

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)**

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1972

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 315](#)]

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members to join with me today in welcoming Mayor Sangster and Alderman Edwards from the Village of Pemberton.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. BARRETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join me in welcoming an outstanding citizen from the Courtenay area, Mrs. Karen Sandford who is the N.D.P. candidate in the next provincial election.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. D.R.J. CAMPBELL (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to join in the welcome to a very good friend of mine from the great constituency of Comox, and to make one or two observations about the conduct of business in British Columbia. Naturally because I am following the illustrious efforts yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, Pagliacci at his best — Little theatre at its worst. Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: That's the trouble with these Italians, they want to horn in everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, the delightful budget by the leader of the Liberal party — I'll have one or two comments to make about that as you might expect. But before I do, I wish to have some direct comments concerning the effort yesterday by the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Naturally, his efforts should come first. I thought that the editor of the *Victoria Colonist*, this morning, must have had a sense of humour in placing on the front page of the

paper side by side the effort by the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Liberal party. The rest of the papers, I'm sure, will not front page it because, since I've been in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, we have never had a display of clowning around such as we got from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

Clowning around, Mr. Speaker, in a fashion which has become traditional with the Leader, not only in the House, but on the hustings.

I'm quite sure that if you were to examine the office of the Leader of the Opposition, there must be at least one wardrobe there and that's a series of costumes. Because the package that the Leader of the Opposition brings to British Columbia is a whole series of ideas which in effect add up to this — you catch any bus, sail down the river on any log, put on any costume, move anti-American or pro-American in one fell swoop, go from woeful to Waffle in one afternoon, move from the comments about northern British Columbia in the name of the democratic tradition, and what these people in Houston are supposed to have done or not done about forming a municipality, running around the country saying what an N.D.P. government really means when it says it is a New Democratic Party — and I'll have more to say about that in reference to my friend from Vancouver East, if I can call him my friend and I use the term loosely.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader yesterday, as he has normally done in this House, got up to tell the story of Houston. That the Minister of Municipal Affairs had created this municipality without any local decision whatsoever. That's exactly the speech that he made in Houston. The report I have here when you were talking to the five people in the phone booth in Houston — five, I'm giving him the Americanised version so he can understand exactly what I'm saying. He's been south now so he's got to have the message.

What happened there? He knows it very well, so he need not try to kid the people of the Province of British Columbia. That council unanimously passed the resolution which is on the minute book. I think he looked at that minute book — and my advice is that he looked at that minute book — and that resolution is very clear that there was a unanimous vote of that council to form that municipality on such terms and conditions as they themselves agreed to.

It was not a vote that was five to four or three to two, it was 100 per cent in favour of that agreement — 100 per cent. Mr. Speaker, political life in British Columbia comes to an all-time low when a Member goes on a fact-finding tour in the northern part of British Columbia, looks at the minute book, knows what the story is, then comes into this Legislature and makes a story out a phony deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, not only that, the Premier made some comments in Vancouver about a Department of Finance official coming to Vancouver. The Leader of the Opposition read into the record again in this Legislature that he had been told by reading *Hansard* that the Department of Finance never had any individual out in the City of Vancouver.

AN HON. MEMBER: It wasn't *Hansard*, it was a letter from Mr. Benson.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Benson, who was the former Minister of Finance — thank goodness he isn't any longer. What happened, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knew full well. The person who was here examining the books of the Province of British Columbia and the operation of the budget in the Province of British Columbia, had nothing to do with the Department of Finance. The Leader of the Opposition doesn't happen to know the difference, as he indicated yesterday about credit, he doesn't have any understanding that the Bank of Canada is a completely separate part of the financial operation of Canada. Once again, Mr. Speaker, he tried to indicate that the Premier of this province was making stories up again about the finances of the Province of British Columbia.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I made that slip purposely because yesterday, the Hon. Leader was up in this House talking about contingent liability again as the N.D.P. have been doing for years and so have the Liberal party in British Columbia. They have indicated in no uncertain terms that they're opposed to contingent liability.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, we want to call it a debt.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, they'll have an opportunity once again as they've had every year, pretty soon to vote on the question of the P.G.E. and the Hydro. They'll have an opportunity, as they've done in the past to show whether or not they're for the expansion of this great railway and the Hydro. They'll have an opportunity to say to the municipalities of British Columbia: "We want to wipe out all of the guaranteed debts which the Minister of Finance has made on behalf of small improvement districts and small municipalities in British Columbia." They'll have the opportunity to say whether that's their position or not.

They'll have the opportunity to indicate to the Province of British Columbia that they cannot take a look at a ledger book and place on one side of it those guarantees which are made on the part of the people of the Province of British Columbia to carry out projects which are worth while in the development of this province and never make one mention, as they've been doing every since he's been leader and long before he was leader, that those liabilities, which are guaranteed by the people of the Province of British Columbia, have asset totals against them which he never mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we should abolish the Crown corporation which has done so much in terms of developing the hydro resources of this province, is the Leader of the Opposition going to go north as he did? Go once again into towns like Chetwynd, towns like Fort Nelson, towns like Fort St. John, Mackenzie? Once again meet one or two of his supporters on the street because he can't get a meeting up there and tell them in northern British Columbia that he's opposed to the extension of the P.G.E.? Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, that the N.D.P. are opposed to the extension of the P.G.E. In northern British Columbia. The leader is nodding his head.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, again the Leader of the Opposition called to task members on this side of the House, because they won't stand up and be counted or that somebody in front of us is pulling the string — the Premier is pulling the string or that the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation (Hon. Mr. Gaglardi) is pulling the string or holding my hand or somebody else's hand and somebody down here can't get up in this Legislature and say what they want to say. Mr. Speaker, that's not what he says when he's out of the country. That's not what he says when he's in Halifax.

Mr. Speaker, what does he say when he's in Halifax when he puts on the other costume? He's got lots of costumes in that wardrobe. This is what he says. In that democratic party over there in Halifax, Mr. Barrett said the place for the M.L.A.s and M.P.s of all parties to iron out their differences is in caucus meetings.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: And that the official position of a part of a government should be supported by its Members in the legislative votes. He commented that there's a lot of blood on the walls of caucus.

