

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)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1975

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 1869](#)]

CONTENTS

Oral Questions

- Rental of Marine Building space. Mr. Bennett — [1869](#)
- Meeting of Columbia River treaty body. Mr. McGeer — [1870](#)
- Purchase of ski lands. Mr. Wallace — [1871](#)
- Status of guide to Alcohol and Drug Commission. Hon. Mrs. Dailly answers — [1872](#)
- Creston Valley hydro lines. Mr. Curtis — [1872](#)
- Purchase of Pacific Western Airlines. Mr. Gibson — [1873](#)

Committee of Supply: Department of Education estimates On the amendment to vote 38.

- Mr. Schroeder — [1873](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1873](#)
- Mr. Schroeder — [1874](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1874](#)
- Mr. Gardom — [1874](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1876](#)
- Mr. Gardom — [1876](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1877](#)
- Mr. Smith — [1877](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1879](#)
- Mr. Wallace — [1881](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1885](#)
- Mr. Bennett — [1887](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1889](#)
- Mr. Gibson — [1890](#)
- Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1891](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1893](#)
- Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1894](#)
- Mr. Chabot — [1895](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1896](#)
- Mr. Schroeder — [1897](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1898](#)
- Mr. Gibson — [1899](#)
- Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1899](#)

Mr. Phillips — [1899](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1902](#)
Mr. Phillips — [1902](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1903](#)
Mr. McClelland — [1903](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1904](#)
Mr. McClelland — [1904](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1906](#)
Mr. L.A. Williams — [1906](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1906](#)
Mr. L.A. Williams — [1907](#)
Mr. McClelland — [1907](#)

Point of order.

Correction of division list. Mr. Gardom — [1907](#)

Appendix — [1908](#)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): Mr. Speaker, we have in the House today a group of students from the Delta Senior Secondary School along with their teacher, Myrna Duthie. I would ask the House to make them welcome.

HON. A.A. NUNWEILER (Minister Without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to the gallery today, from Prince George, His Worship Mayor Moffat and Alderman Len Proppe, who is district chairman for the regional board, also Alderman Howard Lloyd, Alderman Elmer Mercier and Alderman Art Stauble. Also with them is the city manager, Chester Jeffery; regional administrator, Bill Kennedy; and also his planner, Chander Suri. In addition, I would like to welcome my son, Guyle, who is with us here today. We would like to welcome them. Thank you.

MR. J.H. GORST (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to join with me today to give a welcome to Marcus Davies, president of the provincial capital region district Young New Democrats.

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Economic Development): Today in the gallery is a group of grade 9 students from Templeton high school with their Canadiana class. They are being led by Helen Read and Mrs. Blomfield of Templeton school in the City of Vancouver. Could you welcome them, please?

MS. K. SANFORD (Comox): There is a group of students here today from Cumberland Junior Secondary School in the constituency of Comox. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Lorne Irwin. I would ask the House to give them a warm welcome.

Oral questions.

RENTAL OF MARINE BUILDING SPACE

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): To the Minister of Public Works: can the Minister confirm that his department has leased 8,000 square feet on the 8th floor of the Marine Building in Vancouver at an annual cost of \$4.50 a square foot until the price goes up May 1 to \$5.70 per square foot?

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works):

I'll take that as notice, Mr. Chairman. (Laughter.)

MR. BENNETT: Supplemental, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You mean on the same subject.

MR. BENNETT: Yes, he'll get additional information....

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I'll take it as notice, Mr. Speaker, and that's it. If he wants to say anything, I have sat back and given him lots of opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please! There's a growing tendency to ask several questions, all of which depend upon the answer to the first question.

MR. BENNETT: To get additional information, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: On the same subject?

MR. BENNETT: Yes.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: You don't....

MR. BENNETT: Am I recognized, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think there is a point of order.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I didn't know he was on a point of order.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I've taken the question as notice and I'll look into it, and I'll report back as I have done on all other questions.

MR. BENNETT: A supplemental.

MR. SPEAKER: What sort of information does the Hon. Member want?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: If he wants to make a speech, he had a chance to do it during my estimates; and he didn't make a very good speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! This is question period.

MR. BENNETT: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection.

MR. SPEAKER: What is it, some further information?

MR. BENNETT: Yes, a further supplemental, Mr.

[[Page 1870](#)]

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Minister be seated for one minute, so I can determine the nature of the question?

Interjections.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: He's been given lots of time to ask his question. He should have outlined his question, and that's it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'd like to hear what his question is, to determine whether it should be asked at this time.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: If he has a further question, fine; but you don't give a supplemental when you've taken the question as notice.

Interjections.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I took the question as notice, and that's it!

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out that the normal rule is that you ask your supplementaries on return of the Minister's answer and follow it up from there? We're going to get into this problem of latitude in some cases, no latitude in others. Then I'll be accused of being partisan for not using the same rule every time. That's not fair to the Speaker, really, to put him in that position. I would prefer it if you would ask your supplementaries — and we make this a firm rule all the time...

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: ...at the time you receive your response.

MR. BENNETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, that would be fine except that this Minister has never responded during question period and never come back to the House in question period with an answer. The supplemental I have today is that this space has....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I don't think the matter was quite fair in the way the Member stated it, because I can recall in question period the Minister obtaining the floor to answer your questions.

MR. BENNETT: I don't remember.

MR. SPEAKER: I do. I recall it.

MR. BENNETT: I don't recall it.

MR. SPEAKER: I see. You don't recall it?

MR. BENNETT: No. Now I'd like to ask my supplemental, if I may, Mr. Speaker. When bringing his answer to the House, would the Minister advise us why this space has sat empty with only one person manning a switchboard? What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is whether the Minister can tell the House if it is now the intention of his department to cover up all its vacant office space by putting one person in each vacant office to answer phones because no one else is there to do it.

Interjections.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Now will you answer me a question, yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I haven't recognized the Hon. Member for a question. I think the problem I have here is that questions are being asked that are not necessarily within the responsibility of the Minister concerned. He does not operate switchboards.

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If you're saying that the Department of Public Works is the one whose jurisdiction this is under, that's one thing; but the question is not clear whether it should be directed to that Minister or not.

The Hon. Member for North Okanagan on the same subject — or a different subject?

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): A different subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I'd better recognize the Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MEETING OF COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY BODY

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to deduct the wrangling and speeches from the question period so that we get 15 minutes of questions.

I'd like to direct mine, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands, Forest and Water Resources to ask him when the last meeting of the Ministerial advisory committee to the permanent engineering board, under article 15 of the Columbia River treaty, was held. The Minister is a member of that committee.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests

[[Page 1871](#)]

and Water Resources): I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McGEER: Could I ask the Minister to take another question as notice? I thought he would have known, since he's a member of that committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we have exactly the same problem. We've got to either have a rule or not have a rule. Now, really, I don't think we should be going again into supplementaries.

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it's very difficult to apply the rules if we don't adhere to them.

MR. McGEER: I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to save the time of the House in future, to ask him to take an additional point as notice. I would have not anticipated that he would take as notice the kind of meeting which he would have attended.

AN HON. MEMBER: You never know!

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask him if he's aware that the permanent engineering board is in the process of winding up its activities. Unless the committee of which he's an adviser were to dictate otherwise, then this very valuable committee will disappear.

PURCHASE OF SKI LANDS

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, with reference to a statement regarding the appointment of Mr. Al Raine as co-ordinator of ski developments, whether this Minister has now taken over the issue of ski development in the province which was formerly under the Minister of Recreation (Hon. Mr. Radford). Specifically, the Minister is reported as having said that there might be a conflict of interests. I'd like to ask the Minister which ski development lands on Whistler owned by Mr. Raine and his wife under the company named Nancy Greene Ltd. have been purchased and for what price.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the lands have not been purchased. They are the fee simple lands, I think, near Lost Lake, which is near the foot of Blackcomb Mountain. I think they're the only fee simple lands in that particular area. The price established is one negotiated between my staff and those parties and is considerably below the appraisals carried out by the Lands department.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could I assume that no appraisal was undertaken by an outside consultant but only by the Department of Lands, Forests and Water Resources?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: It was deemed necessary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: We have outstanding qualified civil servants, some of whom we, in fact, inherited. They reviewed the question and we're satisfied that the value was substantially above what the cost would be.

MR. WALLACE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us if he, in fact, has taken over the issue of ski development which was formerly handled by the Minister of Recreation?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Certainly not. The point is that there's a significant commercial land potential that is tied to the ski facility. We see that as the function being in the commercial sphere...

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: ...so that we, at long last, get returns to all the people of the province from the Crown lands, instead of the giveaways like Cypress Bowl under the Social Credit administration.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary? The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey on a supplementary.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): Is the Minister prepared to file with this House the appraisals that he has referred to?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I'll consider the question, Mr. Speaker. The material is in the hands of the civil service. I've simply accepted their word regarding this matter.

MR. GARDOM: Well, are you or are you not prepared to file the appraisals, Mr. Minister?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I think I answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McGEER: I'd like to ask the Minister whether he's prepared to file with the House the purchase price of the land in question by the private

[[Page 1872](#)]

developers, and the purchase price by the government from those developers. We only want the two figures and we'd like to know when the Minister would be prepared to file them with the House.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): You don't know the appraisals?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think these are a matter of public record, are they not?

MR. McGEER: No, they're not. Mr. Speaker, they're not a matter of public record; the Minister has given no response.

STATUS OF GUIDE TO ALCOHOL AND DRUG INFORMATION

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question from the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams), the "Professional Guide to Alcohol and Drug Information" has

only just been made available and has been presented to the Department of Education for review. Any decision to make it accessible to schools in this or a revised form will be dependent upon that review. I think if you had noticed in the front of the book itself, from which some of you chose to pick out selected areas, it states there that they would like input from any interested citizens or groups who read it. It definitely states: "We would stress that any drug is potentially dangerous." I would also like to point out that there has been no general distribution of this guide to the schools of this province by the commission or the Department of Education. Also, I want to point out that I've met with the chairman of the commission and stressed that it's very important how this material is to be presented before we can consider using it in the schools.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to ask the Minister whether or not she met with the chairman of the commission prior to this kit being developed at quite an expensive cost.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, I have met prior but not on this one. I met on general procedures. Whenever anything is to go into our schools, I laid out guidelines that it must go through the Department of Education first. But I had not seen specifically that guide in its prepared form. I don't think it was ready at that time.

MR. McGEER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister whether in her meeting she discussed the withdrawal of the material and the rewriting of it so that it could be accurate and truthful.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I just want to repeat that we are going to do a review of it. Then, as I said, at the moment it will not go out, as far as I'm concerned, in the present form. There will be a review made of the material in the book.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary, I'd just like to ask the Minister whether or not she or anyone in government is contemplating firing those people who went ahead with this report before having the approval of cabinet on a matter which was offered to the schools of British Columbia. It's clear in the report of the Alcohol and Drug Commission that this report is available now for school counsellors; it's also clear that your department knew nothing about it. Is anyone going to be fired because of...?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the Hon. Member knows that the Hon. Minister of Education is not in charge of that commission.

CRESTON VALLEY HYDRO LINES

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources as a director of B.C. Hydro on the subject of proposed Hydro transmission lines in the Creston Valley. Can the Minister assure the House that a public hearing or public meeting, if you will, will be held by Hydro or some other government agency in the Creston area prior to any proceeding with the proposal for this transmission system?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: If my memory serves me properly, Mr. Speaker, the proposed major transmission system from the Kootenay Canal to the East Kootenays has been deferred for a considerable period of time. So if it's the major system linking Kootenay Canal to serve the east Kootenay region, that matter has been deferred for some six years, I believe.

MR. CURTIS: I wonder if the Minister would perhaps take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker, just to check into it further. I appreciate his comments this afternoon. Nonetheless, the people of the Creston Valley are very much concerned that this is still, if you will pardon the pun, a current problem. They would like some comment on it.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Hon. Member could just give us more information. If it is the major transmission line, the answer is no, it is not being actively considered.

PURCHASE OF PACIFIC WESTERN AIRLINES

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): After that electric exchange, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the fact that the chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission has announced the intentions of that commission to file a notice of acquisition in the matter of the purchase of Pacific Western Airlines by the Alberta government, I would ask him again: does the Government of British Columbia have plans to intervene in those hearings when they were held?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): The matter is under consideration, Mr. Member. I have no desire to initially oppose the development of socialism between two free enterprise parties, but the matter is under review. If they need any assistance to straighten out their approach to these things, I am certain we have enough staff to help them.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Could you kindly save it, write it down and try it tomorrow?

Orders of the day.

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

ESTIMATES: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(continued)

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

On the amendment.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): One of the reasons why this motion had to be made in the first place lay in the area of financing and the finance formula. The formula was introduced, I believe, in 1967 or 1968 by the former administration and was based on a stable economy. The finance formula projected the amounts of money that were going to be designated for educational expenditure by the province. They determined those amounts on the basis of the past year's enrolment. As such, there was always a full year's lag in the amount of expenditure that was authorized and the actual need.

The spiral of inflation has been pronounced in the last two and three years. When this Minister came into office she knew then that this formula would need some form of revision. The fact that we have had an ever-increasing number of pilgrims to Victoria with cup in hand, asking for special aid and special grants, is proof of the fact that the formula itself is not satisfactory unless we are in a stable economy. The Minister, being in full knowledge that this review was necessary, has in three years not come up with a formula that would be less discriminatory, particularly when you compare urban schools with rural schools.

I have a copy of a critique that was forwarded by School District 27 of Cariboo-Chilcotin. It was forwarded directly to the Minister, so I know that she is aware of it. There is no reason to rehearse here today the contents of this critique, which clearly spells out that the finance formula is not working in rural areas. I would like the Minister to explain before we get to the estimates what the rationale is behind trying to make a formula work which was never designed to work in an economy where costs are escalating to the extent that they have been in the last couple of years.

Perhaps the Minister could tell us in just a few minutes as it has taken to ask the question: what is the design? What is the policy? What is the forecast for the change in this finance formula? She must know it is not working. What is the forecast of change in the formula and what will those changes be?

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): I share the Member's concern. The present formula does not create equity, and actually that is another philosophical discussion we can get into, whether equity will have to

prevail.

There are some areas of the province, I think the Member would agree, where we may have to always put in extra financing. However, as you know there is no point in just tinkering with the formula — a formula which you know was created under the former government and which I know we have a responsibility for.

AN HON. MEMBER: It worked for a period.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It worked for a period of time — you are right. But I think that we know now that it is not the formula to meet the needs today.

I'm sure the Member can appreciate that to make a major change in the educational finance formula does take time because you are also going to have to tie it in with changes in assessment policy, with overall government taxation policy and with the whole very sensitive area of local versus provincial contribution to educational finance.

I think you can appreciate the fact that with all those areas to look into it is not something that one can create overnight. Now you may say we are now in our third year. All I can say to you is that it is a major overhaul involving other departments such as finance also. Our own department is right into it now and has been. We're into looking at the finance formula. We've been working with the teachers and

[[Page 1874](#)]

the trustees on it for several months now. Then, of course, we have to tie it in with the Department of Finance with reference to those other areas.

So all I can say to you is that I wish we had a new formula today but it is a major, major task which takes time to accomplish.

MR. SCHROEDER: In addition, may I ask: are there no recommendations? Is anything in the gears now that would say that there is a hope within the next two or three or four years of coming up with a revised formula — perhaps a different system of designating funds entirely? Is anything in the gears?

The Minister says that it takes time. The Lord knows that if we don't get started it will never get done.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I wish to reassure the Member that there are a number of alternatives already right before the committee. So it has gone past the stage of just sitting and saying we have a problem. We are now facing certain recommendations on alternative ways.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): I wish to support the motion, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the Hon. Minister a few questions about inconsistency — 180 degree inconsistency in both the philosophy and the administration of this government and as it relates to her Department of Education.

I am going to relate to two specific areas and both of these areas deal, Mr. Chairman, with the providing of services.

Firstly, it seems, Mr. Chairman, that the government has apparently accepted without qualification or question that education is a service that should be provided without interruption and without strikes and without lockouts. The government has inherited that concept and the government has not seen fit to amend or to qualify that concept. I'd say that in so doing the government has carried on with a long-time statutory requirement of this province that has bound the teachers, bound the trustees and bound the taxpayers. This statutory requirement and this concept has had long-time public acceptability, Mr. Chairman. That public acceptability has not waned, but I would say it is stronger today than it ever was. Education both in the philosophical sense and by law of this province is a service that is supposed to be provided without cessation and a service that is not supposed to be closed down by strikes or by lockouts.

Who agrees with that premise? Well, this is who agrees: society agrees; the teachers agree; the trustees agree;

the parents agree; and the taxpayers agree. There is universal agreement because education is the agreed necessity. So we find there has been universal agreement that the shop is supposed to be open and the job is supposed to be able to be done.

The job was being done until it was discovered by those who are in peripheral and supportive service that they could cripple the system. I say that that is not right. I say there is no reason why the maintenance personnel, the grass cutters, the boiler operators or the custodian janitors should have the privilege of shutting down the educational system which society does not wish to have shut down and which society has legislated shall be open, Mr. Chairman, and be permitted to operate and to function.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Before the Hon. Member proceeds I would remind him that matters that require legislation cannot be dealt with in committee. Secondly, you should confine your remarks to the administrative responsibility of this particular Minister. With that cautionary word I would ask the Hon. Member to proceed.

MR. GARDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed I shall confine my remarks to the administrative responsibility of this Minister.

