today. It must be completely independent authority.

It's my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that we have wasted a couple of years, even though the CRTC gave this province every indication that it would look favourably and gave a two-year rest period so that this province could establish the kind of independent authority which could make its own application for an educational television channel. That's what the province should have done so that it could have been, when the CRTC held its latest hearings, ready with a professional, well laid-out, thoughtful application. Instead, we had nothing but a simple intervention which was of no use in the matter of obtaining for British Columbians an educational television channel.

I'd like to point out to the Minister, perhaps, one authority to which we might look for some things to do rather than things not to do. That's the newly

[[Page 1941](#)]

created authority in Alberta which is, I believe, called the Alberta Education Communications Corp., set up this year, which has now taken over the functions of operating radio station CKUA in Edmonton, Alberta. If the government ever wants to look at a successful publicly run radio station, that's where to look, because it's got to be the success story of Canada.

CKUA is now under the direct control of that communications corporation. The communications corporation has had the approval from the CRTC to set up FM broadcasting stations in, I think, Lethbridge, Calgary, and some centres in northern Alberta as well, for the purpose of providing education to the people of Alberta through a corporation engaged only in educational broadcasting. They haven't got into television yet, but I am assured by the people in Alberta that they will be going into an application for television very shortly. So if we are looking for some kind of a successful model, that perhaps might serve as some guidelines for the Minister.

But I really would stress to the Minister that the only way we are ever going to expand on what seems to be a good head start in the Minister's department now, is to go about it with the guidelines which are already laid down by Ottawa. There may be unstated guidelines, but the printed guidelines are there for us to follow and they are very clear and easily followed. I am afraid we may have blown our chance to get an educational television channel in this province today. It may be too late, but if it isn't, let's get on the ball and get an independent authority set up now, divorced from government completely, and tell the CRTC that we are ready to play their game now according to the rules laid down by Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Vote 40 approved.

On vote 41: correspondence school, \$990,122

MR. SCHROEDER: In the expense section, code 032, the revision of courses for correspondence courses, are there plans to include in these new courses remedial courses now that the Minister is aware of the fact that reading levels are low, perhaps comprehension levels are low, in students enrolling at the university level? Would it not be appropriate that the revision of courses should also consider the issuance of remedial courses, perhaps by the scores, to be offered to the adult public — people who, perhaps, have suddenly become aware that maybe they didn't avail themselves of all of their opportunities while they were in school and are in need of these remedial courses — are these courses available and what are the plans to make them available?

HON. MRS. DAILY: The courses are available, Mr. Member.

MR. WALLACE: It seems to me, just looking at this vote, that the whole situation in the correspondence school branch is very much at a standstill. The budget does little but take care of inflation it would seem. That's one point. I wonder to what degree the basic concept of correspondence courses is changing, or is it just a matter of marking time, standing still, or is the government recognizing that it can be a very integral part of the diverse ways in which educational services can be made available?

The second point I would like to ask relates to what are to me quite disturbing phone calls I've had from teachers who corrected correspondence courses and so on and who feel that they don't get a fair shake in terms of employment or in their access to fringe benefits and even in their capacity to bargain for the same degree of wage increase which is available to the teacher employed through a school district. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment as to whether she is satisfied that teachers who are involved in correcting papers through the correspondence courses are getting a fair shake in terms of holidays, in terms of fringe benefits, in terms of pay for statutory holidays. In general terms, to what degree does the Minister feel that these teachers are perhaps second class, or at least appear to be second class, in the manner in which they are remunerated and get fringe benefits?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think you are making a plea specifically for the markers, not the staff, of the correspondence department.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Markers, right. Of course, at no time could we compete with what is being paid in the public school system in that area. However, it hasn't specifically been brought to my attention by the markers themselves, but you have brought it to my attention.

MR. WALLACE: They are frightened to bring it to your attention.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Are they? Oh, come now!

MR. WALLACE: No, they say that. They think their jobs would be in danger.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I can't imagine that.

You have brought it to my attention now and I will arrange to meet with them and just see what their specific problems are.

The other area — I forget now just what your question was.