The Leader of the Opposition told the conference that Members who can't agree with the positions taken by the party should leave the party.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there's a democratic Social Credit government in this province any Member on this side of the House can make his views known in this legislative chamber anytime.

Mr. Speaker, the chameleon goes on the road and then comes into this Legislature. One day he stands for

something, the next day his ex-leader runs it down. He stands up here and gives the Legislature the idea that nobody could be more pro-American than the Member for Coquitlam. Then two days later the Member for Cowichan-Malahat, who is a far better leader than the Member for Coquitlam, he got up and he tried to make sure that the other side of the coin would be available for public consumption too.

Nobody worked harder, Mr. Speaker, at the sham battle between the B.C. Federation of Labour and Ray Haynes. One minute they're at one another's throat then Ray Haynes goes to Vancouver-Burrard — and the Member for Vancouver-Burrard knows this very well — and inches tippytoe towards the nomination in Vancouver-Burrard. Then the word comes from the chameleon who is the leader of the party "No, this will give us a bad image in the country. Draw back, please camouflage our connection with the labour bosses."

Whatever can be sold one day is one story. The next day is another. Why, Mr. Speaker, did I suggest to spend some time with the Leader of the Opposition? Because that's been Socialist tactics in the Province of British Columbia since the beginning of time.

In favour of motherhood and against sin? No way. Sugar on the arsenic pill is a better description. Sugar on the arsenic pill.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: My friend is going to get an opportunity in the Royal City to find out how the people of the Royal City feel about him. We'll be there, he'd better believe it.

HON. P.A. GAGLARDI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement): He'll be back selling insurance before long.

HON. MR CAMPBELL: Now I want to say a few words about the comical budget by the leader of the Liberal Party yesterday.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR CAMPBELL: He wasn't clapping so loud yesterday, the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey. He could hardly maintain the stiff upper lip himself.

Mr. Speaker, what did we get from the leader of the Liberal Party as an excuse for a policy for British Columbia yesterday? I'm not going to run through his entire speech because you can simply add it up very simply. He took basic federal government responsibilities in railways, in the operation of steamships, in the operation of airplanes, in the field of old-age pensions and he suggested: "Why wait for Ottawa?"

[[Page 317](#)]

Do it right now regardless of the B.N.A. Act, regardless of jurisdiction, regardless of anything else." Coming from a coastal area of British Columbia I want to make particular reference to one point because it illustrates the poverty of the Liberal Party platform for British Columbia.

There was no difficulty yesterday in trying to see what the Liberal Party was trying to say to the people of the Province of British Columbia. They were trying to say, here are all these Ottawa responsibilities which will never get done — do them here.

And what were they? Well, let's talk about coastal ferries. The Member for Point Grey, the Liberal leader, wants to build a ferry that will run from Kelsey Bay up through to Bella Coola and on to the Queen Charlottes and Prince Rupert. He didn't even know the geography of this coast, just as his counterparts when they were going to cut out the federal subsidy for that steamship service didn't know the geography of the West Coast of Vancouver Island. They still felt that people could go to certain of those communities by road if you please, as an excuse for not carrying on with the federal subsidy.

But quite apart from that the Member left out historical ports in this coast which have enjoyed federal subsidies since the beginning of the federal government's activity in this area. He left out Alert Bay, he left out Sointula, he left out Port McNeil, he left out Port Hardy.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, a simple series of excuses for the lame duck federal government — that's all the Liberal Member's speech was yesterday. What did he want us to do, Mr. Speaker? If you please he wanted the provincial government on the backs of the provincial taxpayer to spend \$30 million on air fields — a clear-cut federal responsibility. On the backs of the B.C. taxpayer.

What did he want us to do, Mr. Speaker? He wanted us to build the ports in the Province of British Columbia because the federal government felt that should be unloaded as well on the backs of the provincial taxpayers.

What did he want to do, Mr. Speaker? We have a federal government that this government has been in negotiation with for some time about the P.G.E. and we have been trying for some time to get federal subsidy for that line. What did he want yesterday? He wanted the provincial government to subsidise the unit costs for making the freight rates, if you please, on the C.N.R. which is a federal responsibility through from Prince George to Prince Rupert. He wanted the provincial taxpayer to pay the shot for subsidising that federal lot.

Once again the Liberal policy: "Load the taxpayer of the Province of British Columbia, get on the backs of the taxpayers of the Province of British Columbia." That's what his speech was all about.

What did he want to do, Mr. Speaker, in regards to income tax? And that was a real dandy. The federal government has just passed an income tax bill. I think that's the Liberal Party.

Where was the Member when the Premier of this province went to the federal-provincial conferences not once but three times, and suggested that they didn't have to make the mish-mash of an income tax bill such as they did? The first thing to do he said, was to lower the exemptions for the poor. To lower the exemptions for the old age pensioners.

AN HON. MEMBER: Increase them.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Increase them, that's right. Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: And what did the Member do yesterday? He asked us to take the income tax apart. He asked us to take the income tax apart. And then what did they say about the old age pensioners? Big deal. Once again the load on the backs of the taxpayers, the sole responsibility for old age pensioners' position in the Province of British Columbia. What's their position as the Liberal Party that has control of the old age assistance board, has control over all old age pensions in Canada? What did they say? Forty two cents.

No, Mr. Speaker, when the Member was talking about federal responsibility in this province — loading the backs of the provincial taxpayer — he never helped us when we tried to retain that federal subsidy on those steamships to the middle coast of British Columbia.

He hasn't raised his voice about the atrocious situation on this coast with respect to air-sea rescue which is being battled through by a little alderman all alone pretty well, except for the voice I raised on his behalf, right here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, not one word about the responsibility of the federal government on jobs that they haven't got done now and should be doing.

What about the job of navigation aids on the coast when we are concerned about the oil spills off the west coast? What about the Coast Guard responsibility on this coast?

What about the responsibility of the federal government to establish air-sea rescue in some of the worst waters anywhere to be found in the world.

When it comes to the problems of the small boater, where is the idea of having fast vessels available all of the time for these people who find themselves in difficulty off the coastal waters of British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker, there's plenty for the federal government to do — which is not being done — without him making some suggestions as an apologist for the federal government, simply a question of loading the provincial government with jobs that Ottawa should be doing. That's all he did yesterday.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave that. The Liberal Leader said something else which is typical of the Liberal Party's tradition in this Legislature and has been ever since. I think it's a disgrace even to mention the idea that it implies.