It seems to me that it is the administrative responsibility of the Minister of Education to see that the schools in this province shall be open. I'd say that this Minister, Mr. Chairman, has committed the ultimate heresy in dodging the problem and in avoiding the issue and just gandy-dancing away from a decision. Her only approach to leadership in this point was to become a sick-bay attendant, along with the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King). All she has been practising with this very vexing problem is Micawberism, while the closure of the school system, on and off for some six weeks, was permitted by a few hundred CUPE maintenance workers, and which was engineered contrary to the philosophy of our educational legislation in this province and contrary to the desires and to the wishes of the taxpayers of this province. That is considerable inconsistency on the part of the Minister.

I'd say to the Hon. Minister that if taxpayers are required by law to pay to keep schools open, and if trustees and teachers are required by law to keep schools open and they themselves, by law, come under binding arbitration, why, by law, aren't the schools kept open and why, by law, don't all school personnel come under binding arbitration as a condition of service? That's in the public interest. It's common sense and that would bring consistency into the legislative process. I'd say that is leadership, and that is what is required. Unfortunately, that is what has been abdicated by this Minister.

The second area of inconsistency is this — it deals with another topic — I refer to the very cardinal statement in the Premier's budget, March, 1975, which, I suppose, in view of the enormous deficit of

[[Page 1875](#)]

ICBC, is going to be reviewed and revised by the Hon. Minister of Finance before this session comes to an end — but we find in this budget this statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: A deficit budget.

MR. GARDOM: As my friend says, it is a deficit budget. Indeed it is.

Interjection.

MR. GARDOM: It's not a factual budget, Mr. Premier. You know that full well. You delivered to this Legislature and to this province a budget that is not factual, and you have the capacity to know that it was not factual when you delivered it.

The statement is this: "It is our belief that it is the government's responsibility to provide basic services to all children, regardless of where these children are being educated." The great question is: to what will basic services extend? One would assume that it would extend to reading, writing, and arithmetic, but they've decided to fob that

off onto a committee of seven, comprised of six veteran Members of this Legislature of the NDP, both in opposition and in government, and the one newcomer over there, no-gun-control Jack. Six out of those seven people have talked, have considered, have caucused and have researched this question year after year after year, and all they've been instructed to do is report by August 1, 1975. The scantiest terms of reference; no promises of governmental action.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Right.

MR. GARDOM: But they could sit down and they could hand down a decision before this Legislature comes to an end. They could have some briefs; they could hold hearings before this immediate session ends. The report, Mr. Chairman, can be tabled and can be acted upon before the start of school year, fall, 1975.

What is proposed is merely a smokescreen to prevent the government from furnishing any aid by the fall of 1975 and just dangling forth a committee report as a political stratagem. There's no responsibility whatsoever upon this government to act upon any kind of a report that may be delivered by August 1, 1975. We find the committee rooms of this House, Mr. Chairman are not being used in the mornings. They could be well used by this committee starting tomorrow morning if there's a genuine interest and a genuine desire to come up with an approval and a recommendation for reform in this particular area.

I cannot believe for one minute that the proposed members of this committee do not today have the knowledge and the information and the expertise they require for this report. If they haven't got it, they certainly have been doing an awful lot of fence-sitting over the past seven or eight years. They all know there are approximately 23,000 students attending independent schools in this province and attending elementary schools and secondary schools. They know that there are about 150 independent schools providing this type of education.

They know that if these schools close their doors, the public purse would encounter a \$25 million bill this coming fall, because it is the government's responsibility to educate. They also know that the only concession of this government to the independent school system since they took power has been to say: "Yes, you can go to the federal counting house and receive some federal money for the federal minority-language programme." They just said: "Okay, you're entitled to take some of the Ottawa money off the table." Yet still today, B.C. school buses still pass by independent school children, still leave them standing in the rain. What does the government really need to have to form a committee to know about that? They already know that.

They also know right today there are available teacher aids sitting on the shelf being denied to teachers and students and children of taxpayers and citizens of this province for no reason whatsoever but the continuing and the adamant refusal of this government to shift from a stubborn and a bigoted position.

Isn't the job that has to be done one of educating? Is there any reason why the fortunate — if you'd like to put it that way - cannot share with the less fortunate, particularly when both fund that which is desired to be shared?

Look at the school board resource centres and the kind of materials they have that are denied the independent schools, which could happen this afternoon by merely the Minister saying, yes, they shall be entitled to receive these kinds of aid: 16 mm. films, 8 mm. films, 35 mm. slides, records, models, film strips, transparencies, flat pictures, audiotape cassettes, videotapes, relief maps, books, supplementary texts — and films, under these titles: "Body Defences Against Disease"; "Let's discuss Smoking"; "Girl to Woman, Boy to Man"; "About the Human Body"; "Common Cold"; "They Call it White Man's Border"; "What Colour are You?"; "The City — Heaven and Hell." There are film topics in every area: art, biology, elementary science, English, general science, health, history, home economics, industry, language, mathematics, music, primary topics, social studies, safety, teacher training and vocational-technical.

Is it too much to ask, without waiting until August 1, 1975, that these aids be made available now, today, this afternoon? Who in the heck needs a committee to reach this kind of a decisions? As the

Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. G.F. Gibson) said to me, do the right thing.

If the schools meet the standards....

Interjection.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, that's absolute nonsense. You're perpetuating the heavy hand of the state by denying these people their rightful entitlement and you know it, Mr. Premier. If the schools meet the standards, if they do the job, they should be entitled to support. There's no question of a doubt that this is enriched education, and by virtue of the fact that it is enriched education undertaken at independent request and desire under those circumstances, certainly they should be able and expected to contribute to it, but there's no reason why they should be denied the support of the state when they support the state. You have not done the right thing, and I think merely to shift this off into a committee when you have the information today, when I would suggest the mind has already been made up because the people who are on this committee are people who have considered this problem since you sat in opposition over here.... Now that you're sitting in government, why are you waiting until August 1, 1975? Are you prepared to give — since I'm getting a lot of chitchat across the floor from the Premier this afternoon, with a little more smoke than light, as usual — an unequivocal commitment, since these seem to have turned into his estimates over the Minister of Education, that the report will be acted upon for the school year commencing September 1, 1975?

HON. MR. BARRETT: What party are you running for? "Down-the-Tube Garde," they call him.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, we haven't yet received that unequivocal commitment from the Hon. Liberal as to which party he's running from, so I think I'll take the same tack.

In answer to your first question re strikes which close up schools, no one is ever happy with that situation. This government believes, of course, in abiding by the present labour relations code of the province to solve this, but apparently the Liberal Party believes in the heavy hand of centralization. If we follow through the argument of the Member who has stood up, we might as well eliminate school boards, because what he's asking is to have the Minister step in. Even without the school board saying it needs assistance, I'm to step in and interfere in their local autonomy and in their rights and responsibilities as trustees to manage the affairs of their own district. So I really think, Mr. Member, that it's quite clear now what the Liberal policy is on that: centralized government, with possible elimination of school boards. If we follow your argument to the point that you're leading us, that's all that we're faced with.

This government happens to believe in the school boards; they happen to believe in local autonomy. Whenever a school board asks for assistance from the Minister of Labour, in the case of a strike, the Minister of Labour is always ready to give that assistance.

But during the last strike in Victoria, right up to the very end we were asked by the school board to let them handle it in their own manner. If you do not abide by this, you are saying in essence: "No, you don't have your own autonomy in labour-management relationships, and I'm stepping in with the heavy hand of government." If that's your policy, we don't happen to agree with it. I don't think the school boards of the province would agree with the Liberal policy on that.

Basic education. We went through all this last night, Mr. Member. You do know that at the present time we do provide free textbooks, which is one thing, to all independent schools. You know the committee has been set up. As the Premier said, this government believes in public input. That's why this committee has been set up. You are looking at it in a very simplistic manner when you say: Why don't you do this? Why don't you provide audiovisual tapes? Why don't you provide this to the independent schools?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down! Sit down!

HON. MRS. DAILY: We believe in consulting with the school boards. Here again, you can't ignore the school boards of the province. Most of those services would have to emanate from some core, obviously a school

board centre. To just announce it is going to be done, without discussing it with the school boards, is not the way I believe in going.

The committee has a major job: to look at all basic services. You are asking us to do it in a very piecemeal, off-the-cuff sort of way. We don't intend to look at it in that manner. That is why we structured this committee.

I want to conclude by saying that, after listening to the other Liberal Members last night, particularly the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams), who said the system was in a state of disaster, it is very nice to hear the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) stand up and compliment me on the excellent programmes in the public school system which he would like to see disseminated to the independent schools.

MR. GARDOM: Just a couple of questions here, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't talking about the elimination of school boards, not once. I wasn't talking about the

[[Page 1877](#)]

elimination of trustees or teacher, I was talking about the law of the land being consistently applied. If the teachers and the trustees have to face binding arbitration which is the concept which has been accepted by society to keep the schools open, why shouldn't the maintenance men in the schools be similarly under binding arbitration so the schools can be kept open? This is the concept that you are missing. You can try to twist it as much as you wish. You've got that point; you know what the point is; you're just not reacting to it. You're not giving any kind of leadership to the province; you're just ducking.

You've developed two sets of laws: one, the law for the teacher; one, the law for the trustees; one, the law for the taxpayers — they've got to conform — but, no, the people who work in the schools and provide the supplementary services can shut down the whole system. And you say I am talking about the elimination of school boards! I am talking about the elimination of improper school closure. That's what I am talking about.

You were discussing the independent schools and what was or was not going to be provided there, and the heavy hand of the state again. Will you say to the school boards in this province today that, yes, you may provide teacher aides if you wish? Will you say to them that, yes, you may provide busing if you wish? Will you answer those questions?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It is certainly very clear there is a basic philosophical difference between the Liberals and the NDP on the whole matter of labour relations.

The teachers have chosen their way of bargaining and the other groups have chosen their system.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the law?

MR. GARDOM: The law!

HON. MRS. DAILLY: And the law, right. But the teachers have theirs.

MR. GARDOM: They didn't choose; it's the Act!

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The point is that we just have a basic philosophical difference on labour relations, Mr. Member. I am just trying to point out to you that if we did follow through to what you are saying, no question about it, you would start imposing on the local school boards at this time. Have they come to you and asked for this?

MR. GARDOM: We wouldn't be encroaching in any way.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: They haven't come to you and asked for it. They haven't come to you and asked for a change in this. I don't think you can stand up and say they have.

Will we do this or give this to the independent schools? I just have to reiterate: we believe in going, about this

thing in a proper, orderly manner, not on a piecemeal basis.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): This is the first opportunity I have had to engage in this debate, and I welcome that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Before the Hon. Member proceeds, I would like to note that the previous Members have not fully appreciated the fact that we are debating the amendment to vote 38. I would remind the Hon. Member of that.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for reminding me of the fact that we are debating an amendment to the vote of the salary of the Hon. Minister of Education to reduce her salary by \$1 as a mark and an expression of the fact that we have no confidence in the policies of this Minister of Education. I intent to direct my remarks strictly to that particular matter.

I would say this, Mr. Chairman: since the appointment of this Minister as the Minister of Education, we have had nothing but a state of constant confusion in the educational system in this province.

The Minister has changed direction so many times nobody knows what her real policy is. She has not been able to explain during the hours when this debate is taking place what her policy is — in fact, if she has a policy at all. She has talked in the last two minutes about the consultations with school boards — consultation with school boards is a laugh in this province at the present time. It's a joke.

In the last two years the Minister of Education either knowingly or unknowingly has led the school boards of this province down the garden path. She has encouraged them to innovate new programmes; she's encouraged school boards to reduce the class sizes in every class in the province, although there is a great question whether the reduction in the size of classes has anything to do with the educational standard of the students in those particular classes. She's asked every school district in the province to institute full kindergarten courses for those under six years of age; she's asked for more librarians, more teachers' aides. Then, when all of this programme is in process, she's written a "Dear John" letter to every school board in the province which says, in effect: "I'm sorry. We can't afford these new innovations. The province is only able to pay for part of them. It's up to you now to figure out how you are going to finance them."

[[Page 1878](#)]

She must have realized, in encouraging the introduction of these programmes, that it was going to cost additional funds and money. There's no question about that. We have to assume she realized this and that the educational system with these new innovations would cost more money.

At that time it was also an obligation on the part of the Minister of Education to project far enough down the trail to at least give the school boards some indication as to where that money was going to come from. After all, these programmes were foisted upon them at the insistence of the Minister of Education and now she draws back from them and says that she is sorry they are too costly and the school boards are going to have to do something to trim their budgets.

We have seen a profusion of so-called solutions to the problems of education put before us in the province in the last few years. I can name a few of them: team teaching; programmed learning; flexible modular timetables; permissive attendance and so on.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: You know when that started.

MR. SMITH: Yes, I know when it started and I am not blaming you for all of these innovations because they were part and parcel of a programme that started before you were Minister of Education. I agree. Differentiated staffing; accountability; cost fads that have been very costly to the taxpayers of the province. In some respects it's been the cart-before-the-horse-approach.

I am not blaming the Minister for all of these innovations because some of them came before her time. But let me say this: each of the innovations introduced by the Minister since she took office have been, to a great extent, costly programmes. It has given rise to the belief that the more money you pour into the system, the better the education. Well, there is good reason to believe now, as there was in previous years, that money is not the answer or the solution to our educational programme entirely.

The problem is that we are turning out of our high school system, from the grade 12 level, too high a percentage of students who are practically illiterate. They can't read properly. They can't write properly. They know nothing about the basic concepts of life that they will have to face after they leave the grade 12 level.

I have to say that for a Minister who, before she became Minister, had all the answers to the problems of education in the Province of British Columbia — in a period of almost three years she has not given to the public of this province one programme which has resulted in increasing the standards or the type of students or the programme that the students wish to have in the Province of British Columbia.

Many reports have been written about the educational system and I am only going to refer briefly to a comment made in *The Victorian* of February 21, 1975, written by one Ken Hinkins, and the headline is: "Kids Robbed of Birthright," and below that, "What In Hell Are Teachers Doing?" Now he expresses a concern that, after sitting in a class at UVic, he found that a great number of those students could not read properly or write properly. Yet here they are through the public school system, trying to go into advanced education.

Students say that because they attended classes they were given A's regardless of whether they deserved them or not, just because they didn't goof off. Is that anything to be proud of in our educational system? I suggest not.

I think the observations of Mr. Hinkins are shared by a great number of concerned parents in the province today, by a great number of concerned career educators and also by a great number of concerned students, who are more painfully aware than anybody else of the shortcomings of our educational system.

I was interested to read a short time ago a letter to the *Alaska Highway News* written on behalf of the students of the junior high school in Hudson's Hope. Do you know what that letter said, Mr. Chairman? Well, it chastized the trustees of School District 60 for not insisting that teachers return discipline and order to the classroom.

I'll paraphrase what they said because I don't have the letter before me. They said this: "We are convinced that the majority of students in this school are here to learn. We strongly object to the present practice which allows a few unruly students to disrupt the learning process of the majority."

We have to ask why that is allowed to continue in the classrooms in the Province of British Columbia.

The Minister must take some responsibility in this respect. At the senior high school level we have an increasing number of students today who are genuinely concerned that their time spent in the high school system in this province is a waste of time. It's undisciplined, undirected, uninspired, unchallenged and completely out of touch with the real world they will enter after graduation whether they go on to higher education or whether they go into vocational schools or whatever it is.

It comes now as a complete shock to these students that the educational system in this province has failed them, that they graduate from high school after spending most of their junior years there only to find out they know nothing about the world outside them or how to cope with the problems of a job in this world today.

What kind of leadership is that?

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): That came under your jurisdiction except for the last three or four

MR. SMITH: What kind of leadership is that? Someone down the line here says that that came under our jurisdiction. I suggest to you, Madam Minister, that for all the ideas that you had before you became Minister, you should have put some of them into force to improve the educational system.

I agree that the educational system is continuously changing. But that is the reason for the motion that we have before this House this afternoon: that you did not and you seem unwilling to change the educational system to meet the demands of the students of the students of this province today. They're not even concerned about what happened to their predecessors that came through the school system. What they want is a system of education which will turn them out at the high school level with some reason to believe they'll be able to fit into the process of the business world and the economic world beyond that high school level with some competence, some assurance on their part that the system has done something for them.

I've even had high school students — I think they say it seriously and conscientiously — tell me that too many of the teachers in the senior high school system today are more interested in inviting groups of students to their homes for wine and pot parties than they are in teaching and that's a....

AN HON. MEMBER: Baloney!

MR. SMITH: Okay. Disagree if you like, but these kinds of comments are becoming far too frequent from the students themselves. Not from their parents, not from the teachers, not from the educators, not from the counsellors, but from the high school students themselves who feel that they're being shortchanged by the educational system in the province. That's a sorry commentary when we have to go to the students to find out what is really going on in the system today.

No wonder we have so many people concerned with the erosion of authority, so many people who are genuinely concerned in the educational system today. We have concerned principals, directors, and district superintendents who will say frankly that they believe that they are persona non grata in the educational world of this Minister. Yet they are professional people who have been in the system long enough to know, not only the good points but also the pitfalls of the system.