[[Page 1942](#)]

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Oh, why it hasn't expanded. It's generally because there is a general steadying of the enrolments. It is fairly static. I think that that is probably attributable to general expansion, particularly of the northern areas where we are starting to move into community colleges in the north — general expansion of multi-media services, too.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just clarify; first of all, I was wrong in talking about the teacher as much as the person who marks the papers. I wasn't trying to be facetious. The Minister smiled, but I have been told by people who phoned me....

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense!

MR. WALLACE: The lady Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) interjected the word "nonsense." It is not nonsense. These individuals have phoned me. They feel that their bargaining power, in terms of the particular role they fill, is rather fragile and that they are less well paid. I gather there is no shortage of people available to do that job. I think we all recognize that it is very much a matter of supply and demand. If they were perhaps to make a

bit of a fuss when in fact they are not in any short supply, you can understand why the individual person will feel that his job might be in danger. I didn't say, nor do I say, that it is in danger, or that this Minister would in any way endanger them. I am just reporting to the Minister that they have expressed this concern, two of them at least, on the phone. One of them refused to give me her name, which I think is a measure of her legitimate concern that she doesn't want to get mixed up in a political hassle. So I want to just say that I very much appreciate the Minister's offer to meet with these individuals to see if some of their concerns can be dealt with.

Vote 41 approved.

On vote 42: publication services branch \$8,582,036.

MR. SCHROEDER: On vote 42 we see the \$6,860,000 for textbooks for free issue. The Minister will recall that the concept of free issue of textbooks was introduced by this government and that last year the number of dollars designated for this vote was \$6.1 million. My question is this: whenever there is a free issue of textbooks in any one given year, there should be a reissue, should there not, of those textbooks, particularly all textbooks which are still in good condition? The ones which were issued free last year would be available for reissue this year, would they not?

Could the Minister report on the experience of the school districts? Are these textbooks being abused? Do they come back in reasonably good condition? What is the report? If those that were issued free last year are going to be reissued this year, why a similar or an increased amount for free issue this year? Could the Minister explain?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: What is referred to here is primarily the purchase of new books to meet new curricula, and it also includes replacement of the ones that have worn out.

MR. SCHROEDER: Do that many come in?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: They are coming in all the time.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, on this vote the name has been changed from Curriculum Resources Branch to Publication Services Branch. I just wonder what significance, if any, there is in the name change.

The other point we touched upon in the salary vote was the whole question of the manner in which books are selected, and the whole question of provision of books. Has the Minister given any thought to decentralizing the process, or is it still felt that the textbook operation, if that is a phrase I could use, should be centralized? Is there any real advantage in considering a more regionalized process? Presumably, there are some local areas where there would be preference for one book rather than another.

We hear a great deal about adequate nationalism and provincialism in many of our publications. I wonder if the Minister could just briefly comment to what degree we are doing a better job of emphasizing essentially Canadian content, both in terms of Canadian authors and the effort of local and Canadian people in providing the kind of textbooks that are needed in our modern society. Is there any study being done at the present time to look at this specific issue of Canadian content in our textbooks?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The matter of decentralization of textbooks. Yes, we have been considering that. It has to be weighed against the increased expenditure that could result from that, but the department is seriously looking at that.

What was the first question on curriculum?

MR. WALLACE: Why the change in name?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Oh, why the change in name? You see in the restructuring book we gave you we now have put this publication service branch all together under one administrator. There is no hidden

meaning to it; it just fits in better with the restructuring of the department.

The matter of B.C. publishers and Canadian books. I am pleased to say the majority of the school books now are either Canadian or British. I have actually written to the school boards to encourage them to use our own Canadian books, and particularly to them to have a more definite liaison with our curriculum and publications departments so that when we are preparing new curricula we can at least say to the B.C. publishers: can you help with that book; I think this has been lacking. So I am glad to say that we have this liaison and we're encouraging school boards of the province to make use of this.

Vote 42 approved.

On vote 43: Jericho Hill School, \$2,330,246.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions. During the early debate on the non-confidence motion in the Minister's department, the Minister advised the House that there were improvements now being made to catch up with some of the problems at Jericho Hill School, problems which fairly recently were still considered to be urgent by the parents at the school, with fairly serious staff shortages and some questions from the parents about qualifications of at least some of the part-time people who were teaching at Jericho.