Because what was the suggestion? He was asking the people of the Province of British Columbia to send a Liberal group to Ottawa so they could negotiate these arrangements for the port, for the P.G.E. Mr. Speaker, any time we have a Canada where a provincial premier, and a provincial legislature cannot make known views on behalf of the people of this province without the implication that we have to bend the political knee to a Liberal machine then we haven't got a Canada at all.

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a statement that is a disgrace to the parliamentary process in this province that statement yesterday by the Leader of the Liberal Party has got to be number one. Mr. Speaker, time after time this government has not only gone with clear-cut propositions to the federal government, but has invited the active support of B.C. Members of Parliament whose job it is. This government has never once rejected the help that it could receive from a properly elected M.P. from the Province of British Columbia.

[[Page 318](#)]

All we ask is that they got on with the job and do just that. And for those Members to come in here in this Legislature and lecture this government and suggest to the people of the Province of British Columbia that only the Liberals know how to do something — and that's through patronage — I want no part of that kind of an arrangement at all. Mr. Speaker, if anybody knows anything about patronage it's the Liberal pork-barrel politicians who are in Ottawa at the present time. I'm going to tell the people of the Province of British Columbia that the Liberals support "Kitten Clubs" in Prince Edward Island.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move along to some comments about the budget. I'm pleased to see the attention that this budget has given to two areas in the government service. Namely, the emphasis on desirability of keeping senior citizens in their own homes. Last year through the department of housing 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent of all the money available in Canada was used by the Province of British Columbia to build tenants' housing for senior citizens.

Now, that's a remarkable record. In the Province of British Columbia I believe the answer to senior citizens' housing of all kinds is to open up a series of options for old people, or better still for those who have retired — whether they are old in today's terms or not is a matter of opinion. Most of them that I meet are people who still want to have life options open to them.

The Liberal Party says that it wants and has endorsed the programme of deferred taxation. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that that might be Liberal Party policies. It's not the policy of this government.

Once again, the Liberal Party wants to leave the old age pensioner and those on retirement and fixed incomes the unhappy prospect that they will have an on-going burden of debts. That's the Liberal policy. That's what fixes a great gulf between this side of the House and that side of the House.

We happen to be a credit party and the official Opposition in this House and the Liberal Party are debt parties and so are the Tories and they always were. But, Mr. Speaker, those who are retired wish a series of options in home ownership, an opportunity for subsidised tenancy. We subsidise more tenancy in the Province of British Columbia than anywhere in Canada. Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 25,000 old age pensioners in the Province of British

Columbia who presently occupy subsidised tenancy housing in the province. That's a total that's exceeded nowhere in Canada and is accelerated very markedly in this budget.

We indicated as well that many old age pensioners feel that the old family home is simply too much at this time for them to handle. That it would be better if they still wished to have the opportunity for ownership to look at the possibility of owning a more modest and a more modern kind of accommodation without losing the feeling of security which came from title.

In order to accomplish this we suggested that the old age pensioners should have as many options open to them as anyone else about where their dollars were going to be invested or used. If they had an older home that was becoming too much for them, first we'd help with the home-owner grant and accelerated home-owner grant in this budget. But we'd also suggest to them that they could use strata title, they could get into condominium situations because of new housing proposals brought forward by my colleague the Attorney General. They could go into forms of cooperative apartments. They could take the old home, take the capital from it — and we did not only suggest that they do it, we helped them do it in the municipality of Saanich.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: They sold their homes. Now the Leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Member's leader, said it couldn't be done. That was his answer.

These old people, Mr. Speaker, wanted a cooperative way, an alternative to housing and any option should be there. What did we do?

They took \$5,000 of the capital from their older home. They took a \$5,000 second mortgage from the provincial government, and then they took a \$5,000 mortgage from my friend, Mr. Andras who I must admit cooperated very highly with this programme. I give him credit for it. He's no longer the Minister of Housing and I'm sorry about that too. I got to like Mr. Andras because I like anybody who is a square shooter and says exactly what he means and does exactly what he says he'll do.

These people have now been given a pilot project which is another option for housing open to the people of the Province of British Columbia who happen to be retired. Mr. Speaker, the idea was born right here and the Members know it.

There are a large number of other options which are going to be perused in the coming year on this whole question of housing. All of them, as far as this government is concerned, are going to be open to old age pension groups, retired people's groups, co-op groups, who want to use modern approaches to housing, to condominiums. We're not going to close the door to any series of options, including the option to live on the family farm, and I'm going to have some amendments to the *Municipal Act* which will permit them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the taxation provided for in this budget is another remarkable situation — amounts of the order of \$45 million for education, \$30-odd million for health. The Leader of the Liberal Party can't read a budget. That was obvious yesterday when he said there wasn't any money in addition for municipalities. Amazing. There's \$7 million more.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much per capita?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: There's \$7 million more for municipalities in this budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: What increase per capita?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad all the birds are once again out of their trees. They don't like the Member for Comox to stand up here because they know they always get the truth.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, this budget.... I'll wait, I've got all day.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the Hon. Minister please proceed with his speech?

Interjections by Hon. Members.

[[Page 319](#)]

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: The Member for Cowichan Malahat will get his chance later. Mr. Speaker, municipalities in British Columbia because of the per capita grant and because of the percentage of transfer payments from the provincial government which are higher there than anywhere — they run from 40 per cent to 45 per cent of the total gross revenue of the municipalities — because of that the municipalities in British Columbia have created for themselves a financial situation which is not available anywhere in Canada. When I last spoke the municipal finance authority had not gone once again to the market. They did go just four days after I spoke to you last and the municipal finance authority placed on the market 7.99 per cent bonds. Mr. Speaker, I categorically say that no finance authority on behalf of municipalities in Canada would have even come close.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the municipalities through the system of transfer payment from the province are in a position not simply to budget on a short-term basis but to budget on a long-term basis.

What is forgotten in the municipal finance picture in British Columbia is simply this — along with the per capita grant, Mr. Speaker, unlike other provinces the provincial government here as well enters upon shared-cost programmes for services which elsewhere are normally completely the responsibility of the municipalities.