There are too many indications that our educational system is failing in two major areas: first of all, in the level of performance in reading, writing, speaking and arithmetic and, secondly, in developing among students a sense of responsibility and citizenship. What are the answers? It was suggested the new panacea was smaller classes. But, tell me, what are the smaller classes the answer to? Are they the answer to raising the level of competency in the language arts, in restoring the work ethic in this province? Are they the answer to developing attitudes of courtesy and respect for others, including property, Mr. Minister — including property? I'd like to ask the Minister if she has a list of specific educational priorities, the attainment of which is dependent entirely upon the size of the class? If that is true, what are they and when will they be tabled in this House?

Studies have been made, not only in this country but in the United States, indicating that class sizes are not the answer to any problem. When are we going to establish educational priorities? Secondly, when are we going to determine the means of achieving these priorities in this province? Thirdly, when are you going to hold educational personnel responsible for implementing these priorities? Fourthly, when are you going to be courageous enough to insist that in our school system we do a few things well? It's not that we have to be all things to all students, but that we do a few things well so that we will not have a graduating class coming out of high school either this year or in future years severely handicapped and disappointed because the educational system in this province has failed them. That, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, is the reason that we have moved this vote of non-confidence in the Minister, because too many students in too many areas from too wide a cross-section of this province and the communities of this province have said to us that the educational system, as they experience it, through particularly the junior and senior high school levels, has failed them. They know it, we know it, the Minister of Education must know it and all we have asked is for her to give us her ideas of how she's going to correct it.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can see that there is a basic grain of concern threading its way through that speech that was full of generalizations. I give you credit for a very small concern there for what's happening in the system, but you couched it in completely generalized terms and I think.... Well, you are being

patronizing and you are showing basic ignorance, Mr. Member, when you make these generalized statements.

Now I want to start with one which I consider is not only showing basic ignorance, but which has done a great injustice to the dedicated teachers of this province. You made a statement in this House referring to a group of students to whom you've spoken and who suggested to you that all their teachers did was invite them to their houses for parties. Now when you make a statement like that, you are smearing every dedicated teacher in this province. I hope that the teachers of this province

[[Page 1880](#)]

pick up this statement in *Hansard*, because those are the kinds of statements that create more demoralization in the school system. The demoralization you are talking about you are encouraging with those smear statements.

Now when you talk about, "we're not happy with this Minister; there's no change," even though you couched your speech in generalizations, I obviously will have to go back over it again with some specifics. What have we done? You're concerned, as I am, Mr. Member, with producing a student out of this system who will be a good citizen, who will have basic skills, to meet whatever job opportunities they should decide to enter into, and to be adaptable. We agree basically, all of us, I think on the goals.

Then you say: "But nothing's happening." These same speeches are being made in every jurisdiction in education across Canada and the United States today, because everyone is concerned with where we're going in education, because the young people are being brought up in a society which is in constant turmoil and changing around them at all times. So when you're responsible for education, you have to be aware of what those particular changes are. You have to try to prophesy the directions to go, which makes it exceedingly difficult. However, we have not sat back for three years, as you are suggesting in your speech.

What have we done? We've been concerned about the dropouts. We have created for the first time in this province a very comprehensive work-study programme where the young people, particularly around the grade 10 level, who were becoming somewhat disenchanted with school and wondering what meaning it has for them, could go out and work in industry, in business, on farms, or in any area in which they express some interest. But the point is: we are keeping the door open so that they can come back and continue their studies.

This work-study programme has been received very well by the school boards of the province. Up in your own area — North Peace River — when I met with the mayor in Fort Nelson, and with the aldermen, to talk about the work-study programme they were delighted and said: "Well, this is good. For the first time we have a Department of Education that actually perceives the educational problems peculiar to the northern region." They said that they can't keep skilled technicians for their large equipment machinery. They keep them a few months, as the Member well knows, and then they go. So we have suggested to them that we can take some of those high school students, boys and girls, out of the high school around the grade 10, 11 and 12 levels, and these students can go into these plants and can actually work there and learn how to run this heavy equipment — boys and girls, I want to repeat. Then they can go back and continue at the same time with some of their school programmes. They were delighted because they said this was going to give them the technical labour skill which is needed and they hope it will encourage the young people in those schools, when they have completed this work-study programme, to actually stay in the north and work there.

So that is one area that has been received very well. That is trying to meet the needs of the young people today who are somewhat disenchanted by the time they get to the grade 10 level.

We have also encouraged the whole look at the restructuring of the grade system. For example, is the grade system that was imposed upon us by the Chant commission for grades 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 really workable today? So what I have said to the school boards of the province is: "You go ahead, and if you can find a restructuring grade system which you think meets the needs of your community, you have the authority from me to go ahead and move on that." So the boards across the province are meeting the needs of their local communities on their own and they are restructuring the grade system.

We have also been very concerned, as you know, about the small school. I have repeated this three times so I just want to run over it very quickly, but the Member does seem to purposely ignore these changes. Some parents say they do not want their children to go hundreds of miles away to a comprehensive school, so now we have encouraged the return of the small school, at the junior secondary level particularly.

MR. SMITH: How are you going to overcome the teaching problems in the small school?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Member, I was just talking to district superintendents about this, and I admit it is a problem. One area in which we have assisted is in the development of our teacher internship programme, and the superintendents in the northern regions are very pleased with this. The Department of Education has financed considerably this internship programme so that some of these young teachers are going up and spending a whole year in the north. Hopefully, some of them will discover that it is a good place to live. At the same time, they are working there to alleviate the teacher shortage to some degree, although at the same time they are under the supervision of a qualified teacher.

The whole area of the community college is one that the Member doesn't seem to refer to at all — the expansion by this government of the community college system. Here again is an excellent area where the young people who have left school and decide they want to go back can complete grade 12. This is a marvelous entry system for many young people who can't go back or do not wish to go back because they

[[Page 1881](#)]

are too old for the regular high school and now they can make a re-entry into the college system.

We also, as you know, have reinstitute the grade 12 equivalent exam. It can be a short cut. There are many people who have gone out into the working world and just through their own work experience and their own study find they are ready to write the grade 12 equivalency test. This means they don't have to go back to school; if they have the ability we give them the chance to write it. This has worked particularly well with the inmates of our prisons, and I am sure some of you read recently in the paper of the number of inmates who have taken and written the grade 12 equivalency and now, when they leave that environment, they are equipped with grade 12. This has been done through the encouragement of the Department of Education.

We are attempting to make basic changes in the curriculum. Your concern is that the students say that it isn't relevant. We've heard that cry for the last 10 or 20 years and it will probably continue. I don't think we will ever be able to convince all students that everything they are taught is relevant. There are certain things that have to be learned anyway, but certainly we want to encourage them to stay in school. That's why we have set up regional community curriculum committees so that there is local involvement, which your leader keeps talking about, almost implying there is none going on in this province.

Under my Ministry it has increased tremendously by the very fact that now teachers are involved in local curriculum decision-making. The parents are being invited to the schools, and I've encouraged these meetings. I think you're going to see some very interesting community programmes locally developed in the schools of our province.

Then we were talking again about the fact that students going to UVic can't read and so on, and that was one particular test given which I referred to before, but that doesn't mean that we accept the fact everything's all right. So I guess I have to repeat again that we have an assessment programme going on language arts followed by a provincial testing programme, which obviously the past government didn't come to grips with. They were responsible, basically, for what happened in the '60s. I refuse to take the responsibility for graduates or what happened in the '60s, but I certainly take the responsibility for what is to happen from hereon in, and that is why we are moving on our provincial testing programme.

You seem to suggest that when I advocated the reduction of class size I said it was a panacea. At no time did I say that. I think if you'll look back on all the public statements I've made on the reduction of the pupil-teacher ratio, I always qualified it by saying that it simply must go along with change in instructional style. It is no panacea and I

agree with the Member on that.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I wonder if, before I make a few comments, I might have some clarification. The amendment is to reduce the salary of the Minister, and there are some good reasons why I support that, but there are many other areas I'd like to talk about. Everybody who's spoken yesterday and today seems to be all over the ballpark on education and I wonder if we could have some determination as to whether we're going specifically to talk about the issues of why the Minister should have her salary reduced, and get on after that amendment vote to the more general issues of education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The point is well taken. There have been three speakers so far this afternoon. The last speaker, I might point out, was totally relevant to the amendment. I would ask that we continue that good example, and I would ask the Hon. Member for Oak Bay to speak to the amendment and leave general questions until later.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Vicious attack!

MR. WALLACE: Well, Mr. Chairman, one or two areas would relate to the amendment.

First of all, I'd like to refer to a communication which the Minister had in December, 1974, from a teacher in Terrace. The letter was labelled "personal and confidential." I don't want to identify names; I just want to find out what action, if any, was taken.

This teacher wrote a letter making serious accusations about what was going on at Skeena Junior Secondary School, and enclosed a copy of an article from a local newspaper, the *News Advertiser* of December 3, 1974, relating to some unruly incident carried out by some grade 8 students. That particular incident is not itself too important to the total issue, but within this letter the teacher, who has since herself resigned — I'd like to amplify some of her comments in a moment — made certain accusations against two individuals who are in an administrative capacity in the school system in Skeena and said that there had been harassment and intimidation, and that, in fact, three teachers had filed charges against these two administrative people but subsequently the repercussions of this episode were that one of the teachers was dismissed, and the other two harassed to the extent that one of them sought a transfer and the other one subsequently resigned.

The teacher who wrote the letter made the suggestion that a professional evaluation team be sent into the Skeena secondary school because the situation was far from satisfactory, and I gather some

[[Page 1882](#)]

similar kind of evaluation was done in the Cowichan district when the efficiency of the system was under question.

The other point which this teacher made was the very effective way in which teachers are silenced by the instrument known as the "principal's report." This letter which was written to the Minister asking for her to take action suggested that this whole influence of the principal's report should be taken into consideration in the professional evaluation that might take place. In fairness to the writer of the letter, she went on to say: "I realize I have made some extremely serious allegations, and because of this I have thought a long time before writing you. I hope you will not think I am embarking on a campaign of character assassination because of a grudge."

Now that is the portent of what this teacher felt in her own experience, and I want to mention some of the other comments made by teachers, including the one I've just referred to. But first of all, could I leave that question with the Minister: what action was taken in the light of the serious allegations? Was some investigation carried out, and is the Minister satisfied that if there were problems in the administration in Skeena Junior Secondary or in the school board related to that school, the problem has been corrected?

The other comments I will make briefly relate to points raised by teachers who feel that the system is really failing badly and that, really, it seems to be the bureaucracy that counts and not the actual peripheral part of the system which results in the teaching.

One quote I have here is from an English teacher who has taught for 20 years in Terrace. She says she is becoming distraught that: "The standard of English at the grade 9 level has been deteriorating steadily but is definitely getting worse much quicker in the last three or four years." She says: "We are probably on the second generation of non-reading television watchers." She can't even write questions on the blackboard anymore because the children not only can't write but they can't read.

The feeling expressed by others is certainly that while it is of some value to encourage children to be creative, definitely the basic skills have been neglected. I would like to refer to the Minister's answer of a moment ago when she said, quite rightly, that she is not prepared to suffer for the sins of what might have happened in the '60s. I would like to ask if the Minister feels that it is such a long, drawn-out process before standards deteriorate or before they can be upgraded.

I would like to quote a very recent example which I just checked out on the phone yesterday. We have heard a great deal about this kind of heading — the illiterates at university. This specific example relates to the students in a chemistry class at UBC. I am quoting the teacher concerned, who is professor Ray Green. He tells me that at Christmas at UBC, 50 per cent of the students failed their exams. This wasn't just in English per se; this was in physics, chemistry and other subjects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. It would appear that the Hon. Member is entering into a general discussion under the Minister's estimates. Perhaps we could dispose of the amendment and then proceed on to the consideration of the vote.

MR. WALLACE: I am busy trying to determine to what degree the Minister is negligent in dealing with this in a more hasty fashion. We have repeated statements that the trouble started in the '60s, and she is not taking the blame for that. We have now got a press release which tells us about some rather circuitous way in which various studies are going to be set up. To quote the Minister's press release.... If you'll just give me a moment, Mr. Chairman, I think I can relate my remarks to the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. WALLACE: In the press release of April 11, the Minister states: "Schools have been attacked by some and defended by others without the necessary evidence to support either claim." I am trying to support the claim that the evidence is very clearly demonstrated by teachers themselves and by universities. We have the Minister talking about an assessment programme and a pilot project in language arts. The whole press release suggests that it takes a rather detailed and lengthy and involved study to find out, first of all, if there is a problem and, if there is a problem, the dimension of the problem.

In my view, the repeated publicizing, particularly by the universities, as to what the problem is.... The case I was trying to quote, Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted, relates to one experience in UBC by the department I have quoted. When 50 per cent of the students failed their Christmas exams, largely because of the communication problem, not necessarily because of the content of the questions and answers, the university was quite understandably in a tremendous uproar. Special supplementary classes in English were started and there was doubling up in certain other classes. This same teacher at the university reports to me that in the exams of the last few weeks, the failure rate has returned to the normal average of around 7 per cent.

On investigating and on discussion with the students, the appalling situation was discovered that their capacity to read and write and to understand even what the questions were that they were being asked and being able in a comprehensive way to reply to the question was the basic problem and the reason

[[Page 1883](#)]

they had a 50 per cent failure rate.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that if the university, in a moment of panic and concern when they get staggered by this kind of discovery that the first-year students after three months of university can't

understand an examination paper and can't write enough to answer the questions but can smarten up the situation between Christmas and Easter...I just have to ask the question: why do we need all these pilot projects and language art studies, and the kind of very involved and, to my mind, typically bureaucratic approach to what is a pretty obvious problem?

Beyond that, how often do we talk in this society about the wonders of technology, the technology that creates an artificial kidney or puts a man on the moon?

Don't we have some pretty obvious basic access to technology in regard to methods of teaching our children to read and write? I don't think we need any long and involved study. We don't think we need any long and involved study. We don't need to measure precisely how bad the problem is. We just know it is mighty bad, and we know that the people in British Columbia are spending a pile of money on education and are expressing real concern as to the product from our high schools in terms of the very basic capacity to communicate through reading and writing.

So I ask the Minister if, on reconsideration, and in the light of the kind of rapid results that were obtained at UBC when one group — I don't know how many students were involved.... But there is little doubt that in that one particular example the students have been instructed over a crash-course type of programme to interpret questioning and to transmit, in turn, their own thoughts to paper. Whether this was achieved in a short time or not really isn't the point.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that children are coming out of high school with this tremendous gap in their capacity to communicate. Surely the first requirement of any educational experience is either the ability to comprehend what you are being told or your capacity to respond or take initiative in passing information on to others. I would like the Minister to comment on that.

The other area on which I would just like to touch briefly was an excellent statement made by a teacher in the interior who appeared before the committee at one stage last summer. I have the greatest respect for this teacher. She also happens to be a very loyal member of the NDP. She quoted the White Paper in its particular reference to the supportive role of administration to classroom activity. This is another reason why I have to support the amendment: in my view, the educational system, as this lady pointed out, is a hierarchy, and the higher up you get in the hierarchy, the more power and authority is in the hands of administrators, with an increasing limitation of any kind of real authority or capacity to introduce initiatives on the part of the actual teachers.

The White Paper infers that the role of administration is one of support of the classroom activity, but the position this teacher — and, I know, many other teachers — holds is that the people in the superior positions in the hierarchy actually direct the work of those under them. They don't support the work of the teacher in the classroom; they direct. There is a very big difference.

This particular teacher makes the point that there should be a more efficient method of distributing the responsibility to make decisions, and that this would put more real authority in the hands of the teacher in the classroom. I wonder if the Minister would care to give us some evidence that there is, in fact, greater policy on her part to give teachers the initiative, the incentives, the capacity to take initiatives, for example, in the choice of books.

One of the points raised by another teacher is that you get dumped with your new books in late August or September, and you go ahead and start teaching from the new books. And if, in the course of three months, it turns out that these particular changes in textbook are unsuitable, the teachers have very little opportunity to have any say in this. By the time the books are presented to the teacher, it is too late to make any substantial changes.

The whole question of the silencing effect that I mentioned to you by the principal's report; I wonder if the Minister is prepared to do anything to try and make certain that this influence in the system is not one such as to silence a teacher who may have ideas and initiatives in a classroom or in a school which are not suitable to the principal's ideas, and therefore the teacher has the choice of either stifling her own ideas and initiative or running the risk of antagonizing the principal.

What incentives does the Minister offer to teachers to develop new courses and new techniques and new

materials? This teacher said to me: "If you work out new ideas now you have to do it in your own very scarce time, and often you get criticism from colleagues who don't like to be shown up by someone else who is prepared to put in more time than they are." Is this a valid criticism? If it is, then it is a tremendous reflection on the inhibiting effects that can be applied against the teachers.

This teacher goes on to say:

"There is no one in the school who has the time to take an interest in the actual science of teaching. All the extra people in the system are busy administrating, disciplining and counselling."

This teacher asked me to find out where the new courses are invented. She just knows that they are

[[Page 1884](#)]

thrust at the teachers in September of the teaching year.

"(They) never have an opportunity to study or use the books ahead of their introduction to the pupil. By the end of the year, when you find out that some of the books are no good, the school district has already bought a great lot."

I'd like to hear from the Minister: Who actually buys the books? Who selects the books? Again, since the Minister frequently, in opposition, talked-about the collegial approach, a greater distribution of decisions-making, and the participation of teachers and students and parents, I wonder if she would care to make some comment on the question of books and the opportunity of teachers to get a look at the books before they're actually introduced or approved for the teaching.