The major announcement by the Minister now has been that there will be two advisory boards set up to at least advise on the operation of Jericho. I understand that there is a meeting this evening, as a matter of fact, among the members of the parent group and others at Jericho to talk about recommendations for staffing, or at least personnel, on these advisory boards.

This is rather slow in coming because the Chud report recommended that those boards should be in operation within two months.

There is a concern among the parents yet, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that the advisory boards, rather than helping to run the operation of the school, may be just another hurdle to get through when they are trying to get some help.

They would like the Minister's assurance that those boards can be more than just advisory boards to advise the department on certain aspects. Why can't those boards be full school boards, just like an ordinary school board in any community in British Columbia? If it wants to set up its own budget or is allowed to set up its own budget and run its own operation then let it.

I am afraid that when those parents finish holding their meetings, such as the one tonight, and they get the word from the Department of Education that they will have no real value or autonomy — and I believe that's the way they are going; they will be strictly advisory boards to the department with no autonomous powers of their own. I believe those parents are going to be heartbroken because they expected a lot more than that.

Perhaps the Minister could at least consider to expand those boards into more than just advisory boards. I don't think that is what the parents want or have been hoping for.

I'd like the Minister, too, if she would, to tell the House how many of the approved staff that her department has approved for Jericho have in fact been hired and whether there is trouble getting staff at Jericho School. How quickly does she think the problem may be overcome at Jericho Hill School and how quickly will the advisory board be operational with whatever their function will be?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Well, in answer to your last question, all but two vacancies have been filled on the staff. There has been no apparent difficulty getting staff. Two vacancies.

MR, McCLELLAND: But have you approved extra staff? How many have you approved in your department? All but two?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It's all been covered with the extra staff that was approved.

Our intentions were never at any time to draw the teeth of this group. The whole intent was to give the parents the distinct responsibility. I understand they are drawing up the terms of reference. It is quite possible, Mr. Member, that there will be teeth in those terms of reference which we will endorse, and will give them considerable authority within the framework you are talking about. So let's wait until we see the terms of reference.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver-South): I would just like to ask the Minister one short question.

During the past few years, quite a number of blind students have gone through teacher-training programmes at the University of British Columbia who have found difficulty in finding work in teaching in the public schools. I understand that in other areas throughout Canada and the United States, it is possible for them to get employment without having to go into, for instance, continuing education or into blind institutes. They would very often like to be able to teach sighted children. Are there any blind teachers now being employed in the public school system?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I cannot answer that, but I'll discuss it with you later. We'll check on that. I

[[Page 1944](#)]

know there is no barrier as far as we're concerned in the department. I know there are blind teachers who are excellent teachers of sighted children. I just cannot tell you right now who are doing this in our school system. But I'll certainly check that out for you. We certainly encourage the school boards to hire these very capable teachers.

MR. WALLACE: Just a brief question along much the same lines. Could the Minister comment on whether there tends to be just the institutional type service available to the blind student or the deaf student? Should we not be trying to keep as far as possible those handicapped people within the general community at the usual local school? One gets the impression — I may be wrong, but I get the impression — that we do tend to institutionalize those particular children with those handicaps.

Could the Minister just comment briefly on what prospects there are, let us say, to expand the potential of the local schools closest to which the child is resident so they can provide at least some of the educational service so that these already severely handicapped children don't have to put up with the additional problem of being treated in a very separate and institutionalized way.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It's an interesting question. I think if you look at the enrolment, which I realize you don't have in front of you, but in 1965-66, the total institutionalized at Jericho was 346. We're now down to 254. That is evidence right there that these children are still receiving the services but on a decentralized basis.

Vote 43 approved.

On vote 44: research and development: \$2,307,446.

MR. WALLACE: This would certainly have to be one of the votes that we would like to know a great deal more about, not only in terms of the past and what has been happening in this department but hopefully some prediction or outline by the Minister of what we can expect from this department in the future. I've no wish to repeat much of the debate that took place earlier on and I've no wish to transgress on the element involved of an individual's rights which are subject to grievance procedures at the present time, but I would like to try and get from the Minister some specific outline of what this department really is doing.

We use the words "research and development" in a very broad and general way. I am still very much in the dark as to what specifically this branch of the Minister's department was instructed to do, Regardless of the personality clashes we are told led to the termination of the appointments, what were the people in this department instructed to do?