But in this province there is a formula on top of the per capita grant for such activities as housing for school financing which, if you really look at municipal government in terms of local government instead of municipal government, there is a formula which is the best in Canada for education costs. Nowhere else is the province responsible for raising the local capital in its entirety for schools. The formula is unexcelled for capital anywhere else, relieving therefore the structure of local government finance from that responsibility.

Similarly with hospitals, that's a local government participatory situation in this province. The provincial government again relieves the municipalities of that responsibility.

In other provinces where arterial roads and where metropolitan transit and where metropolitan road systems are required who pays for it? In the Province of Ontario, in the Province of Quebec, in the Province of Manitoba, in Alberta — those road systems, Mr. Speaker, are again the responsibility of the local authority. Here there is a formula which takes the full cost of arterial roads and places it in the Department of Highways, shares on secondary roads on the 60-40 formula basis.

Those formulas have to be taken into account when you're intelligently talking about municipal finance in any province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this budget goes another step. If you really understand the municipal financing in British Columbia you take the transfer payment by way of per capita grants, then you look at various other forms of it.

Now what is the formula in British Columbia for pollution abatement? The formula, Mr. Speaker, is that the provincial government pays 75 per cent of the cost to the local governments in excess of 2 mils.

Now, Mr. Speaker if you look at any of the pollution abatement proposals in Canada you won't find that formula anywhere. Because in most jurisdictions you won't find a formula at all. But, Mr. Speaker, more than that, what is the effect of that formula? The effect of that formula is that having levied 2 mils on the assessment base of

the municipality, with the provincial government picking up 75 per cent of the total remainder that means that the smaller municipalities with low tax bases can afford to go into sewerage treatment. They can afford to go into sewerage treatment in the Province of British Columbia and they can't do it elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do Members think it makes any difference if you've got a pollution problem on the door step of Victoria than if you have one on the door step of Courtenay? Do they think that the application of the programme should not take into account that some parts of the province may be less able, because of their assessments, to handle the problem of pollution on their doorstep?

But from the public health point of view, from an equity point of view, from a responsible point of view — whether they have assets in their own right to be able to accomplish these things or not — it is public policy in the Province of British Columbia to help municipalities who are unable to meet pollution abatement standards.

Mr. Speaker, if this budget doesn't speak out loud and clear that one of the forward thrusts of this budget is pollution abatement then those Members haven't read the budget. They simply haven't read the budget.

Now we take a look at another growing problem in the urban world of the 70's. This is on top of the per capita grant. What are we going to move into now? The budget provides another formula which is not available anywhere else. A formula which will permit a provincial presence for the first time in the area of mass transit.

I don't like to use the word transit because some people in the urban world think that transit either runs with a little train through a hole in the ground 150 feet down or it's not rapid transit.

I don't want to get into the bill, Mr. Speaker, but if you read it — and I'm only talking about it on a formula basis — if you talk about it on a formula basis you're talking about a provincial presence in the transportation world which is going to be one of the number one problems of the urban world of the 70's. Because people in the 70's — and I'm predicting this — are going to become less and less dependent on the motor car. They are going to wish to limit the pollution of the motor car in their villages and in the towns and in their cities.

Long before other jurisdictions stated it as public policy that's a direction we wished to go, not only in the name of the environment, in the name of pollution abatement, but in the name of equity. The provincial government is from now on going to have a permanent position in the emerging transportation problems of our towns or cities and is stating loud and clear that we wish to have a new look at the dependency of the world on the pollution creating problems connected with the use of the motor car.

Mr. Speaker, on this whole question of municipal finance, the Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Mr. Strachan) was good enough to make some out of context comments from a report called the Plunkett report. Has he still got a copy there? Good.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give you some comments too and the leader of the Liberal Party suggested that after this budget I'd have no testimonials to read. I got more and I won't have time to read them all this afternoon but I embarrassed myself so much last time with the modesty of some of the comments made about the Department of Municipal Affairs that I really can't do it again.

But this is from the British Columbia School Trustees' Association speaking about that Plunkett report. I know the Hon. Member had this available but he didn't choose to read it to the House. I don't think he was trying to mislead the

[[Page 320](#)]

House — I wouldn't think he was going to try and tell the people of the Province of British Columbia something that wasn't true — I'm going to tell the former leader he was fudging. He was fudging.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he never fudges.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Here is the president of the B.C. School Trustees' Association talking about the Plunkett report — former president, that's right.

It's a strange thing for me to find myself in complete agreement with the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he brands this report as irresponsible, juvenile and completely false.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they pay for that report?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: No, they didn't. The Member for Cowichan-Malahat got up and told this House and read from a report which a responsible organisation — namely the B.C. School Trustees' Association labeled irresponsible, juvenile and completely false. Mr. Speaker, once again what are the facts?

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker, and once again this is not a testimonial from the Department of Municipal Affairs. This is the document which the municipalities put out when they wished to tell the whole story to Canada and to the world that British Columbia's municipalities have not been excelled anywhere in finance.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cowichan-Malahat — like all members of this Legislature — was presented with this document. The Municipal Finance Authority of British Columbia — what do they say? It was issued in 1971 about the end of August. "The growth and stability of British Columbia municipalities" and then it goes on, Mr. Speaker, on page after page to illustrate in a number of ways and I'm not going to bore you with reading them all here because I'm sure that the former leader of the N.D.P. has long since repented for his, misleading statements that were part of his address on the last occasion he spoke.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other feature of the budget which I think is outstanding and that is the portion of the budget having to do with special funds. I happen to be responsible for the first citizens' fund and these funds going as they do to the items mentioned by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, when last he spoke, are pretty well known as to their intent by the Members of the Legislature.

The fact that the budget has directed that that principle be extended to the beautification of our countryside insofar as unsightly hydro lines are concerned, the fact that it has been extended as a principle to the preservation of open space is a very important financial breakthrough insofar as government is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in other jurisdictions when a commitment is made by government to one form of activity or another, the public can never be sure that it won't be on again off again, up and down and around about, as the economy moves along.