One of the last points I'd like to ask the Minister, in relation to criticisms that have occurred, is on the possibility of having a continuous school year so that staff changes would be made throughout the year and the change for the children would not occur all at one time and be traumatic. The teacher wouldn't have to spend the first two months getting the kids back in shape after the summer holidays. Has there been any thought given to the fact that holidays could be taken at times appropriate to the local situation in regard to the local job market, parents' holidays, farm production schedules and matters of this sort? Isn't this the kind of initiative and innovation that the Minister was always suggesting would be listened to carefully and acted upon by government.

Last but not least, in relation to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the reason that some of the unfortunate dismissal decisions have been taken by the Minister relate in the first case to lack of delivery or lack of performance, and the second in much the same way within a six-month period but for somewhat different reasons. Does it not seem contradictory Mr. Chairman, that here we have the Minister two and a half years or more in office, who was seeking exploration and dialogue on the educational system, dismissing to highly educated professionals for their performance? Here we are two and a half years down the road, and the Minister herself has made very little in the way of change based on the studies and the commissions that were supposed to be carried out.

To be more specific, since the Minister is quite entitled to have specific questions in relation to the accusation that she hasn't done much, I'd like to ask, for example, what has happened within her department to the report *Teacher Education in British Columbia*? The Minister and the Premier accused Mr. Bremer, for example, of being a bit of a flop. Yet among other things, I have here a document which hasn't seen much publicity, entitled *Teacher Education in British Columbia*.

For the value of the House it should be pointed out that this was a committee on teacher education which was set up in the fall of 1973. A meeting was held at which 75 briefs were presented. This thick report was finally the outcome of the deliberations. There were some very substantial recommendations presented on June 27, 1974. I won't take up the time of the House to repeat the recommendations; there are a substantial number of them.

That was in June, 1974. If there was some lack of performance by these professional people who were set up to do the job, here's one very tangible, visible report on the very vital matter of teacher education. I just wonder if the Minister would tell us what has happened to that one.

In my other hand, we've got the report which has seen a lot more daylight, called *Towards the Learning Community*, which is the working paper on the community colleges in British Columbia. I've noticed piecemeal announcements by the Minister about certain parts of the college system. But the fact of the matter is that this report is a very comprehensive one under several headings; there must be a total of about 100 recommendations. Could the Minister, perhaps, in response tell us to what degree action is being taken, or will be taken, on the outcome of the report on community colleges.

I know that B.C.'s school trustees are very concerned about teacher training. If I had more time I would have liked to quote some of the statements I've collected from other teachers who feel that the universities are doing an appalling job of trying to provide appropriate and useful training for graduates who are choosing to go into the teaching profession. In fact, teacher training and teacher certification and teacher discipline are all subjects that I know the trustees are very concerned about.

I'm glad, at least on one point, that the Minister has postponed until further meetings with the parties concerned any consideration or action on the proposed teaching Act which was put forward by the B.C. Teachers Federation. If it's any crumb of consolation to the Minister, who is getting hammered from all directions, at least we can agree on some things. I would agree that we must approach the matter of a professional teachers Act with the greatest of care and caution, particularly if, in conjunction with such a proposed Act, the B.C. Teachers Federation continues to insist on compulsory membership of every teacher before he or she can teach in this province. The Minister well knows that we're strongly opposed to that. If, in addition to that, the Minister should make the mistake of giving the teachers complete internal control of training, certification and discipline when they also have the capacity to take away union membership, then I think this would be an absolute

[[Page 1885](#)]

catastrophe in this province. The last point I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman, is: what is the future organization and elective representation to be in relation to regional colleges in British Columbia, and would she give us some...? Did you want me to repeat that? I'm wondering, what the future planning is as to the organization of regional colleges and elected representation on the boards of regional colleges. In other words, what is the Minister's response, to the report towards the learning community?

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, the Member has brought up a number of questions here, and I'll try to deal with them — hopefully not leaving out any of them.

The first one you mentioned was your great concern over what had happened in a district in this province with reference to some unfortunate situations between administration and teachers. Those are the concerns which come over my desk and which, I may say, I give most attention to. They are basic to the whole system. If you have a demoralization setting in between teachers and administration, it's a bad scene. I think this is what I was trying to say to the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) yesterday. When I said to the teachers of the convention, "Are you principals" — I was also speaking to the principals — "responsive to the teachers in your district?" — these were the messages I was trying to give out to them. And what do we do about it?

You referred to the question of whether there couldn't be a professional evaluation study team, similar to Cowichan. I want to point out to the Member that that was done by the BCTF. They were the ones who set up that team, and we were very pleased to have it done. They sent their own peers in to evaluate, which I think in your own profession you would appreciate. If I recall correctly, I think that my reaction to this letter was the same thing. I think this is a matter where their own peers should be very firmly involved. I suggested that this be handled through the B.C. Teachers Federation and discussed with them. At this time I have no further comment on this, but I'm glad you brought this one to my attention. I'll see what progress has taken place there.

You were concerned that we hadn't done anything about this hierarchy which exists in the school system. When I was speaking to the teachers, I said that my main concern was with relationships within the hierarchy. You always get down to human relationships. However, we concede that if there are hierarchical, shall we say, restrictions which are causing unproductive work from teachers, then you have to look at what those restrictions are. So what we have done, Mr. Member, since you ask specifically, is that, as you recall, last year legislation was passed

regarding district superintendents — that they must consult with their staffs in making major educational decisions. This was certainly a very specific move towards increased consultation by the staff members and the teachers. I would also like to tell you that the department is at present examining the whole role of the principals within the school system, and there could be something possibly coming out of that very shortly.

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

I've always encouraged staff committees within the system. I feel that staff committees are beginning to spring up around the districts. More and more principals are involving themselves closely with staff committees.

Now you mentioned also that you were concerned that teachers said they get new books thrust upon them. First of all, there's been a tremendous improvement, I know, certainly since I taught a very long time ago, in the matter of the supply of books and the great variety of books given to teachers. You just walk into a classroom today and look at the great variety of books which are presented to teachers to choose from. I think in that area there has been great improvement.

Your other question was: how do you get new books, new courses designed? We have teacher curriculum committees, the names suggested by the teachers federation themselves, which work with the department people. These are working all year round, so teachers themselves are responsible for input into new courses.

Also, I do want to make this clear: when those new books are sent out to the districts and to the teachers, there is what we call a first-year period when the books are examined and used almost on a pilot basis by the teachers. The teachers are asked to give their input into desirability of this new book. There are workshops on the uses of the guides which go with those books. I can assure you that those books are not just dumped on the teachers. There is a lot of prior work done, and then work and discussion is done after on whether the book is suitable or not.

You made a point that the faculty of English at one of the universities was able to take a group of students and very quickly bring them up to standard. Then you said: why can't you do the same thing quickly? Well, after all, they are dealing with under 1,000 students in this particular case and I am responsible for over half a million. I am sure you appreciate the fact that the same pattern can't be immediately transferred onto 500,000 public school students.

We are not doing an assessment to say: is there a problem? We are going much further than that. We are asking the teachers to pinpoint the goals they

[[Page 1886](#)]

have and to tell us what problems they see in basic standards. Following that, in the fall, there will be a specific testing programme. Out of that testing programme we will be able to decide where we must move in curriculum changes.

I know you cited cases where the standards are low. On the other hand, someone just gave me a clipping the other day from the North Vancouver school board which showed that the North Vancouver high school students in one school had scored in the highest in their English standards across Canada. I am not saying in any way that this means that it is good. But I think it is interesting to look at that school and find out why.

Principals' reports. You are concerned about the manner in which they are made in isolation from the teachers. We have made specific changes here just recently in regulations. I will ensure that Members who are interested shall have copies. These are basic regulation changes where the teachers must get an opportunity to participate in the evaluation report made on them by the principals.

New courses. I discussed that with you on curriculum.

You mentioned the continuous year. It is interesting, There are two school districts that have tried this. The biggest problem they run into is the parents. The parents object to it. Parents say: "I don't want mine going in the summer." The two boards that have honestly tried to move this in have had to withdraw because of not getting

enough support from the parents of the district.

I can assure you that dialogue is still continuing on this. I am sure there is some board that is going to be able to break through on this. You can appreciate the fact that if the parents don't support this, it is very difficult to impose it. But because of this, we have expanded our summer school programming so the schools can be used more in the summer. We have made major changes, I believe, to cut down on the fee structure and to encourage more students to partake of the benefits of the summer school programme.

Teacher education. I am sure you are aware that book you held up there refers to a conference that started almost a year and a half ago. We funded the production of the material that was to come out of it. I have been waiting patiently for over a year and a half for the results of that conference which just arrived, I believe, about two days ago. I'm not knocking the people responsible. But when you ask me what we have done about it, I say that we just got it; we just received it.

Interjections

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No. That was the preliminary one. We are talking about the final. That was an interim report. Then they asked for more funds — am I correct? — to produce the final report. That is what I have been waiting for. That has just arrived on my desk.

In the meantime, we have moved because we feel teacher education is so important. We are glad to have that material. We are sending it to the joint board of teacher education, which is already functioning and which has trustees, teachers and parents on it. They are going to get that report and they are going to use it.

I want to tell you, I am very pleased with what this joint board of teacher education is already doing. They are moving right in. They are suggesting to the faculties areas where they see there should be basic changes in teacher training.

Speaking of the faculties, I want to make this point. Remember that the faculties of education and particularly the faculties of English, which have been knocking the high school graduates, have a certain responsibility too, I am sure you would agree. They are responsible for training those teachers.

MR. WALLACE: That's their main problem.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Right. Therefore, those are the areas that this joint board of teacher education is working on.

You asked what had happened with the community college report. I am glad you picked that one. That community college report has had more action forthcoming from it by my department than any other report ever produced. Let's look at some of them.

One of their major recommendations was that we establish community colleges in the regions of the province where there are none. I just announced in Courtenay last weekend that following the setting up of four advisory committees in those four regions — East Kootenay, the northwest, the northeast and northern Vancouver Island — I am ready to recommend to cabinet the establishment of community colleges in those areas. There is a concrete, major move out of that report.

They also recommended a study on college financing, which is now taking place in my department. Out of it came a suggestion of a review of the whole lower mainland college organization, and, as you know, just recently — in fact, just two weeks ago, I believe — we had a press conference in which we released the March report, a far-reaching report on what should happen to the growth of the community colleges in the lower mainland. I think that of all reports that is one report where you can see very definite action in a very short time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I would like to call to your attention that we are debating the amendment as to whether this Minister's salary

should be reduced or not reduced by \$1. I would ask you to confine your remarks to that area.

MR W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to deal with the amendment, which is a non-confidence motion in the Minister, and I would like to deal with the very specific areas of failure of this Minister and of this party as government — failures of programmes they advocated while they were in opposition and programmes they advocated in an election. In fact, education, a major issue during the 1972 election, helped elect this government, yet it is one of their major failures.

The first area of failure of this Minister is the priority of the Education department for allocation of government funding, and the priority Education has as a department in relation to other departments. When a decision is made between two or three different departments, Education always becomes the loser. I would like to point out that if Education is a priority, it certainly would be reflected as being No. 1 in the allocation of funds from the budget. Yet we see, although Education was given 28 per cent of the funds from the budget in 1970, 31 per cent of the total budget in 1971, 32 per cent of the budget in 1972, that growing percentage of the total tax dollars has decreased to 23.6 per cent in 1975. Now that's not an increase and that's not making education a priority. That, in fact, is pointing out the failure of the Minister of Education to sell the educational programme to the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) and even increase that 32 per cent we had achieved by 1972. Instead, we have had the percentage decrease steadily, and today in 1975, it is at one of its lowest levels in many, many years.

Not only is that lack of priority indicated in the allocation of funding, but even where we have disputes or jurisdictional claims between departments.... I know that educational facilities suffered in my own School District 23 in the construction of a new high school in Westbank in which a decision of the Highways department to hold up construction of the school complex that was being built adjacent to and in correlation with a community recreation complex has delayed the opening of the high school. Indeed, there was a period when, because of the Highways department having more clout, they held up the construction of the high school so that those Westbank students in the high school who have been on shift last year and the year before will continue to be on shift far beyond the projected start and finish of the new high school. Again, Highways had a greater priority with this government than Education and was able to hold up the construction of the school. All this was to do with the jurisdictional dispute and the location of a road, and construction didn't take place on the initial forecast.

The Minister has failed to deal with the very real problem of equality of education in recognizing independent schools. It is not enough to say that other governments haven't done it. Independent schools and their problems are a fact in this province. In many areas, such as in northern B.C., they educate up to one out of three students in independent schools. Yet this Minister, although the leader and Premier talks about being concerned with their problem, refuses to press within her caucus or cabinet or party the recognition of the needs for financing.

Interjection

MR. BENNETT: The Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) says that our party changes quickly. Our party changed at convention, and I am happy to say that I helped lead the change. I have a personal commitment and always have had. I always have had a commitment towards recognizing independent schools. Our members at convention voted on that resolution and passed the resolution not only at one convention, Mr. Chairman, but at two conventions — the convention of 1973 and the convention of 1974.

I know the Minister of Education is more interested in what our convention does than the NDP is because she recognizes who will be looking after the interests of education after the next election. But this, Mr. Chairman, is another failure of — after pleading sympathy, always sympathy and always telling the independent schools that help is on the way — delivery when the opportunity of power and the opportunity to give direction and help came to the Minister. As the opposition critic, this Minister criticized the last government, and in some instances probably correctly, over failures in the education system. But here again, besides a declining priority for education we have a group of students, the independents going to independent schools, who are being penalized.

I ask and advocate to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that in recognizing her failure in this area,

why is no attempt made to expand the school districts and local autonomy to include the independent schools, maintain those characteristics and those programmes that keep them separate, but involve them and give them representation on school boards, guarantee their property and their autonomy, guarantee their teachers, bring them under the umbrella of an expanded educational system and give them not just token finance, but give them full financing? That's the second area of failure of this Minister and two of the reasons why there is a non-confidence motion and an amendment to her estimates, because we express the lack of confidence that the public has in this Minister and in this government in recognizing the needs for education.

It's easy to continue to talk about specific programmes and areas because education is

[[Page 1888](#)]

controversial everywhere and we don't see the results of education, as the Minister has pointed out, for many years. But we can see the immediate attitudes of government, and the Minister has shown us clearly that she has not been able to sell the education priority to either her cabinet or her caucus, because we've seen the declining amount of the percentage of revenue since this government took office — a decline from 32 per cent of the total taxes to 23 per cent — and that, Mr. Chairman, would indicate very clearly and would be reason enough to have a non-confidence motion and a vote against this Minister and against this government's educational policy.

The third area was the commitment of this Minister and her government to take the educational tax off property. The very same property owners and homeowners who have children who are going to the schools, who are concerned about the quality and the equality of education, are also the ones who were promised tax relief. In fact, that education tax would be taken off property and, of course, we have seen a programme that hasn't taken tax off property. We saw a grant introduced last year, which we called "son of homeowner grant," which was expanded this year but will, in fact, not take the property tax off education or the educational tax off property. In fact, most people in this province will be paying more for education this year than last year, and the Minister and the government have failed to meet this commitment they made not only in seeking office, but a commitment they made while they were in office.

Here we have a government that's seen its revenues double while they've been government, revenues that have risen from \$1.5 billion to over \$3 billion, and yet we see them giving less of that money as a percentage to education. We see them unable, with those revenues, to meet their commitment to take the education tax off property. We see the homeowner with children, who already has a high cost of educating and raising a family, paying more and more of the cost. We see the Minister setting a programme for school districts about reducing the pupil-teacher ratio and then locking those school districts into the programme and not giving additional aid this year. We see the costs for education soaring. We see the cost to the homeowner soaring in British Columbia.

You know, the average B.C. municipality is going to face an increase in the mill rate of between 9 and 12 mills this year, and the Minister, on average, has said that the educational provincial tax rate will be 7.15 mills. You add to this the increase in tax our poor homeowners will pay because of the tax increase to meet general expenditures in the municipalities and the new 1.17 for the assessment authority, and our homeowners are not having their taxes reduced, they're having them increased in every area.

This Minister made a commitment and broke that commitment, but, in breaking it, and with the ad hoc type of financing she did with the Education department last year creating policy and financing on the steps of the Legislature, she locked school districts into a reduction of the pupil-teacher ratio and then withdraw the support this year to help them continue to finance to meet that programme.

In fact, the Minister, and this is the fourth area, has helped to destroy the equality of cost of education in this province through her very lack of direction, or her indirection.

Let's take a look at what's happened to her pupil-teacher ratio of 19. In Grand Forks it will cost 37.8 mills in 1975; to achieve the same in Kamloops it will cost 50 mills. To achieve the same rate in Merritt it will cost 29.7 mills. In Nechako to achieve the same rate...a pupil-teacher ratio of 20-to-1 will cost 55 mills. Not only do we have a higher cost for education on the homeowner, a cost burden that the property owner in the province can't meet any

more, not only do we have another commitment broken, but we also lose the general equalization that should take place throughout the province. This has been a failure of this Minister and a failure of the government.

We've heard the Minister talk about new programmes and new directions. Yet we've seen the indecision and lack of control in her department, particularly when the Premier had to fire her first consultant on television. Then the research and development department that was going to open up the brave new horizons for our children, of course, is fired by the Minister. We have a White Paper that's done nothing. We've seen that the only bold act of the Minister was to decree from Victoria that authority could no longer be trusted to the individual teacher or the individual schools. She would make the decisions on authority and how it was to be administered or what authority was to be removed.