What, in effect, did they do?

Thirdly, what exactly is Dr. Peterson and the other group now doing in terms of redrawing the terms of reference for future members of this department? The whole situation just seems rather ludicrous. We have this branch set up and, so far, the only people who were working, the senior professionals in the department, have been fired. Again, as I say, I'm not arguing whether they should or shouldn't have been fired, but the department has been denuded of the very people who surely would be using the budget. We're looking here, for this present year, at a budget of \$2.3 million. That's a very large sum of money. At the moment there does not appear to be anybody in the branch who would be doing research to use up that budget. That would be one very basic question.

Specifically, what do we mean by "research and development"? What programmes did the Minister want carried out? To what extent were they carried out? In other words, for the \$750,000 that was shown in last year's estimates, what has the taxpayer got for his \$750,000 other than a series of firings?

What is scheduled for the future? I mentioned the appointment of Dr. Peterson, who I gather is conducting some inquiry as to how this department could best function. At least this is the impression I've gained.

Beyond that, could the Minister give some kind of outline as to how \$2.3 million is likely to be spent by the end of the next fiscal year when there's virtually nobody in this branch. I presume there are only clerical staff in the branch and that none of the six or seven senior professionals have been replaced.

That leads to the next question. Could the Minister tell us at what stage her department is at in advertising for successors to the persons who are no longer employed in this branch? In the light of the controversy surrounding the branch, is the Minister having any particular difficulty in getting applicants for the jobs? It looks as though the mortality rate in that branch is fairly high. I would assume that if there isn't some fairly specific outline by the Minister of the future course for this branch, it would not be unreasonable to suspect that professionals who might otherwise want to take part in educational research would be somewhat wary of trying to fill the roles from which the former professional educators were dismissed under controversial circumstances. In other words, the public image of the research and development branch can hardly be considered to be bright and confident.

It's probably too close to 6 o'clock to get anything other than a hasty statement on this. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I think it's too important a part of the Minister's responsibility to be just hurriedly answered before 6 o'clock. The sum of money involved is very

[[Page 1945](#)]

substantial, so I would move that the committee rise, report resolution and ask leave to sit again.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No.

Motion negatived.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Chairman, I will explain why I particularly wish not to have an adjournment. We have gone through the budget debate in which I outlined step by step what has happened in research and development. Take the *Hansard* out and read it, Mr. Member, We have gone through the budget debate over and over.

MR. WALLACE: I'm not satisfied; I want more detail.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: We have gone through the non-confidence vote in which I answered your questions as well as I was able to on this.

I don't know how many times, Mr. Member, you want to hold up the House in going over this. If you do, I'm prepared to bring out my budget speech tonight, go through the whole thing again, go through all my answers again which I gave in the non-confidence motion, if that's the way you want to spend your time on the educational estimates when the people of the province have many other items here which they're interested in. But so be it, if that's what you wish to spend your time on.

Now, otherwise, I'm prepared to answer specific questions in the next few minutes which you gave. If you're not satisfied with that, Mr. Member, I shall go over the whole thing again this evening. If that's what you wish.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, apparently the Hon. Minister is back to her teaching days when she is lecturing me like she would lecture her students.

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: That may be the defensive posture which she chooses to adopt. But I think it's a sad day in this House if the opposition Members are expected to ask a question once, get an answer, and, whether they like the answer or not, that's the only one they're going to get. That's exactly the very authoritarian attitude you've just displayed in this House.

I'm asking again, because I'm not satisfied with the answer I got before. I thought in a democratic system you could go on asking questions. I want to know....

Interjections.

MR. GARDOM: It's a matter of principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to go through this exercise again this evening to answer the Member.

Interjections.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

[Mr. Speaker rises.]

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I will recess the House by reason of disorder, unless you are prepared to come to order. I am not going to stand up here all day. I am getting hungry. Would the Hon. Members return to good order? I'm afraid I will have to recess the House if I can't get order.

[Mr. Speaker resumes his seat.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would also like my words recorded in *Hansard*. Mr. Speaker, the committee reports resolutions and asks leave to sit again. It further reports that a division took place in committee and asks that the division be recorded in the *Journals* of the House.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