Other jurisdictions — and that's a fundamental difference between Social Credit and the other political parties who operate government — they make a commitment but as far as the taxpayer is concerned, as far as the public is concerned, there is no more assurance that will be on-going policy, that it will be as the Manitoba Premier said here just a little while ago, that he'll be able to eliminate property tax. He said "I'd like to go to the moon some day too." Mr. Speaker, he wished the moon was closer.

Interjection by Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: When this government sets up a perpetual fund, there is not only an availability of capital for school construction and hospital construction on an on-going basis, on a planned basis, on a positive basis, there is an on-going commitment to these programmes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm only going to speak about the fund having to do with the first citizens because I happen to have had the responsibility for distributing \$1,700,000 from the proceeds of this fund — \$1,700,000 in one year.

Mr. Speaker, there is just page after page of community projects, engineered, thought through, initiated, by the Indian people. What, Mr. Speaker, has been the history of commitments to the Indian people by following a budgetary course such as they do in the federal government?

Mr. Speaker, in the last five years, the federal government has made commitments to the Indian people in culture, in housing, in public health, to band councils, to management, to educational seminars. And what happens? It melts away as soon as the winter leaves Ottawa. As soon as that sun comes out down there, there are no funds, Mr. Speaker, there are no funds. The Indian people who have come to expect a certain course of action, Mr. Speaker, the Indian people are honest enough in their dealings with government not to want the moon. But they are determined, Mr. Speaker, that when they have been told that a certain level of financing is available for a programme and they plan on carrying it out and they work on it and they build it up and then they push the button to try and find the funds, to carry out the project and the projects are not there, Mr. Speaker, that is the cruelest thing that can be done with a minority group in this country.

For years, Mr. Speaker, that particular group have had their expectations raised only to be dashed to the ground again because of some budgetary ups and downs, wiggle-wobble, wiffle-waffle, that's going on at the federal government level.

That's not good enough and, Mr. Speaker, you know full well the kind of projects that are involved, because many of them are in your area. It's not large sums of money that are the difference between making life better for these people and not making it better.

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Well, you can have the list, this will be a public document. I'll file the whole list in the House a little later.

AN HON. MEMBER: File yourself!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I know you'd like to file the Member for Comox. The N.D.P. have been trying to do that for five elections.

Mr. Speaker, the N.D.P. always enjoy it when the Member for Comox speaks. They've had five cracks at the Member for Comox and they're going to get a sixth pretty soon. Mr. Speaker, the result will be exactly the same.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hit him again, he's still alive.

[[Page 321](#)]

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: The difference between doing some of the things which are involved with small projects like bringing opportunities to small communities, the difference between having a set of carving tools and not having a set of carving tools, the difference between having a set of books for pre-school kindergarten and not having a set of books, the difference between having some clothes so that the young people who are up in the northern part of British Columbia can come to Vancouver just like anyone else and have clothes to wear.

The difference between having a decent place to have their meetings and not having one — sometimes a very limited outlay, the difference between being able to examine a project for its feasibility to help themselves in community workshops and not being able to do it — Mr. Speaker, this list is full of two and three and four and, yes, larger — 15,000 and 20,000 donations. But the point, I'm trying to make is this: these same kind of statements have been made year after year after year at the federal level about new programmes for Indian people. Handicraft help and cultural help and all this sort of thing. And what happens? No delivery, Mr. Speaker, no delivery system at all.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that long after this government has been in office for 100 years, the best thing that this government will have ever done is to put these priority projects out where the public can see them, with the on-going commitment that they don't have anything to do with day-by-day expediency, political expediency, the ups-and-downs of finances, the ins-and-outs of one political party or another.

Mr. Speaker, that is the crowning glory of this budget. That's one of the fundamental differences between this side and that side. We know that. The N.D.P. party damned these perpetual funds with faint praise and then voted for them, which the N.D.P. quite often do. The Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, in this House, went one step further and never forget that. The Liberal Party said: "Wipe them out altogether, don't have any perpetual funds," go on the normal Liberal Party of in-and-out, up-and-down, wiggle-wobble. No basic commitment. Expediency, expediency, expediency. No programme. No programme, no programme. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that this government has made a basic commitment to the Indian people of British Columbia and kept every word.

I'd like to say a few words about housing. At the present time, in the Province of British Columbia, the urban renewal programme is essentially confined to the greater Victoria area and the beautification of the water front, to the Vancouver area in terms of the only pilot project of its kind in Canada having to do with the community effort to rehabilitate an area without the bulldozer.

That's the Strathcona project. It is the only project of its kind in Canada. It is the first to suggest that urban renewal, as it once was thought to be, is not a good thing for a city and I couldn't agree more because I said it right at the beginning.

This is a project whereby the local people are going to be involved with the renovation of their own community without taking a bunch of bulldozers there and ripping out their traditional and family homes. I want to credit, once again, my friend the former Minister of Housing, Mr. Andras, for bringing this programme last year to fruition. It, I think, is going to be a lighthouse project for Canada.

It was engineered by my friends who happen to sit for Vancouver East — the first Member for Vancouver East, the second Member for Vancouver East, and the Member for Vancouver Centre.

This programme will be the urban renewal programme of the future. But there is a great raft of projects and if any of the Members want to know where housing or urban renewal or land assembly for their own particular communities sits, they could ask me about it in the estimates.

I do want to say something about a specific problem of housing and I want to offer a specific solution. I'm going to ask the question and I'm going to give the answer.

Many people talk about land speculation and there can be no question that there is a great deal of land speculation. There can be no question either, if you know anything about the zoning process, that there is a great deal of artificial scarcity about building lots, particularly in the lower mainland. There can be no real question that the zoning activity on the part of municipalities very substantially confers benefits on people who do not pass it on to the person seeking to own his own home, and that there is a way that this could be done.

The public body has conferred the zoning on a parcel. The facts are that in the lower mainland you could increase the value of a residential lot by as much as \$9,000 and more by the simple exercise of zoning, even if you didn't do anything with it.

From residentially-zoned land, which is currently worth perhaps \$5,000 to \$6,000 an acre, by the actual action of conferring zoning, you can increase the value of that property to \$14,000 and \$15,000. I'm not going to get into the implications of that insofar as the capital gains tax is concerned — and the big steal is on by the Liberal government in Ottawa. Seeking to tax the capital value on that land in which they have no investment or very little and from which the individual is going to be expected to transfer to Ottawa, 3,000 miles away, money which was never created there. It's unearned completely.