Today we have complaints in different communities, as I travel the province. In fact, I had one from a hockey coach who is dealing with 15- and 16-year-old boys — a difficult age. I have some that age myself. At a time when they may need some intermediate form of authority, the teacher doesn't have it. In one case most of a hockey team individually had been asked to leave school. They're being denied an education because there is no other step the teacher can take.

I'm not saying that a teacher needs to use the strap. I'm saying that the Minister made a decision because she doesn't trust the local school board or the school or the teachers to make an individual judgment. We have the procedures, or should have the procedures, if any teacher abuses any method of authority. For the Minister to decree from Victoria, as she is wont to do, that she knew best.... She has

[[Page 1889](#)]

created a situation of no alternatives that shows her disregard for the individual ability of a teacher to make a decision in regard to authority. In fact, it is almost a contempt for the ability of the teachers to adequately maintain order in their classrooms. I find that shocking.

So we have, Mr. Chairman, without going into all of the programmes, real or imagined, without going into whether the children can spell or can't spell, areas of very specific promises that were made and broken. We have the very real situation of the homeowner paying a higher and higher cost for education in this province. We have the situation where there is not equality between different communities and school districts. We have the situation of confusion in the department — acknowledged confusion — and a lack of direction by the Minister. We have the fact that when there is a jurisdictional dispute, another department can slow up the construction and the provision of school facilities.

Mr. Chairman, it should be obvious that this amendment was not brought in frivolously but that it accurately reflects the feeling of not only the opposition but the people of this province, both in the ability of the Minister and the ability of the government to meet its promises. The Minister has failed; the government has failed. I support the amendment.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It's very interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition finally in person make the statements that I know he's been making across the province. I often follow along where he has been. It's very interesting because he makes this statement about education being in chaos and that the Minister is a disaster. Following making his statements, it's interesting to note that local newspapers immediately have a reaction from teachers and from parents who say: "We don't agree with him. The system is not in a disaster." I think it's good. The more you go out and make those statements, the more compliments come back the next day in the paper; so carry on, Mr....

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No! Compliments to education, not to me. If the education system is held up, and if the Minister is given credit for something, it reflects and helps the students of this province. That's what we're concerned about.

You talk about priority.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILY: You talk about priority; that's all you referred to. "The Minister is not getting enough money." I'm very proud of what I have received from the Treasury Board of this province for education in this province. Do you know why I'm proud? You just have to look at the schools of this province to see the effects of the money which this government has put into education since we came into office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. DAILY: In 1969 the percentage growth figure in direct grants to school districts under your government at that time was 17.5 per cent. In 1970-71 it dropped 12.1 per cent — direct grants from the provincial government. In 1971-72 percentage growth of direct grants to school districts — now this is exclusive of the homeowner grant — was 8.9 per cent. In 1972-73, 9.9; in 1973-74, the time we came into office, 17.2 per cent growth in direct grants to school districts; in 1974-75, 20.77 per cent; and this year, 1975-76, the coming fiscal year, 27.10 per cent growth in direct grants from this government to school districts.

Now I concede that there are still out there areas because, as we discussed with the other Members....

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILY: I agree, and he made a good point. There is inequity in the financing, and the whole system — the assessment system, which I know is being looked at under the Minister of Finance's property taxation, including the finance formula — all has to be put together to remove these inequities. Our government has done whatever is possible to try and erase the inequities as well as we can, particularly with our supplementary grants this year.

I think all you have to do when you talk about priorities is to look at the situation in 1975 in our classrooms compared to what it was under the former government when they left office in 1972. Class sizes have been reduced by three, which means that this government, to do that, has put in over \$60 million, along with the local taxpayers, in the area of teacher salaries. And there is classroom construction, the construction of gyms and libraries, \$20 million for supportive services, more money for the native Indians, innovative grants — money provided for research and development grants. When I move around the province I find that those demands are there. People want them, and we are meeting them as well as we can at this particular time.

The interesting thing about the leader's speech, which seems to permeate all his speeches in the House, is that while he can criticize, I still don't know what his policy is. I want to know how much you are willing, as a government, to spend on education. We haven't heard it yet.

[[Page 1890](#)]

Interjection

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, you're making the statement, not him, on this area. You can't have it both ways. You can't be protecting....

MR. BENNETT: I've read your old speeches.

HON. MRS. DAILY: Well, I'm glad you read them. You probably had to read them to learn something about education. (Laughter.)

The point is, Mr. Member, that you have to look at the situation which exists now in this province compared to what we inherited from your government. Teachers, trustees and parents would not want to go back to that system that they had under your government — ever.

MR. BENNETT: Aw, you've broken every promise.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Promises! I am proud to stand on any platform at any time and go through the promises which I personally made on behalf of my party on education, and list them. I can show you our platform and I can show you how many have been achieved.

Removal of the capital referendum.

Removal of the operating referendum.

Restoration of bargaining rights to teachers.

School taxation removal grants, which have been brought in.

Interjections

HON. MRS. DAILLY: And we know that in a time of inflation....

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I'm willing to level with the public. In a time of inflation this government has done whatever it can to relieve the local taxpayers at this particular time, but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett)....

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. There is a Member speaking.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I know, must find it highly embarrassing when he travels around the province and sees what has been accomplished in the last three years, and looks back to what was facing the taxpayers of this province, the children of this province, if his government had been perpetuated.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): It's embarrassing to see how much they hate that government over there!

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief question for the Minister, and I'm following on some things I said last night, things that were very eloquently put by the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) this afternoon.

Interjection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, you were not interrupted when you were speaking. Would you let this Member speak, please?

MR. GIBSON: I'll defer to anybody who wants to carry on that dialogue there, Mr. Chairman.

The question is to the Minister on this question of the committee that is going to study the provision of basic services to the independent schools. That committee was mentioned in the Premier's speech on the budget. He said this: "It is our belief that it is the government's responsibility to provide basic services to all children, regardless of where these children are being educated."

Mr. Chairman, that is a good and proper statement of policy. But when is it going to be clothed in reality? I ask this Minister just a simple question: do "basic services" include classroom instruction? That's a very simple question. Common sense would tell you that basic services must include classroom instruction, because that is the

basic service. But unfortunately common sense is not always a guide to the actions this government is going to take.

I ask from the Minister a precise answer. Do "basic services" include the most basic of all services — classroom instruction?

Since the Hon. Minister is sitting right next to the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) who made that statement in his budget speech, I am sure that she can clarify that fundamental question for this House right now.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think this is the third time. I cannot clarify it any more than by saying the committee will be meeting. It will be making its recommendations. The Premier set a deadline of August 1. How can I possibly answer those questions until the committee entrusted with looking into this makes the recommendations?

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Chairman, I can't believe that this government is going to set up a committee on

[[Page 1891](#)]

basic services without knowing what basic services are. Of course they know what basic services are. I'm just asking for a specific admission that basic services includes classroom instruction. It's very simple. Either that, or the government's so confused in its priorities that it doesn't understand what it's doing in this field any more than in the other fields it's bungling around in.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): This debate is a good opportunity to say a few words on the financing of education, and I have some material here which is technical so I will be referring to notes on occasions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hopefully on the amendment, Mr. Member?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Yes, of course, because financing, I think, is a very fundamental area where this Minister has lost my confidence, I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman, wholeheartedly that educational finance is an area absolutely foursquare within this non-confidence motion.

We know that the school boards are facing the effect of inflation and we have always held in this party, as has the NDP, that education is an investment in the future; one that pays dividends in terms of the money invested in it. We would not believe, or we would hope that we would not be led to believe by the Minister's replies, that this government is so cynical, or has been so cynical, as to give extra money to encourage the reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio — a reduction about which this Minister has boasted frequently — and then refuse to follow up, thereby saddling the province's school districts with greatly increased costs.

Let me give you one example. The district which received \$100,000 last year under this programme — which would not be a large district; a relatively small district — would have to budget \$250,000 to cover the cost of those teachers hired under that supplementary programme last year. This points out that the supplementary grant given last year was to cover only the four-month period, and the school year, as we know, is budgeted over a 10-month period.

The Minister has announced now \$21.7 million in supplementary grants for the year, together with \$3.8 million to assist school boards who had the unforeseen enrolment increases, and the needs of special classes after September of last year, but the Minister has given — and I strongly object to this — no clear indication as to who can expect this supplementary money and how much. Nobody knows whether they can budget on the strength of it.

Now the Minister mentioned in Prince George that if the school trustees of the province budgeted to maintain their existing programmes and existing staffing levels plus such additional programmes as were "absolutely necessary," the government would "make every effort" to ensure that no district would find that its mill rate increased "drastically out of line with the overall average increase for all other districts in the province."

Well, I feel that the Minister should stop tantalizing the school boards in the manner that she is doing. I think that it's time that we got from this Minister, and from this government, the type of government to which the NDP was pledged when it was in opposition.

So far as I am aware, no official of the Department of Education has indicated to any individual school board whether it can expect a supplementary grant or no. I'd like the Minister this afternoon to tell us in specific terms how these grants are going to be allocated.

For example, can a board whose budget was approved after the review was arranged, as a result of correspondence to all secretary — treasurers on January 27, and which is now above the provincial average, be assured that it will receive supplementary grants to bring its mill rate to the provincial average increase? Will the Minister make that commitment? How much above the average must it be before these grants come into effect?

Now I know at the present time, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that school boards are bewildered. They simply don't know. For example, the letter sent to them a few days ago by Mr. I. Vallon, the department superintendent of financial services, accompanying their budget, which said: "Also enclosed is a copy of a news release made by the Hon. Minister of Education regarding the 1975 provincial grants to school districts which should be of interest to your board," they'd like to know whether that statement is an indication that the board receiving the letter was eligible for a supplementary grant, or was this simply sent out to everyone. Now it's time the boards had the answer to that question.

I think the Minister also has a duty to speak out on this subject. Otherwise, she's doing a disservice to the schools, to the students, and to the school boards which are forced into a final bit of cheese paring on their budgets, the budgets which are already approved by the department, and thereby reducing programmes because they do not know whether this Minister is going to share the supplementary money with them.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Minister will want to comment in detail on this because I think it's time we knew how this money is going to be carved up. It's time the school boards had a chance to budget with the full knowledge of the resources available to them. Before I take my seat I would like to spend a moment or two on a couple of other matters in

[[Page 1892](#)]

educational finance.

The Minister has said on a number of occasions that she intends to make changes in the archaic financial structure facing education in British Columbia. But I note in *The Province* of March 25, which I have in my hand here, that she is quoted as saying that while she will make no commitment on changes she realized that "the entire B.C. financial structure will have to change before many of the underlying problems can be eliminated." Well, I hope there's going to be a serious examination, Madam Minister, of this problem and that the Minister and her officials, Mr. Chairman, are developing proposals which can rectify differences in the current formula.

I would like to say a word or two about the current formula — in particular, whether they will recognize the fact that different cost levels and economic disparities between districts are not recognized in the basic education programme at the present time and that above the basic education programme a district's ability to institute new or additional programmes is dependent on the dollar estimate per pupil. I would suggest that a number of changes should be made in the formula currently in existence. I think these are very necessary changes. The instructional unit concept, of example, is a reasonable device but it needs modifying both as to the method of determining the number and the value of the unit. A new method might be to divide the pupil-teacher ratio accepted by the government in the actual enrolment as of October 31 of any year.

I wonder whether the Minister will comment on that proposal from us or constructive change in this archaic system of grants. A method similar to the present one could determine the value of the unit and this could then be adjusted across the board by an amount equal to changes in the cost-of-living index. Perhaps the Minister would comment on that specific policy proposal for change. Individual districts would then have their values adjusted by multiplying the provincial unit by the ratio of the average teacher salary in the district as of October 31 and the average teacher's salary in the province as of the same date. This would take into account these local differences which are a major bone of contention.

Of course, you would have to have, Madam Minister, separate additional allowances for improved transportation and health services. That would still be needed and you would still need special allocations to districts with special and peculiar problems or needs. But this would be the only area where such supplementary grants would be needed. The value of the instructional unit would take into account both the cost of living and salary variations which vary so widely, depending upon the average years of experience of teachers within a district. This has been referred to, I know, by the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) and the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams), both of whom have this specific problem within their schools districts.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Okay.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Okay, agreed? Fine. Well, that's fine. The Premier and Minister of Finance agree to these proposed changes.

Let's deal with the capital side. The capital side is a disaster area. I have that reference in *The Province* where Peter Bunn of Victoria, a former NDP candidate, I believe, and a director of the B.C. School Trustees Association, says that the delay on the capital side doubles the cost of construction in the school system. He talks about the 51 steps that the school board must take before a school can be completed. The steps involve 20 individual approvals from the education department, three actions by the Provincial Treasury Board, and one approval by the Insurance Corp. of British Columbia. This lengthy procedure which Mr. Bunn talked about and described as being "labyrinthine" raises building costs and delays, and means that "facilities are not available on time even though the demand for them can be predicted several years ahead." Now if that isn't an archaic structure, I don't know what is.

I know that Mr. Bunn has the interest of education at heart and I heartily endorse his views to the Minister, because in three years we really haven't progressed at all in this area of capital construction. I think there should be immediate approvals through departmental channels following agreement by the department and the school district that have been assessed of such construction. The obstruction we have now is unnecessary, Madam Minister, and it is a very adverse reflection upon hard-working school boards. Departmental permission to proceed with the project should be at a minimum. It would cut down a costlier department, among other things. No approval should be required following approval of sketch plans until the department receives notification of tenders. If one of those tenders is within the allocated approved amount, approval should be immediate. We are recommending a straightforward simple policy change in the second area of educational finance and I trust the Minister will accept this.

I would like to know what steps the Minister has taken to change the finance formula in British Columbia. Does she approve of the concept of having education financed out of general revenues, as is the case with other public services? Does she approve of that?

Does she recognize the fact that grants for the basic programme do not recognize regional disparity, geographical location, social injustice or variations in costs for the provision of basic programmes? Does she acknowledge that in order to raise the same revenue

[[Page 1893](#)]

for education, the district with the lowest taxable assessment has a mill rate six times higher than the district with the highest taxable assessment? Therefore the individual property owner pays more for education in the district with the lowest assessed value.

Does she acknowledge the fact that expenditures on educational programmes at the present time at the district level are restricted by the district's ability to raise revenue through local taxation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am having difficulty relating this to the amendment that is proposed.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, just sit back and contemplate....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions hardly come into this amendment.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The question of financing of education in British Columbia doesn't come into this amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Questions? Well, maybe my confidence in this Minister may be restored if I get good answers to these questions. How's that, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not bad.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Not bad at all.

I would like to know on what the mechanism for the control of expenditures on education at the district level should be based — whether the control of expenditures at the district level should be based on the wealth of that district. I would like to know whether she recognizes the fact that the problem of the educational programme that we face now is that the wealth of the district determines education given, and the fact that the homeowner grant does nothing to relieve this inequity and, indeed, aggravates the educational expenditures problem because the general revenues of the province are limited.

I wonder whether she will acknowledge the fact that the province is in a position of paying a significant portion of the costs for education without participating in the determination of those costs.

I think she should recognize and acknowledge that there is mounting resistance on the part of local taxpayers to accept the continuing growth of school taxes which have rendered the local revenue base unpredictable as a source of revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether she agrees that ad hoc financial arrangements make it difficult for school boards to plan effectively and, further, whether any restraint the department could exercise is being severely impaired by our present ad hoc arrangements.

I would like to know whether she agrees with the contention that removal of the taxing authority from the school board -would allow it to have more time to concentrate on providing better quality of education. Most of the school boards' time is taken up now by salary questions and things of that nature.

I would like to know why these policy proposals were not made by September, 1974, which is a fairly critical date in terms of education. We have stopgap measures for 1975. I think that she would have to admit that what she has presented and what the Minister of Finance has given are nothing but stopgap measures with regard to overruns under section 197(1) of the Public Schools Act.

Does she agree that there are going to be very substantial increases approximating 8 mills on the present assessed values? I don't think that she can accept the fact that the provincial government should continue to avoid its responsibilities of leaving decisions to the school districts as to how much revenue is to be raised in each.

I would like a statement from the Minister indicating that if the school boards had more opportunity to deal with education and were less than totally concerned, as they are now, with finances, the whole education in the province would be better.

I would like to ask her further whether she wrote to the Premier, Hon. David Barrett, on September 18, 1974, asking for all these points that I have made and whether, indeed, these quotes that she has heard me give are very similar to her request to the Minister. If she does that, she will go a long way toward redeeming the public's confidence in her, if not in the Minister of Finance.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Going back to the very first part of the questions of the Hon. Member, I believe they were dealing with the matter of the supplementary grants and the finalizing of the mill rates for the school boards.

I've had some trouble with research, I must admit, Mr. Chairman, but the Hon. Member there had better check his research because the notes he was using were so stale and old that I can't understand how any Member of this House could be so ignorant of what the present state is in reference to the issuance of school budgets.

The Member doesn't even seem to be aware that last week we released publicly to the press and every school board in this province what the supplementary grants were and then from there on also what the increase in the mill rate would be for each board. That was prepared and handed out to school boards in the province over a week ago. The press has copies

[[Page 1894](#)]

of it also. It was in the papers.

I cannot understand the Hon. Member standing up a week later and asking me what is going to happen. Are you going to give supplementary grants? How are you going to distribute them? — when it all took place well over a week ago. Unbelievable, Mr. Member! You certainly have not been spending our time on your research in Education, obviously.

Back to the other questions on financing. I always appreciate hearing suggestions on revisions to the educational finance formula. You've posed a lot of concrete ideas on changes that you hope would remove the inequities. It's impossible for me to stand here in the House and react to every one. I can pick out a couple of major ones; I have certainly written them all down.

I did point out when you were out of the House before that there is a committee working on this. They are now facing several alternatives for basic changes, but it has to be tied in, as you know, with the Department of Finance and their changes in overall property taxation policies. The Department of Education has been working very hard, and they have teachers and trustees with them now on this. Some of your suggestions we have written down here, and we always appreciate constructive suggestions from the opposition.

There's one point I want to make though. Bad as the old finance formula was, we must give it credit for providing within its framework as much equitable distribution as possible. Equalization factor — that's right. It worked very well, as the Hon. Member says, for a number of years.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Do you like it now?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No. I'm just saying that, compared to other formulas across Canada, at its time it did provide a very good foundation programme. But with the costs escalating, you're quite right, there are districts in this province with low assessment bases which are suffering. There's no question about it, and that's why the government has the responsibility to look into major changes here.

I understand that the Liberal policy is for centralized financing and the removal of property taxation for schools. It has always been the intention of our party to phase into this area also.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: It's going the other way, though.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I don't think that even if you were in power at this time, Mr. Member, you would have much alternative. You just have to look across Canada and you can see that property taxes are rising 10 to 25 per cent right across Canada in every Canadian city. All educational taxes are up right across the country. We are facing here, as you know, great inflation in education.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Very dramatic.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Dramatic. And this government is attempting to take impact off the taxpayer as much as possible. I did say we would try to level off the increase. The average increase this year is 7 mills. I can give you the list, as you apparently don't have it, on how that works out for every district in the province. You have made your

case; there are areas that do suffer.

On the other hand, there are other districts with high assessment bases that come under that, and that's the area we really have to make changes in.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Minister. I did not know of this press release of last week. We have difficulties, as you know, in handling a whole pile of Ministers at once.

I understand that the overall grant announcement has been made, but do I understand the Minister to say that each school district now knows precisely how much money? If so, I apologize to her. Having worked so diligently on other Ministers whose names came up in this absolutely absurd and dictatorial list system that we have, I'm afraid we cannot be on top of every Minister all the time. If she has given out the exact grants for each district, I apologize to her.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Member, it's in the statutes: April 20 every year.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, good for you. I'll withdraw the remarks I made, then. But the fact is that she hasn't touched most of the other proposals.

I don't like this reference to: "Boy, we're strapped for cash." We keep hearing the reverse from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett). We keep hearing things are great. But, oh, it's economic conditions, and nobody under present adverse conditions could do otherwise. Well, we're getting the same old line: one saying one thing; another saying another. I can appreciate that probably the Minister of Finance has privately told this Minister this.

I would wonder whether or not she will answer my final question: has she made representations to the Minister of Finance along the lines of those questions that I put to her? If it's not her fault, we should know in this House because that will affect the vote on the question of confidence. If it is her fault and she really hasn't been kicking the snooze out of the Minister of Finance on behalf of Education, we think we should know that too, because it will affect the vote.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No comment.

[[Page 1895](#)]

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Just a few brief remarks to the Minister. They have to do with the region from which I come, the southeastern part of British Columbia, the region called the East Kootenay — that forgotten part when we're talking about northern affairs and so forth. We feel alienated in East Kootenay as well, the forgotten part of this province. However, there's no consideration from that government; they've even stopped filling roads — up there, Mr. Chairman.

But I want to talk about the need for post....

Interjections.

MR. CHABOT: They destroyed the jobs at the same time.

Yes, great service, great service for the area. That area per capita probably has more parks than anywhere else in the world — in the world! Three national parks, three class A provincial parks. It's now a massive wilderness conservancy.

Now we're on the question of education, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for bringing me back to the point. I was temporarily interrupted by the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams).

The question I want to ask is a question I raised here in the Legislature two years ago, in the spring of 1973. I'm sure that the Minister recalls very vividly my questioning her about what action she proposed to take to provide post-secondary education for those people in the East Kootenay. The Minister told me that they were looking at it. I

told her that the former government had made a decision that there was a pressing and upfront need for the establishment of a vocational school in the Cranbrook-Kimberley area. However, there wasn't that pressing a need for a community college at the time; there probably is now — I'm not aware of that.

But the Minister, in our discussions at that time, when we had the opportunity to discuss and get answers, suggested that there was a possibility that they would be establishing a vocational school in the vicinity of Fernie. There was going to be an interrelationship with SAIT — the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology. I suggested to the Minister at that time that that was a mistake, that Fernie was not central in the East Kootenays. We're not concerned about the inter-tie with the institute of technology in the Province of Alberta, but we are concerned with providing a service that is central and that is a convenience to the people in the East Kootenay. That service should be provided in the Cranbrook Kimberley area.

Even though the government concluded in 1972 that these services were needed and they were going to proceed with the establishment of these services in that part of the province, the Minister thought it necessary at the time to have the matter examined by a task force. Well, the task force examined the question and came up with the conclusion that there was a need for a vocational school, that it should be located in the vicinity of Cranbrook.

That wasn't good enough. We've had all this delay since 1973. The task force even concluded that the proposal that had been put forward by the former government wasn't good enough. We had to establish a royal commission to examine the needs of post-secondary education in the Kootenays, in the East and the West Kootenays, and their interrelationship. Well, we have those reports now and, from the latest press release I have now, even though they've had a task force examining the needs of post-secondary education, we've had a royal commission or, post-secondary education. From the latest press release of April 25 — fairly immediate, fairly current — it says that the other three advisory committees are studying the East Kootenay region.

Interjection.

MR. CHABOT: It says so in your press release 24-75, dated April 25, 1975. It talks about community colleges, I believe, and it says that the other three advisory committees were studying the East Kootenay region, the northwestern region and the northeastern British Columbia. Their recommendations are also being studied by the department with a view to implementation.

Interjection.

MR. CHABOT: The report is in on that one. My question is....

Interjection.

MR. CHABOT: There appeared to be an urgency. I did look at the recommendations of the royal commission regarding the urgency of vocational training for the East Kootenay. They were even considering at that time — there was such an urgency when they brought their report down some considerable time ago — that there was a need for even going into warehouses, garages, abandoned buildings. It was that pressing in the East Kootenay. Yet even though recommendations were put through and the former government was prepared to proceed, nothing has happened.

We're concerned in the East Kootenay as to what's happening as far as post-secondary education is concerned. That's one of the reasons why we have this — amendment on the motion for the Minister's salary — because we don't have any confidence in the Minister's ability to deliver the kind of services we feel we deserve, the kind of services that should

justifiably be given to the East Kootenay. After all, we're part of British Columbia, despite the fact that certain segments and certain portions of that part of the province wanted to secede to Alberta. We want to be an integral part of British Columbia; we want to feel a part of British Columbia. We need these kinds of services which you are

denying and delaying providing to the East Kootenay.

There was a meeting in the East Kootenay some time ago in January by the East Kootenay Post-Secondary Education Committee. There are so many committee meetings, task forces, advisory commissions and royal commissions that I can't keep track of them. They're coming out of your ears, there are so many of them. It was a very critical report that came out of this. There were 52 people present from all over the East Kootenay — a tremendous representative group of the various communities throughout the various school districts. It was well attended. They had some pretty hard statements to make about what the government is doing with all these studies.

This was the conclusion of their meeting.

"Having these reports on hand, the provincial government proceeded to let them gather dust on the shelves. Eventually Selkirk College was requested by the Department of Education to provide interim service to the East Kootenay pending final resolution of the East Kootenay community college problem. It was understood up to this point that the educational system was heading towards the provincial government paying all the bills of school construction and operation.

"For the current fiscal year, April 1, 1974, to March 31, 1975, Selkirk was given a grant of \$114,000 to provide satellite services to the East Kootenay with a promise of further 100 per cent provincial funding at a later date if additional services should so require.

"However, a new superintendent of finance has pointed out to Mrs. Dailly that it is illegal for the provincial government to fund 100 per cent of any programmes which have not been approved by the school board. Between this and declining tax revenues, Selkirk was abruptly informed that all 100 percent support would cease as of March 31, 1975. Any financial aid after that time would be given only on the usual 60/40 per cent basis.

"Since Selkirk's academic year runs from September to June, the period from April 1 to June 30 is now a financial disaster."

Well, they're concerned because it's going to mean a loss of \$40,000, as they point out here, to the West Kootenay school. I'm not going to read the whole thing; it's fairly lengthy, fairly objective, fairly realistic. It says: "The idea that the provincial government will build a community college for the East Kootenay may now be considered dead."

The Minister says this is out of date. Well, you know, you're not hesitant to issue press releases. God I don't know, you keep the mailman busy. There must be quite a few mailmen coming in and out of this building because I never get a press release denying these statements or suggesting what you're doing. All the press releases that I get from you is that you've appointed another task force, you've appointed another royal commission, you've appointed another advisory committee.

That's why I'm bringing this matter up. Maybe you can clarify it; maybe you've changed your position; maybe you disagree with the positions that are outlined to you by your superintendent of finance. If that's the case, I give you an opportunity now to respond.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Press releases do give you a great opportunity for speech-making anyway, Mr. Member....

MR. CHABOT: Sure, do you want another one?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think the point is that it would be advisable, through, to try to bring you up to date right now, and I appreciate that opportunity.

The East Kootenay college. First of all, five of the six school boards in that area have now passed bylaws requesting the establishment of a community college in their area. You're quite aware, Mr. Minister, that under the government which you were a member of, once the participating board said they wanted a college, they couldn't put one up. Your government of the past insisted that they go to a referendum of the people. We have removed that.

Now that these boards have come together and passed bylaws, the next step will be a cabinet order, which I am prepared to present to cabinet immediately. We believe in having the school boards take part in this because they are producing part of the money to finance those colleges on a local basis. I think you should be very pleased, Mr. Member, that the community college for your area is at the stage now where it just needs an order-in-council.

As far as location goes, you should know that once the order-in-council is passed, a college council is appointed. They are empowered to decide and make recommendation on the location. I'm really quite pleased with the fact that that one is underway. The school boards have cooperated very well with us and have shown the need for one.

I know that in your area, Mr. Member, the strongest need right now is vocational training. I do agree with you. In that area, I'm sure the report that came from the advisory committee did put great stress on vocational training. I know that by this

[[Page 1897](#)]

September there should be an opportunity for provision of programmes for some vocational training. It won't, maybe, be able to move as quickly as we'd all like to see but there will be definitely a start in September. We're very aware of the vocational needs of your area.

Green Timbers is just at the stage where I would be prepared to recommend to the cabinet possible acquisition. I'm not sure about that yet. We're just discussing it.

I think, Mr. Member, that should answer your questions on that. Thank you.

Interjection.

MR. SCHROEDER: It's illegal over there.

One of the concerns that the Minister expressed in a recent address to the B.C. Teachers Federation convention was one of control in education. In reviewing the address, the Minister quite rightly said that there were reasons for the controversies that surround education, and these controversies testify to the fact that:

"While all proposals or educational philosophies incorporate programmes designed to equip people for the good life, the citizens in a democracy inevitably disagree on what the good life is. As a result there is a confrontation and a controversy."

There's not real agreement as to what form education should take and, as a result, there is a struggle for control as to who should decide what form it shall take.

She goes on to say:

"As a result, we find one level of government in education often pitted against another, and rightly so. We find lay people pitted against professionals. In a period of much talk about community control of schools, several levels of a community are frequently at odds."

I would have to agree.

"So the question of control resolves itself into an either/or situation. Which single community of interest will exercise control to the exclusion of others? And, conversely, can all communities of an interest integrate their forces for a combined attack on a common problem?"

A good statement of a very real problem, and yet the Minister has been very, very quiet in response to one of the loudest voices seeking control in the educational system.

I think that there can be very little disagreement, Mr. Chairman, that ultimate control — perhaps not the design, perhaps not the administration, but ultimate control — must belong with parents, even though they are lay

people. The children who are being educated belong to the parents, and ultimately the control should belong to them. Therefore I would have expected that the Minister would have made a clear statement, other than that which I find in the same speech a little later on. It would have been a clear statement from the Minister that she is concerned about the preservation of control; of education at the local level — through their elected officials, yes, but at the local level.

I wonder what the Minister has to say about the proposed teaching professions Act? I know that it has been proposed. I know that it has been proposed by the teachers' federation, and I know that it is not the voice of the Minister of Education. But surely since the Act was first put into print in November, 1974, and since I know that it was presented to the Minister on November 20, 1974, surely she would have had an opportunity to respond as to the validity, the acceptability, the desirability of this teaching profession Act.

There have been various people who have had the opportunity to respond, and some of them are not lay people. Educators. I have a critique from Simon Fraser University, for instance, whose main issue with the entire Act is one of a transfer of control, the very thing that we were concerned about at the beginning, in the opening statement of these remarks.

The redistribution of power and control that is suggested in the Act is unidirectional. Power or control is moving in only one direction in three areas, and that direction is always toward the federation. One of the directions is from the government to the federation: "The proposed creation of a teachers' certification board, with the majority of members drawn from the BCTF, effectively places the control of teachers' certification in the hands of the federation, thus shifting power from the Department of Education and the Minister to the federation." Now surely the Minister must take exception to that? Yet she has been very, very quiet. That's one of the reasons we have had this move for the reduction of her salary.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

There is another area — I said there were three. The other one is that power and control are moving from the trustees, or the elected representatives, again to the federation in this way: the proposed expansion of the powers of the local association and the staff of local schools substantially reduces the powers of the school board and its officers.

Then there is another area. There are three. This is the one where this particular critique is the heaviest because it happens to come from the university: the control moves from the university to the federation, because of the proposal that the teachers' certification board, in consultation with the joint

[[Page 1898](#)]

board of teacher education, should establish standards and criteria for the accreditation of teacher-education institutions programmes. You see?

It is a unidirectional movement of power, this particular Act, from various sources to the teachers. I'm wondering why we really need this teaching professions Act. I'm wondering what the Minister's opinion of it is, because she has been deafeningly silent on it. I'm wondering if we really need it. Has there been any desire vocalized for this?

Has the Government of British Columbia expressed a need for this legislation? Has the Minister asked the teachers' federation to come up with a teaching professions Act? Did the school boards or the B.C. School Trustees Association request a teaching professions Act? Did the universities of British Columbia express any need for this particular Act? I think the answer is no. The question has to be asked. If legislation of this kind is to be brought before this Legislature, should there not be some evidence of need? Certainly.

There is another question that certainly the Minister has been faced with, but I have not heard the answer. Is the creation of a professional monopoly in the public interest?

AN HON. MEMBER: From whom?

MR. SCHROEDER: And is the confirmative, unfettered discretionary power to one federation in the public interest?

There are plenty of other questions but let me go into the work sheet of the report of the task force, whose work background really provided this teaching professions Act in the first place. Here is clearly spelled out the hunger for power from one particular segment. I am not here to debate whether this is right or wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take a stand.

MR. SCHROEDER: The Minister should have given us at least some reaction so that the people who have read about this Act in the press could express their confidence in this Minister rather than their non-confidence, as they are doing through the motion which is before the House. Listen to this: "The task force recommended that a teaching professions Act should be sought because it presented the most likely avenue for the federation to attain major participation both in determining entry to and maintaining competence in the profession." There it is. The teachers themselves are hungering for the power of the control of education. They have some arguments in their favour. They are the professionals. They, after all, have more experience in education and have taken more classroom time in instruction, and have taken teacher training. They, perhaps, have some arguments in their favour. But my question to the Minister is this. Where does this government stand in response to this unidirectional motion of power to this area?

MR. LEWIS: Where do you stand?

MR. SCHROEDER: Here's another one. One of the reasons why this federation seeks to have this Act incorporated is that they wish to fulfil federation policy aspirations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take a stand, Harvey.

MR. SCHROEDER: When you take a look at the Act itself, it becomes very, very clear that the federation does have aspirations of ultimate control of the teaching process, and I say this Minister should have taken some stand and should have given us some indication and assurance that ultimate educational control will remain at the parental level.

Another one of the reasons why this Act is sought is because the Act would "ensure internal self-government." Not only that but it would "provide for a change with the initiative vested in the federation" and it would "encourage professional growth." What the 1974 annual general meeting authorized was that the representative assembly approve a draft of the teaching professions Act and that the attendant regulations to be forwarded and presented to the Minister for enactment. I couldn't help but note the notes at the bottom: "Good shot, boys. Give yourself all the authority you need so that you don't need the scrutiny and support of parents whose ultimate control..." — that is, the ultimate control of education should be vested in them.

There are other questions, but we have already indicated that we would like to give other speakers as much of an opportunity as possible to debate this particular motion. I would like to hear what the Minister has to say, perhaps for the first time, on the teachers' professions Act.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: First of all on the matter of control, I made it quite clear that I feel very strongly that control must finally rest in the hands of those who are accountable for the decisions. Parents can be part of that control, certainly. But let's face it. The people who have to make the final decision, the educational decision, are the ones who have to be accountable, and parents can be part of that.

Interjection.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Certainly. If you want to establish a new system altogether and eliminate school boards and set up a new structure, I think that's fine if you are sure that's what the public

wants. I think that's what you have to check — do the parents want that? Are they dissatisfied with the present structure? I think this is where we have to take it from.