Let's take the situation in the lower mainland. In 1968 the value of the land, North Delta, for a residential lot was \$5,500; 1969, it was \$5,700; in 1970, it was \$7,500; in 1971 it's projected to be \$8,500. In Ladner the land was worth \$5,500 in 1968; 1969, \$7,500; 1970, \$7,500; 1971, \$8,500. Tsawwassen is even more spectacular and there are as yet no sewers there.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: If the Member would be patient I'm going to ask some questions and then I'm going to answer the question.

In 1969, there were no sewers in Tsawwassen, and it isn't completely sewered yet. In 1969, the value of a serviced lot was \$6,500, and I'm only taking the low figure not the top figure. In 1970 it is expected to be \$13,500, in 1971, probably \$14,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we take this projection on to five more years, in 1972, and I'll only use one of those places because it illustrates the point, 1972, an individual seeking to build a family home in North Delta, \$8,250 in 1972 — and this is the low figure again — 1973, \$9,075; 1974, \$11,000; 1975, \$12,500; 1976, \$13,750.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there in fact is a way in which this problem can be tackled. Everybody talks about speculation, but nobody does anything about it. Last year, there was placed in the *Municipal Act* a section known as land use contract and a number of planning people in British

[[Page 322](#)]

Columbia, most of whom were airy-fairy planners, I might say, were unwilling to examine the possibility of using the tools which the Legislature had given.

Now let's take a specific proposal and let's take what can be done under the land use contract. This land use contract remains something which the municipality confers on the land and it can't be removed until the conditions are changed by the municipality. Secondly, it is and represents itself as a restrictive covenant against the land.

Thirdly it is registerable and is deposited in the land registry office. Now what can a municipality do under a land use contract? They can develop the area, promote greater efficiency and quality. They can consider the impact of the development on present and future public costs. They can look to the betterment of the environment. They can look to the fulfilment of community goals, which I suggest certainly housing is one of them, and they can provide for necessary public space. They can make that a condition for development.

In the name of lower housing costs, they can do a number of other things.

Before they confer unearned gains on people holding land for simple speculation so that the profit simply disappears into the hands of the developer, they can do a couple of other things, and here's a specific example.

Seventy acres of land. There are no people holding lands who should be permitted to develop those lands without full disclosure of the book value they currently place against the land. That should be a public statement on the part of the developer, handled if you like in committee of the municipality if you wish.

But that public figure could be disclosed to the municipal council, and here's one proposition — \$279,000 is the book value of a particular piece of land in the Municipality of Delta, at the present time. The development cost of that is \$13,200 per acre, and the basic financing that goes along with it is \$1,300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we've come to the time when before a municipality confers such unearned profits on a speculation deal that the individual who is going to own that house has a right to know that land in a sufficient quantity is going to be available and on what terms.

You can do it this way. The overhead for that development is in my opinion a legitimate 5 per cent. The sales costs of that land are in my opinion no more, nor should they be more, than a legitimate 5 per cent. The profit on that land should be no more than a legitimate 5 per cent. The public, that is the Crown or the municipality, certainly in terms of profit the provincial government are entitled to 50 per cent of that profit.

Mr. Speaker, before a municipality confers the zoning on that individual there should be written into the land use contract a contract that that developer will sell that property to John Doe and Mary Smith at a fixed price for a fixed period of time and will guarantee that the price in this case would not be in excess of \$6,500 for one lot and

\$5,600 for another lot.

If you took out the speculative profit, if you took out the speculative value of zoning — which I say does not belong to the person holding the land but belongs to the person seeking to own the home, or a large measure of it does — then you could solve the problem of much of the housing problem in the lower mainland. Because much of the housing programme in the lower mainland is the result of true facts, and true facts only and that is that municipalities have 9,000 acres in their own name, not in the name of any private speculator. They have 9,000 acres in their own name in the lower mainland right now. And they are themselves, Mr. Speaker, if you please, speculating on that land.

Mr. Speaker, that should not contribute to artificial scarcity which is artificially created in the lower mainland because of that factor.

The second factor is that municipalities having zoned under the regional plan enough land in the lower mainland, I would suggest, to look after the needs industrially and commercially from now until probably the year 2050 or 3000 because of another planning goofup, that municipality should be zoning land for residential property but should be attaching to that right — a commitment on the part of the developer — to sell the land at an agreed-to price after there is full disclosure on the part of the developer that his book value is as indicated in documentation straight to the municipal council.

Mr. Speaker, if the municipalities in the lower mainland would do those two things there would not be any artificial scarcity of residential land in the lower mainland. There would be no artificial scarcity.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: If the Member had been listening to what I said, if he will read section 702A of the *Municipal Act* which he voted on last year could be put into the *Municipal Act* it would prevent municipalities from not exercising that section when it came to its commitment in terms of housing.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have the right to do that right now. I'll answer the Member's question. We're going to legislate certain commonsense situations into the *Municipal Act*. I'm not suggesting that that's one of them.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, I'll give you an opportunity to interfere as much as you like with the local economy of municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I do wish to answer some questions concerning an area which is also important in municipal government and that's boundary extensions. I'm going to do it very quickly because no Member in this Legislature has ever shovelled more mud into this chamber than the Member for Vancouver East (Mr. R.A. Williams). And I'm going to bring some fresh air, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Vancouver East the other day talked a lot about democratic government and the rights of the individual in democratic government. He also had a lot to say about the position of various municipal people and the fact that the Department of Municipal Affairs ignored local people and didn't take their advice. Well, Mr. Speaker, because this has become a habit with the Member from Vancouver East I think its time that the people of British Columbia had that gentlemen unmasked once and for all. Because I don't want him to cut and run this time like he did last time when he made all his statements in the House. I hope he'll also stay this year for my estimates, because he certainly didn't stay for estimates last year. That's one of his favourite tactics, Mr. Speaker, to make a speech in the House

and then turn tail and run.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he had some statements to make about a mayor of a municipality and that the Minister of Municipal Affairs ignored the Mayor of that particular municipality. He knew a number of things, again, which he was not prepared to disclose to this House — which is par for the course too.