Regarding the professional teachers' Act, first of all we go through the history of it. The whole assumption of your discussion here is almost as if the Act was coming before the House tomorrow and we are all aware that it is not. You know that I received it but that it actually got to the press gallery before it got to my desk. It had not gone to the BCTF AGM at the time they presented it to me, so I certainly didn't feel it appropriate to engage in discussion at that time. Then the BCSTA requested time to consider it at their annual convention. Then I asked both groups to consider it carefully and express their views.

At the present time a committee of the BCTF and the BCSTA are meeting to discuss the Act in what they hope will be a non-threatening and a non-political way, because it has been unfortunate that this Act has been blown up in the press — only once, I must say, but in a way that did appear to be rather threatening. Perhaps the BCSTA at the AGM next week will be able to assist by indicating their views. Therefore, until those steps have been gone through, I think it is premature for me as Minister to express my views.

MR. GIBSON: A brief point of clarification from the Minister: once those steps have been gone through, what further process would the Minister see, if and when this proposed legislation is to proceed further?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I suppose after I hear from both those groups, then recommendations may come from them as to whether they think it should get any more public input or not. Then, after I have weighed and listened to both groups' suggestions for whatever changes may be there, I will discuss it with my department officials. Perhaps a good idea, Mr. Member, if it is possible, might be to have the all-party committee deal with this also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the Hon. Members that matters of legislation should not be dealt with in committee, but rather administrative responsibilities under existing legislation.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Education, if she did what she wanted to, would probably like to resign and quit. All of those answers that she had when she was in opposition as education critic, all of the problems she was going to solve — self-created problems, or self-imagined problems — that she thought there were in the Department of Education, she found that she just can't seem to put her finger on.

I don't want to call the Minister incapable — maybe she's tried — but she is incompetent. She is incompetent, and the people of this province realize she is incompetent.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, the reason that this motion is before us this afternoon, the reason we are debating it is because the people, the taxpayers of this province and the parents of children tell us — and I have even had children in school tell me — that they are unhappy. They are unhappy with what is happening because the morale in the classrooms of British Columbia has been in a complete and steady deterioration under the Minister. I hope to say that to the lady Minister but this is exactly where it's at. There is no discipline whatsoever...

MR. BENNETT: No discipline. No discipline.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...in the classrooms of British Columbia today.

MR. BENNETT: None.

MRS. WEBSTER: You've never taught school.

MR. PHILLIPS: Those who aspire to work in the classrooms, those children who want to receive an education, who want to pay attention, are being disrupted by those who want to make a farce of the system.

I would like to ask the Minister what plan she has to restore discipline to the classrooms of British Columbia.

MR. LEWIS: Cat-o'-nine-tails.

MR. PHILLIPS: What policy does she have? This unwritten decree of hers that the teacher writes on the bottom of the report card asking the student not to bother returning after a Christmas recess or an Easter recess....

MR. CHABOT: A new twist.

MR. PHILLIPS: Is this a new twist? Are we to take these children who have a small discipline problem, maybe arising in the home, maybe the fault of that particular teacher, and say to these children, "There is no room for you in our educational system. Out!" And tell them to get a Job?

Should we not have some discipline? Should we not restore the rights of running the classroom to the teacher, Mr. Chairman? I think we need order and we need to restore the responsibility of order to the

[[Page 1900](#)]

teacher.

HON. MR. COCKE: Why don't you say it?

MR. PHILLIPS: If the teacher abuses the responsibility, then we need to retrain the teacher. But this is happening, and it is happening under this Minister. You can yap all you want to, Mr. Minister of Health. You know it's happening and your taxpayers know it's happening.

We know the children are being evicted, put out of the education system because they have a small discipline problem.

MR. CHABOT: A new twist. There will be more new ones.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's a completely new twist and it is working a tremendous hardship on a lot of parents.

Sometimes this problem has been created within the school system itself. I'll tell you it is disgraceful when you hear some of the things going on in the classrooms in British Columbia where students are insulting their teachers, abusing the property of the taxpayers. What are we going to do, Mr. Chairman? It is the Minister's responsibility to restore to those children who desire an education in this province the right to have it without being disrupted by unruly students who don't care. She created the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How?

MR. PHILLIPS: The responsibility is also hers to solve it.

I'll tell you, the trustees are disheartened, the school principals are disheartened, the school teachers are disheartened, the school counsellors are disheartened, and many of the children in the school are disheartened because of this situation. Chaos reigns in many school classrooms in British Columbia today. Lack of discipline; entire lack of discipline.

I'd like to move on to another subject.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) seems a little upset. Maybe he should go and try to patch his potholes.

Interjections

MR. PHILLIPS: There used to be small potholes in the road. Now there are holes. You can lose a car in

them, and that's why the cost of the insurance corporation is skyrocketing in this province — because of the deterioration of the roads under this Minister. That's why the insurance corporation is losing \$34.1 million a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order, please. The Hon. Member for South Peace River was doing very well in staying on the point until the Hon. Minister of Highways introduced....

MR. PHILLIPS: Bring that unruly, unshaven Minister to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Hon. Member to try to be as relevant as he was.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'd just like to cover one other subject and I'll be as brief as possible, Mr. Chairman. I want to go back just a few short years...

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I'd like that.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...during that election campaign of 1972...

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): Which you won by a landslide.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...when the NDP came into the great Peace River area, that area that was developed by the great pioneers who are working their farms up there now.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Everyone with a strap in his hand.

MR. PHILLIPS: When the cost of farming was going high and land taxes were escalating, what was the promise to the great pioneering farmers up in that area who are working to feed the hungry people of the world? What was the promise by the NDP government?

HON. MR. COCKE: Get a new MLA.

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, yes, we're going to remove the school taxes from the land. I remember sitting here in the spring of 1973 when this socialist government brought in their first budget. I listened and I looked and I tried to read between the lines.

AN HON. MEMBER: You never listened in your life.

MR. PHILLIPS: Could I find one sentence? Not one little sentence...

MR. LEWIS: Open your eyes, Don.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...talked about removing the school taxes from land or from homeowners in this province.

[[Page 1901](#)]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member if the matter he is now discussing is under the administrative responsibility of this Minister. Is it not under the responsibility of the Minister of Finance?

MR. PHILLIPS: It is this Minister who stood just a few moments ago in this Legislature and talked about how she had changed the financing formula and how she had given more money to school boards, so I consider it perfectly relevant.

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: I just want to say that it is this Minister's responsibility because this Minister has spoken on this subject several other times in this debate, if you will recall. I want you to be fair, as I know you sometimes try to be, Mr. Chairman. Just hear me out; I'll just be a few short moments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll listen.

MR. PHILLIPS: Then along came 1974.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): Impossible.

MR. PHILLIPS: There's a great formula to remove school taxes from land: maximum of \$40 or one-fifth of the additional school taxes over the homeowner grant. And what happened that year? The Premier wipes out all limitations on assessments and the taxes went higher than they had ever been before.

MR. CHABOT: Right on.

MR. PHILLIPS: And the homeowners and the land owners in this province in 1974 paid more school taxes than they ever paid before.

And what's happening again this year? You talk about not talking about school taxes under this Minister's estimates. She's the one making the announcements. The school taxes are going to increase in this province to an unheard of high in the history of this province.

MR. CHABOT: Right on.

MR. PHILLIPS: She's the one making the announcements.

The ironic part of it is that we are not moving to remove school taxes in the Province of British Columbia from land. We are increasing school taxes on land in British Columbia; we are increasing school taxes on homes in British Columbia. Instead of moving closer to the objective, closer to that election promise of 1972, this government has failed in yet another of their election promises and is moving in the opposite direction, to work yet a greater burden on landowners and homeowners in this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today they are getting less value for....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I was hoping that the Hon. Member would establish some relevance to this Minister's administrative estimates.

MR. PHILLIPS: But I'm going to say....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask you to try to be more relevant to this Minister's estimates.

MR. PHILLIPS: What I'm going to say is there have been mill rate press releases all over the place. Why, that Minister prints press releases so fast you'd think she was running out of paper like the fellow who's running out of gas — he drives a little faster to get home before he runs out of gas. I think she thinks she's going to run out of paper because she really puts the press releases out in a hurry.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: Not only are school taxes increasing in the British Columbia under the socialist regime. But people are getting less value for their money because of this problem that I spoke about earlier, where the children who really want to learn are being jeopardized by those with a bit of a behaviour problem.

Instead of the school teacher having the right to discipline...

HON. MR. LEA: What way?

MR. PHILLIPS: ...within the school classroom, she has to go to the counsellor, and the counsellor can't discipline so the counsellor goes to the principal, and the principal can't discipline so the principal goes to the superintendent, and the superintendent says, "Ah, we must not expel this student from school," because that will give

the superintendent a black mark, that will give the principal a black mark, that will give the counsellor a black mark, that will give the teacher a black mark, and that will give the school a black mark.

MR. CHABOT: Just put a little note on the report card.

MR. PHILLIPS: So what do they do? They tell the kid: "Go home buddy, and stay away until you can be better." But it is not a proper expulsion from school. It's sort of an undercover, underhanded

[[Page 1902](#)]

method.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): A black mark is a good mark.

AN HON. MEMBER: Beautiful. (Laughter.)

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm strictly using a terminology that has been pointed out to me by the school teachers and the principals in this province.

HON. MR. LEA: Shame.

MR. PHILLIPS: It will be a demerit mark against that particular school and against the administrators in that school. So what do they do?

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: They strap him.

MR. PHILLIPS: They send the kid home. They send him home.

HON. MR. LEA: Beat him up.

MR. PHILLIPS: While he's home for two or three weeks he's losing out on his education. When that student goes back to school he has a worse problem, because not only does he have the same behaviour problem he had before, Mr. Chairman, but he's lost one week or two weeks of his education.

I'll tell you, we must restore dignity to the classroom in British Columbia — the dignity of the pupil, the dignity of the teacher, the dignity of the counsellor, the dignity of the principal, and the dignity of the school trustees. The responsibility is on that Minister of Education to take whatever action she deems necessary, but the responsibility of the education of the youth of this province rests on her shoulders.

MR. LEWIS: Here's a strap for you, Don. (Laughter.)

HON. MRS. DAILY: It is very, very difficult to follow the performance of that Member, but underneath all the dramatics and the gloss and the waving of arms, I do concede to the Member that he probably has had expressed to him by some parents a concern that their children have been taken out of school.

I've made it quite clear to the school superintendents that that I consider is the last resort, and just because there is a discipline problem with the student, every effort should be made to keep that student in the school environment. But I think we all have to agree that there comes a time with some students where it is necessary to have them suspended for a certain period of time. But I've made it clear that this should be a last resort.

However, we have to give some assistance to the teachers, and I agree with you. What we are trying to do through this government, and that is why I said I am glad that money is going into Human Resources and into the Minister of Health's (Hon. Mr. Cocke's) budget, because we feel the only way to help these young people who are the ones who are particularly disruptive and obviously have some serious, maybe emotional problem or other particular problem, is with some combined services. What we are trying to do is build up those mental health, human resources services through child-care workers, through mental health consultants.

Mr. Member, surely that is a better way than just to give some very quick form of physical punishment to the child which does not ever really come to the root of that child's real problems.

The big problem that we face now, of course, is in training enough child-care workers; in having the Minister of Health find enough mental health people and consultants. But all I can say to you is that I agree with you. I don't think it is fair to a child to be kept out of school. Every child deserves the right to an education. But this problem, may I say to you, Mr. Member, is not just common to British Columbia. You can pick up the paper any day and you can see even in jurisdictions, as I said earlier in the House, where the strap, for instance, is used, the same cries are coming from the parents saying there is no discipline in the schools; we want more help.

So I think the problem is far wider and not as simplistic as you apparently perceive it is.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, on that same point, I would just like to ask the Minister: is there any special training being conducted for the teachers? Now I don't know how large a family you have, and I don't propose to ask you, but what I do sense is that within our teaching profession sometimes you put a young teacher in a school who maybe or maybe not is from a family life — maybe she is an only child. What type of training does she have before she goes into the classroom that will equip her to deal with these situations?

Depending on the age of the child, you're going to have energy and you're going to have those children testing, because that is the sum, substance and vigour of youth and that is what youth is all about — to test, to test the home, to test the parents and to test the authorities, no matter where they be.

My point is, Mr. Chairman, that if the teachers are not equipped to handle this testing.... You're going to have a little more testing by some children than by others, because they've got a little more energy and maybe they eat a little more Wheaties in the morning. Maybe they're from a family where they have to test a little more because there are brothers and sisters

[[Page 1903](#)]

around. What I'm saying is that if this problem is caught and, as we say, nipped in the bud in the very first year.... And I find that most of the grade 1 and grade 2 teachers have a tendency to be the younger teachers who naturally don't have a family of their own. They are the ones with whom, I would say, the problem starts to grow, because these are younger teachers. They haven't had a family of their own and they maybe....

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know. But I'm saying that I think this is where the problem starts. If they test and there is no final law, no final authority where these children.... Maybe they're not getting it at home. Maybe then they go on and they test and they test and they test, and if there is no final authority, then they end up as teenagers out testing the police force. You better believe it, and this is where it goes. I'd like the Minister to assure me that we are giving these younger teachers some special training. Or do they have guidance from the principals? Do they have guidance from the superintendents? There are no counsellors — correct me if I'm wrong. It's been a long time since my children were in those grade 1 and 2 classes. Are there counsellors now for these younger teachers who are having the say over the formative years of these younger students? This is the crucial time. There's an old saying: "Give me a child until he's eight and I will completely control his mind for the rest of his life."

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you get that old saying?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I've heard it several times.

AN HON. MEMBER: Karl Marx.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do you wish to have the floor, Mr. Minister of Health?

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to assure me, because this problem, it would appear, is growing

every day. Maybe the Minister would assure me that she's doing something about it, particularly in these formative stages, because although my children are just about out of the school system, I hope someday to have some grandchildren, and I would like them to come up into an education system that's going to be good for them.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: There are two areas we're trying to work there. We have a joint board of teacher education, which is taking class control as one of their main projects, and they're working with the faculties of education to do what you're suggesting so that the young teacher who comes out of the faculty of education does get some real emphasis in that curriculum on how to control a class. I think that in the last few years this has been sadly neglected. They're developing the course and maybe we could go out there to UVic and have a look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are they teaching?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: What are they teaching? Well, for one thing they're teaching them some form of understanding of what makes a child tick so they can diagnose that child with whom it looks like they're going to be having some particular problems. The family course? That's why we support the family life programme on this side. That's all part of it. Some of the teachers under the former government probably didn't have an opportunity to take that family life programme; maybe that's the problem.

The other thing is that we do believe that the government has a responsibility, and we're hoping to fund in-service workshops so we can send around those master teachers you're talking about to the younger teachers, and maybe to some of the older teachers too who have difficulty in operating in a new scene, to encourage them and show them ways. I've had a number of principals write to me who said: "We really opposed what you did in the beginning with the removal of corporal punishment, but one thing we found and why we support you now is that now we really have to deal with the child and with the child's family and with all the integrated services." I think that is the most important thing.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Briefly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to the Minister, in support of this motion again, to some of the remarks she made during question period today with regard to the distribution of this "Professional Guide to Alcohol and Drugs" information. The Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) groans and moans. One of the questions that should be asked, Mr. Chairman, is why the Minister of Health never saw this kit before it went out, and why the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) never saw this kit, and certainly why the Minister of Education never had consultation with the people involved before this kit was proposed to be put in the schools.

The Minister says that there are Done in the schools at this time. I hope she's sure about that because there seems to be some doubt in some people's minds about whether or not there are.

Interjection.

MR. McCLELLAND: You didn't say that? Mr. Chairman, the question is: is this kit in the hands of teachers and counsellors at this time?

[[Page 1904](#)]

Interjections.

MR. McCLELLAND: Yes, I'd be very happy if you did.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The point I was making is that the Alcohol and Drug Commission's education committee and the Department of Education have not distributed this to the schools. If there are any in the hands of counsellors or teachers in the schools of this province, they themselves must have requested them. They have not been distributed.

MR. McCLELLAND: What's the difference?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: There is a basic difference. The Alcohol and Drug Commission....

MR. McCLELLAND: Where did they get them from? The Alcohol and Drug Commission?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: The Alcohol and Drug Commission is known to have been working on a number of these programmes. They have had consultation with a number of people in the province. I have been talking to the chairman and, as far as I know, they are not in the hands of the counsellors. But there may have been some counsellor or some teacher or some doctor, for whom these are made up also, who may have heard about the guidelines and written on their own to ask for it. That's why I can't stand here and say to you that it's not in the hands of any counsellor at all. If they did, they did it on their own.

I wanted to make quite clear to you today that the Department of Education has a procedure laid out with the Alcohol and Drug Commission that we must look through the material that is going into the schools or being distributed to the schools. We just received the book, as I said. In the very beginning of the book, it suggests that the materials are not considered to be definitive; they are asking for input. As far as we're concerned in the department, we are going through the whole book — we are going to review it. As I said to you, the results of those reviews will depend on whether we will recommend it to be acceptable to the schools. I have definitely been informed that there has been no general distribution of that kit.

Also, remember that the kit is a guideline to the teachers and to public health nurses, social workers, lawyers, et cetera. It is not to be used and handed out, of course, to students. Irrespective of that, I'm still concerned about looking at that very carefully before we endorse it.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Minister because I'm sure that wasn't the impression we had in this House after question period today. Everyone that I've talked with felt that the Minister said that this book was not in the hands of any teachers or counsellors.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It may not be.

MR. McCLELLAND: I'd like to ask the Minister if it doesn't bother her somewhat, considering the policy she says is in force in the Department of Education, that this book was put into completed form. It's not a draft by any means; it is a complete guide. It is a complete programme made and ready for use by counsellors and teachers. Does it not bother the Minister that this could have happened without consultation with the Minister, or the Minister of Health or the Minister of Human Resources, or anyone else in government it seems? It must bother the Minister.

I must take issue with the Minister's statement that this is not a definitive guideline. It is a most definitive guideline. I'll read the front page. She accused me of taking the front page out of context. I did no such thing. While the front page says: "Information in this literature reflects the current state of relevant research, definitive studies have yet to be completed," that makes it even worse because it goes on to say on the next page that in this binder: "It is hoped that"

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Second Member for Vancouver South on a point of order.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Member for Langley is speaking about something that one or two other Members in the opposition seem to be aware of. As far as I know, no one in the back bench of the government benches has received a copy of this kit. I would like to know what it's all about.

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. This is not a point of order. I would ask the Hon....

MRS. WEBSTER: Well, I certainly think it is a point of order because why should...?

Interjections

MRS. WEBSTER: I'm quite aware of the fact that this is something that has not been issued by the Department of Education, or it would have been put out to everyone.

Interjections.

[[Page 1905](#)]

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think that that's an excellent point of order. I think that the back bench should all have had a copy of this. It would have been very helpful had the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) had a copy, had the Minister of Education had a copy, had the Health Minister had a copy. It would have helped in the every day operation of government. But, unfortunately, Madam Member, who just took her place, even the cabinet Ministers didn't know this thing was happening before it went into the schools.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Education on a point of order.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I know it really isn't a point of order, but I want to clarify one question for the Member. He said he was disappointed when I said I wasn't aware for sure whether any counsellor had perhaps written for it. I have a report here in front of me that no copies have been sent out to meet requests from counsellors. They have been told that requests are still being held in abeyance by the commission. Carry on.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, that's all we ask.

I did want to say that this is a definitive guide for teachers. It says, in fact: "It will allow teachers to be able to respond accurately and sensitively to student challenges and questions on drug use." Now that's a very positive statement.

Then, to have the book filled — and I mean filled — with garbage is a shame and a scandal. I don't understand how it could have got as far as it did with all the money spent. There is \$5 million in that Alcohol and Drug Commission budget this year. How much did this cost, and why didn't the Minister of Education know about it? That makes her incompetent, in my opinion.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): There's not \$5 million in the budget.

MR. McCLELLAND: Well, there is so. Check your estimate book. There's \$5 million. What's the matter with you? It's right in your own estimates.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: May I answer that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would again point out to the Hon. Member for Langley that we are considering any amendment to vote 38 under the Minister's estimates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I would ask that he focus his questioning on her responsibilities.

MR. McCLELLAND: That's right, Mr. Chairman. This book was meant to go into the schools in British Columbia. And because the Minister didn't know about it, it makes her incompetent. I would like to answer the question that the Members at that end are asking. I received the report from the Alcohol and Drug Commission. I made a simple request and they gave it to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. McCLELLAND: A simple request, Mr. Chairman, and they gave it to me.

Interjections.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wait till the estimates are passed.

MR. McCLELLAND: I think that this Minister of Education right now needs to ask some questions before this goes any further. I would like to have the Minister's assurance that she will commit to this House that this report will not go out in its present form period — ever — and that it will be withdrawn from any kind of publication right now. That's a commitment we'd like to have in this province.

I would like the Minister to tell us why, with \$5 million in the budget, it was found necessary in an educational programme to use material from the Government of Alberta and put the seal of British Columbia on it as an official publication of this province in seven of the eight reports of this book. I would like the Minister to find out why, in fact, when this was said to be an educational booklet for use in the schools, there is nothing in it about education, literally nothing about education in the whole report.

As a simple backbencher in the opposition I can only expect, because the government seal was on this booklet when it came to me, that it's an official publication of the government and officially condoned by the government. No other conclusion can be reached. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not from now on, and whether she will commit, that nothing — nothing — will ever go into our schools from the Alcohol and Drug Commission without prior approval of the Minister of Education.

I would like to make one point very clear. The Minister says that this book is not in the schools. If this book and its contents had not been brought up on the floor of this House, it would have been in the schools. It would have been in the schools. It's completed and ready for distribution. It's not a draft.

[[Page 1906](#)]

It's ready to go, and it cost a lot of money. If it hadn't been for the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) and myself bringing this before the floor of the House, it would have been ready to go into the schools, and the Minister never would have known about it.

That Minister had fired her entire research department because they got a little too uppity and too skittish for her views. Here we have a group of people who would willingly poison the minds of the children of this province and she's not willing to recommend any firings. I think that's shameful and disgraceful, and it's about time something was done about it.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: That book could not have gone into the schools without my approval, because that is the procedure which is set up.

MR. McCLELLAND: I don't believe it. I don't believe it. Why was it finished and done?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: May I say that as Minister of Education I receive hundreds of copies of similar books from other agencies in this province — government agencies and others — that are produced and brought before me? Before they are sent out, it is asked for my approval as to whether they should be sent out. The book is not in the schools, and the procedure we have set up would prevent it from going into the schools without first having my officials look through it.

I would also like to point out that I have stated in the House earlier that as far as I am concerned this book would not receive endorsement from me or my department without revisions being made. I have stated that.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Now that we have the Minister's assurance that this professional kit is to be vetted and before it is distributed is to be changed, I wonder if the Minister would also take the committee into her confidence with respect to the other school programmes which are mounted by the Alcohol and Drug Commission. Would she inform the committee the extent to which those other programmes have been vetted by the Minister's office?

If you will refer to the report of the Alcohol and Drug Commission which was tabled in this House just a few days ago, there is a section on the school programme. It is noteworthy that in discussing the development of a school programme, the following steps have been taken by the commission: (1) a professional kit has been developed to provide up-to-date and accurate information about alcohol, drugs and related issues to teachers and counsellors.

Now, that's the very same one. The Minister tells us it is not going out until it's changed. That's fine.

(2) The person responsible for schools, occasionally with other staff members, has initiated and/or participated in seminars and workshops for counsellors and teachers. These provide in-depth information on chemical dependency and counselling techniques.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the material used in those in-depth studies giving in-depth information has been approved by the Minister and if she would be good enough to table with this House that information. Such in-depth seminars have already been conducted in Burnaby, North Vancouver, West Vancouver, Kelowna, Kamloops and Victoria.

(3) Staff members have made numerous presentations and held seminars on drugs, alcohol and related issues for various parents' groups.

I would like to know whether the Minister has passed upon the material which is being used by this commission with regard to those parents' groups?

Mr. Chairman, I ask you and I ask the Second Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) to pay particular attention to this.

(4) A learning-by-doing course for elementary school children involving training in the use of the scientific method applied to pharmacological concepts, together with the development of human relations skills in conjunction with the authors, Dr. G. Belward and Ms. B. Bethel, has been established.

Imagine! For elementary students, a learning-by-doing course in the scientific method applied to pharmacological concepts. What does that show you? How to take a fix?

(5) A 35-page parents' study group manual has been printed and is being provided free of charge to interested parents' groups around the province. Liaison with local health units and school districts has been established in this area of family life education in Courtenay.

(6) Staff members are involved in ongoing evaluation of available curricula, programmes and other resources in the area of drug education.

Can the Minister assure the committee that all of the programmes and all of the materials which are being taken by the staff of this commission to the schools, to the teachers, to the counsellors, to the students and to the parents' groups have first been assessed by the Minister's office or by the members of her department and passed upon before they are used in the educational system of British Columbia?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Most of those programmes have already been developed in the schools themselves with materials developed in the schools. I think the thing to be aware of is, in discussing this with the Alcohol and Drug Commission — because I

[[Page 1907](#)]

too feel as Minister that I want to be completely aware of all the programmes that are going on in this area in the schools — they have informed me that at no time have they entered any school district or any school without the approval and the request of that local school board.

I think that if you do believe, again, in local autonomy and decentralization, you do have to leave some responsibility to local school boards. I think you could check very carefully and find out that those programmes you

are talking about, Mr. Member, were not just put into the schools by the Alcohol and Drug Commission. The school boards went to the commission and asked them if they would come and assist them. Some of the programme material they developed was developed with the staff in the school. That is as far as I can answer you on that matter of programming.

I can assure you that I have a member of my department who is a liaison person with them and who keeps me informed as to the kinds of programmes which are going on. To a school board of this province which is saying: "Look, we want some help in a specific programme," should you say: "No, you can't get that help until you check with the Minister of Education"? I think you must ask yourself whether that is the route you want to go.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, just one brief response. The Minister has an example of this professional kit which she now says she would not permit to go into schools in its present state. Surely you must have the same concern about the other programmes and educational material which is being made available by the commission.

Certainly the school boards should not have to ask your permission. But you should tell the Alcohol and Drug Commission that you want to vet their material before they make it available to school boards or anybody else.

MR. McCLELLAND: Just one question to the Minister. I don't want to ask her a question, but it just relates to this whole thing again. If the Minister really believes that this book would not have gone into the schools in its present form if it hadn't come before this House, I say the Minister has been duped by the Alcohol and Drug Commission because it would not have gone this far and it would not have been.

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, there isn't very much in that official report the Member was just reading from that's of very much value to the people of this province. But the one glowing report that is in there is their enthusiasm for this professional guide to alcohol and drug information, which is one of the things they said they have developed along the educational lines this year and will be offered — not "might be" if the Minister says okay, but "will be offered." That is the reason some of us got concerned and went and got one of these. We wanted to find out what was being offered. The Minister should have one this a long time ago. If she has a liaison officer who is supposed to be telling her what is going on in the Alcohol and Drug Commission, she better fire him or her, too, because they're letting you down. I still suggest you've been duped in this whole matter, Madam Minister, and that's what's so shameful about his whole sorry mess.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

Leave granted.

MR. GARDOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's a point of order or a point of privilege or point of correction, but I see from *Votes and Proceedings* of Tuesday, April 29, that the Hon. Clerks are probably having a bit of spring fever and they interpreted the Member for North Vancouver—Capilano (Mr. Gibson) to be the Second Member for Vancouver—Point Grey (Mr. Gardom). Perhaps if *Votes and Proceedings* were amended accordingly in the vote recorded on the first page of *Votes and Proceedings* of Tuesday, April 29, 1975.... (see *Hansard*, page 1831.)

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Hon. Member would be indignant if his name were shown on the vote, and his constituents might find out that he was not here.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, no, no, no! I was here but I was not present for the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I see. You wouldn't want them to know that at home. (Laughter.)

MR. GARDOM: I'm quite happy about what they know at home — I'm not in the same difficulty as you are, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I never get to be recorded in any vote; it's very disappointing. The matter has been corrected, I understand, by the Clerks, in any case.

MR. GIBSON: On the same point, I'm very flattered by the mistaken identity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know how it happened. Nobody dares explain.

Presenting reports.

[[Page 1908](#)]

Ms. Brown presented the report of the Select Standing Committee on Health, Education and Human Resources which was taken as read and received. (See appendix.)

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

APPENDIX

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Health, Education, and Human Resources begs leave to report as follows:

On March 26, 1974, the Select Standing Committee on Health, Education, and Human Resources was empowered by the House "To Examine Into and Study the Subject-matter in Item 4 of the White Paper Tabled in the House by the Minister of Education" and "To Report to the Legislative Assembly on the Said Subject-matter at the Next Following Session".

Item 4 of the White Paper deals with the subjects of school district organization and administration and the system of teacher salary bargaining, including learning and working conditions contracts.

Hearings were held in Victoria on May 28; Smithers, September 4; Dawson Creek, September 5; Vancouver, September 6; Castlegar, September 16; and Salmon Arm, September 17.

Following advertisements placed in the newspapers of the Province inviting public participation, the Committee held six public hearings and heard 62 briefs. Twenty-seven briefs were submitted to school boards, individual trustees, or regional trustee organizations. Twenty-eight briefs were submitted by local teacher organizations, individual teachers, or regional teacher organizations. Among these was a brief from the Provincial Administrators Organization. The B.C. Teachers' Federation made two briefs, one in Victoria, May 28, and one at Salmon Arm, September 17. The B.C. School Trustees' Association made a single presentation at Salmon Arm. Only two briefs were made on behalf of citizens, one by the Burnaby Citizen's Association and one by Mrs. Tunya Audain of Vancouver. A brief was presented by the B.C. School District Secretary-Treasurers' Association. A faculty member of Selkirk College made a presentation in Castlegar. In addition, a number of briefs were mailed to the Secretary and Chairman of the Select Standing Committee.

The following briefs were presented at the public hearings:

Victoria, May 28, 1974: Greater Victoria Teachers' Association; South Vancouver Island Agreement Co-ordinator; Sooke Teachers' Association; Cowichan District Teachers' Association; Nanaimo District Teachers' Association; and Cowichan School Board.

Smithers, September 4, 1974; Smithers District Teachers' Association; School Trustees, School District No.

52, Prince Rupert; School Trustees, School District No. 80, Kitimat; School District No. 54, Smithers; North Central District Council of the B.C. Teachers' Federation; Supervisor of Elementary Education; Skeena-Cassiar District Teachers' Association; and Prince Rupert District Teachers' Association.

Dawson Creek, September 5, 1974: Peace River South Teachers' Association; School District No. 28, Board of School Trustees, Quesnel; School District No. 60, Peace River North; and School District No. 59, Peace River South.

Vancouver, September 6, 1974: Mrs. T. Audain, independent citizen, parent;

[[Page 1909](#)]

APPENDIX

Coquitlam Teachers' Association; B.C. School District Secretary-Treasurers' Association; Sechelt School Board; School District No. 75, Mission; Victoria School Board; Lake Cowichan School Board, School District No. 66; Vancouver School Administrators' Association; Burnaby Citizens' Association; Vancouver School Board; School District No. 63, Saanich; School District No. 68, Nanaimo; Vancouver Elementary School Teachers' Association; West Vancouver Teachers' Association; and Vancouver School Teachers' Association.

Castlegar, September 16, 1974: B.C. School Trustees' Association (West Kootenay Zone); Castlegar School Board, School District No. 9; Creston Valley Teachers' Association; Windermere School Board, School District No. 4; Selkirk College, faculty member; Nelson Teachers' Association; Cranbrook School Board, School District No. 2; North Columbia Teachers' Association; Trail School Board, School District No. 11; Trail Teachers' Association; and Castlegar Teachers' Association.

Salmon Arm, September 17, 1974: School District No. 89; Central Okanagan Teachers' Association; Public Schools Principals' and Vice-Principals' Association; North Okanagan Secondary Principals' and Vice-Principals' Association; Shuswap Administrators; North Okanagan Principals' and Vice-Principals' Association; B.C. School Trustees' Association; B.C. Teachers' Federation; Board of Trustees, School District No. 23; Shuswap Teachers' Association; School District No. 40; Kamloops District Teachers' Federation; Okanagan Valley Teachers' Association; School District No. 77; Summerland Teachers' Association; and Kamloops School District No. 24.

Your Committee wishes to take this opportunity to express its gratitude to all of the individuals and organizations who contributed their time and experience in making submissions to the Committee, thereby assisting it in discharging its responsibilities.

Following a number of meetings held by the Select Standing Committee, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. *School district amalgamation*—School district amalgamations should be approached only with the greatest of caution and only after public hearings have been held. The context of amalgamation should not be measured only in terms of dollars but also in terms of community responsiveness and the adequacy of the learning experience. The Committee urges boards and school trustees to continue to examine the possible regionalization of certain services wherever these are practical and it is feasible to do so.
2. *Collective bargaining*—After hearing many opinions as to the form collective bargaining should take, and suggestions for local, zonal, and Provincial bargaining, the Committee believes the negotiations on a zonal basis should be encouraged but that zones should be entered into on a voluntary basis, preserving the right of a board of school trustees and a teachers' association to exercise their local autonomy by bargaining at the local level, if they so prefer. The Okanagan Region has been an example in the past of successful zonal negotiations. To that end, the Committee recommends that the Minister of Education, prior to the opening of negotiations in any given calendar year and in consultation with the B.C. Teachers' Federation and the B.C. School Trustees' Association, establish a system of zones for the consideration of the associations and their respective memberships. These zones should be established prior to September 1 in any given calendar year.

Each school board and teachers' association should then decide whether it wishes to participate in bargaining in the zones which have been established. Should they decide that they would prefer to bargain individually, either the board or the local teachers' association could opt out of the zonal arrangement which has been established.

The Committee recommends that both trustees and teachers take advantage of

[[Page 1910](#)]

APPENDIX

the opportunities which the Department of Labour intends to provide in training personnel to be more effective in the collective bargaining process. The Committee also recommends that in the event the parties fail to establish an arbitration board, the Department of Labour appoint an arbitrator.

The Committee reaffirms that the final resolution of disagreements in the bargaining process should be through the form of arbitration after a full process of negotiation and conciliation has been attempted. Further, to ensure the successful completion of arbitration, the Committee recommends that the provisions of the *Public Schools Interim Arbitration Procedure Act* passed by the Legislature in its last Session be incorporated into the *Public Schools Act*. However, the section of the *Public Schools Interim Arbitration Procedure Act* with reference to deadlines should not be included. The time limits would remain as they are now, under the *Public Schools Act*.

Finally, the Committee recommends that the scope of bargaining be as it is currently defined in the *Public Schools Act*.

Respectfully submitted.

ROSEMARY BROWN, *Chairperson*

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