He knew, for example, that the boundary which was drawn in the Municipality of Dufferin excluded the pulp mill because to have included it in the Municipality of Dufferin would in fact have meant that we would have created on the outskirts of Kamloops another Tadanac, another Fraser Mills, such as the leader of that particular party has been talking against in this Legislature for some time, as I have. But I didn't just talk about it. I eliminated the Municipality of Tadanac and the Municipality of Fraser Mills.

But, Mr. Speaker, what he also didn't say was that the petitions for incorporation at Dufferin were from the people who themselves placed the pulp mill within the boundaries of the proposed municipality at Dufferin and I excluded that particular portion for two reasons.

The first one and I know, being a professional person, all the more sad — and I say most of what I'm saying now more in sorrow than in anger — the Member being a professional person should have known the effect which would have been caused by putting that particular pulp mill inside any municipality.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, if you placed that pulp mill inside Dufferin or inside the municipality of Kamloops the loss to the area in taxation would be an assessment of \$18 million — as of today, \$18,500,000. Therefore the decision was made that until such time as the municipalities within the greater Kamloops area could come to some functional agreement which would permit that assessment to be shared with all of the municipalities, the mill would remain outside, so that the tax take from that pulp mill could remain with the regional district and be shared by all of the municipalities.

But, Mr. Speaker, that Member didn't mention that at all. He lead the people of the Province of British Columbia to believe that Mr. Charlie Bennett was a grey eminence behind the throne and at one time the mayor on an interim basis. He was not appointed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but at a public meeting where the residents of Dufferin voted that he be recommended to occupy the interim mayor's job. Mr. Speaker, that Member knew that, but he suggested that there was some individual by the name of Mr. Charlie Bennett. It would not have taken much professional ability to understand that Mr. Charlie Bennett is neither a resident elector, a tenant elector, or an owner elector in the municipality of Dufferin. And he knows that.

I will read this telegram from the Mayor:

AS MAYOR OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF DUFFERIN I WOULD LIKE TO REPLY TO THE REMARK MADE BY BOB WILLIAMS M.L.A. FOR VANCOUVER EAST. MR. WILLIAMS CHARGES THAT THE CREATION OF DUFFERIN WAS STRICTLY TO BENEFIT A FEW DEVELOPERS AND FAT CAT INDUSTRIES. THIS IS COMPLETE GARBAGE AS MR. WILLIAMS MUST BE AWARE THAT THE TAXPAYERS OF THE AREA PETITIONED AGAINST THE CITY OF KAMLOOPS BOUNDARY EXTENSION WHICH IS THEIR DEMOCRATIC RIGHT AS RESIDENTS OF A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY. THE MINISTER OF THE MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE MUNICIPAL ACT HONoured THAT PETITION. THE TAXPAYERS OF THE AREA THEN VOTED. THE POLL DREW 75.5 PER CENT OF THE PEOPLE IN THE AREA ON MARCH 27, 1971. THERE WAS A 79 PER CENT MAJORITY IN FAVOUR OF INCORPORATION.

You can figure out the arithmetic to that. There was 75.5 per cent of the people of the area turned out — 79 per cent of the people voted in the majority, out of a total of approximately 900 people. Thus the voice of the free people in a democratic country.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I know the Hon. Member doesn't like this. That's why I'm reading it.

IT WOULD SEEM THAT MR. WILLIAMS DOES NOT BELIEVE IN OUR DEMOCRATIC WAYS. DOES MR. WILLIAMS BELIEVE THAT 79 PER CENT OF OUR TAXPAYERS ARE DEVELOPERS? THE ZONING IN DUFFERIN WAS DONE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE MUNICIPAL ACT AFTER PUBLIC HEARINGS AND HAD BEEN HELD AND REFLECTS THE WISHES OF THE INHABITANTS. BOTH KAMLOOPS AND DUFFERIN ARE ON DUAL ASSESSMENT ROLLS WITH KAMLOOPS BEING 27 MILS AND DUFFERIN 12 MILS. IN REGARDS TO DEVELOPERS IN THE AREA, MR. WILLIAMS AS A PLANNER MUST REALISE THAT GOOD COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT IS ESSENTIAL IN ANY MUNICIPALITY AND I FEEL WE ARE FORTUNATE TO HAVE THESE PEOPLE IN THE AREA. MR. WILLIAMS STATES THAT THE MAYOR OF DUFFERIN....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR CAMPBELL: This, Mr. Speaker, is the most despicable part of all. I can stand up in this Legislature and I can protect myself, but the Mayor of Dufferin can't. And who is the Mayor of Dufferin that this gentleman came in and threw the mud all over this chamber at the last occasion he spoke?

MR. WILLIAMS STATED IN THE LEGISLATURE THAT THE MAYOR OF DUFFERIN IS A LAND DEVELOPER. I WOULD LIKE TO CLARIFY THAT ERRONEOUS STATEMENT. MY PROPERTY WAS THE FOURTH....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order!

HON. MR CAMPBELL: No, you don't want to hear it.

MR SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Members are calling order quite properly insofar as the Honourable the Minister is using the proper name of a Member and should be using the constituency. I realise....

HON. MR CAMPBELL: I'm reading a telegram Mr. Speaker....

MR SPEAKER: I quite realise that, but the Minister is not empowered to do indirectly what he could not do directly and this is precisely what is happening. So I am asking you to refrain from naming the Member by name, but by constituency.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be delighted to read this telegram and when the Members of the Legislature hear where I insert the Member "the second Member for Vancouver East" they'll understand who I'm talking about.

THE SECOND MEMBER FOR VANCOUVER EAST STATES THAT THE MAYOR OF DUFFERIN IS A LAND DEVELOPER. I WOULD LIKE TO CLARIFY

[[Page 324](#)]

THAT ERRONEOUS STATEMENT. MY PROPERTY WAS THE FOURTH SMALLHOLDING UNDER THE VETERANS LAND ACT AFTER THIS CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES. I AM NOT A LAND DEVELOPER HAVE NEVER BEEN ONE AND DO NOT INTEND TO BECOME ONE. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO SUBSTANCE TO THE REMARKS MADE BY MR. WILLIAMS THEY ARE NOT BASED ON FACTS BUT A FIGMENT OF HIS OWN IMAGINATION.

I'm sorry Mr. Speaker I'll read that last sentence again.

THERE IS ABSOLUTE NO SUBSTANCE TO THE REMARKS MADE BY THE SECOND MEMBER FOR VANCOUVER EAST THEY ARE NOT BASED ON FACTS BUT A FIGMENT OF HIS OWN IMAGINATION. SIGNED MAYOR ROY PARKER, DISTRICT OF DUFFERIN.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution to the fragmentation surrounding the City of Kamloops. But to come into this Legislature and smear people who can't answer for themselves on the floor of this House is a tactic which is not in keeping with the British parliamentary practice.

Now Mr. Speaker, the Member for Vancouver East, or rather the second Member for Vancouver East — because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't put the first Member for Vancouver East in the same category. I'll say this at least for the first Member for Vancouver East. When he talks about people — he's erroneous in his statements of

course, when he talks about the road-runners and the riff-raff artists — but at least the Members he's talking about are in the Legislature to speak for themselves. I'll give him that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the second Member for Vancouver East has made a public career of smearing people in British Columbia who aren't on the floor of this House.

The Member has a few things to say about the Gulf Islands and the Member, of course, led the people of the Province of British Columbia to understand that the Minister of Municipal Affairs was interfering with the position of local government.

Of course, the second Member for Vancouver East was wrong as usual. I'm going to read the letter which I received as soon as the Member had finished speaking, practically.

This letter is from the person who happens to represent the Gulf Islands and that Member for Vancouver East, (Mr. R.A. Williams), suggested in this House the other day that that document which he was holding up as the end-all and be-all of the planning process in the Province of British Columbia, was a unanimously-endorsed document on the part of the electorate members of the capital regional district.

Let me read you what the gentleman who represents that area had to say. I would rather accept his word I tell the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat, (Mr. Strachan), than the word of the second Member from Vancouver East. I know I have to accept his word because he's an honourable man.

This letter is addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I will start by mentioning that I am the Salt Spring Island electoral area director who had the pleasure of conferring with you along with Alderman E. Broom, Mr. J. McKilvrie, and Mr. C. McQuarry, of U.B.C.M. on December 1, 1971. I appreciated the time and attention you gave us. I am most interested in your reaction to the proposed outer Gulf Island zoning bylaw and the publication "Gulf Island Options." Like you, I am less than enthusiastic about the latter. In fact, I lost a bitterly contested motion, 20 votes to 20, on the regional board to have it referred back to the committee for change. I agree with your point, that politicians must be responsible for charting directions which communities will take. I hope to bring this into effect to a greater extent in the capital regional district since I have been made chairman of the local planning committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, the second Member for Vancouver East certainly does not speak in this province for the democratic process, nor does he represent the political viewpoint, nor does he represent the representative viewpoint of people freely elected in a free society, in a free election on Salt Spring Island and Dufferin — which were the only two subjects he spoke about in his whole address to this House.

He did nothing but discredit the parliamentary process, the democratic rights of citizens to determine their own course. As long as I'm Minister of Municipal Affairs in this province, if people in a free vote exercise an option which is there under the *Municipal Act*, they'll have that right and I want the people of this province to know that that is what makes the difference between a red-herring Socialist and a democratic free government.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Opposition made a point of order.

MR. BARRETT: Earlier in the statements made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he alluded to a reference of mine to a statement made by the Premier and he stated to the House that I had misled the House in my statement. I will bring to your attention....

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order!

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member was referring to a statement that I read and I read as follows. "Today there is no argument" — this is the Premier speaking — "Today there is no argument about whether the

government of B.C. is debt free or not. Financial people around the world know it, even the Government of Canada knows it, the Bank of Canada knows it, they have sent a man to Vancouver to find out."

He then referred to a statement that he said was misleading, from the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Benson, and I read the letter from Mr. Benson as follows: dated January 14:

Dear Mr. Mather:

Thank you for your letter of January 10 in which you ask whether the Bank of Canada sent a special representative to British Columbia, to study the financial methods of the B.C. government....

"The Bank of Canada" is what I asked. The Bank of Canada is what the answer is, and the answer is simply, "it did not," signed by the Minister of Finance.

I ask the Minister to either withdraw his statement or that the records show he made a false statement in terms of what I said, and I give him a copy of this letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a moment, there is no apology necessary, nor is any withdrawal necessary. No intention or imputation of motives was done by either Member when they were on their feet.

The Honourable Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

MR R.M. STRACHAN (Cowichan-Malahat): Well, Mr. Speaker, we just had the annual snake dance by the Minister

[[Page 325](#)]

of Municipal Affairs. He slithered and he slid and he coiled and he curled and like a tarantula he struck at everything that moved.

The reason he never attacked that government is because they've lost all motivation and all movement.

We have this highest lecture about attacking people who are not here to protect themselves. That man, in the last five years, has never made a speech in this House, without undermining, attacking, berating, bedeviling, barracking, every municipal official in the Province of British Columbia who was not here to defend himself.

In that snake-oil dance, he made reference to the island and communications. He said that only he himself, and an alderman somewhere, had ever spoken up on behalf of the waterways of Vancouver Island and the islands. Twice, for the second time in this session, he specifically attacked a person who was not here to defend himself.

He didn't even give the Member from Alberni (Mr. McDiarmid) credit for getting up and fighting for the West Coast — takes all the credit to himself and some alderman. But he attacked the M.P. for Comox-Alberni. That man, as usual, doesn't know what he's talking about. Here's the record for the last two years, of the M.P. for Alberni — unmatched by that man or any other Member anywhere. Here it is.

T. Barnett, M.P. — reference to coastal safety, ship reserve, coast guard, fishing boats and fisheries. Dozens of references. Check them in *Hansard*, my friend, where they have a *Hansard*. Go on, go on.

One, he talked about the Amchitka blast. Two, Berkley sound; three, clean up the mercury and fish; four, Cherry Point tanker pilotage bill; five, drainage and port administration; six, about a sale of the fishing fleets; seven, small boat harbours; eight, fisheries closing lines in territorial waters; nine, oil tanker wreck claim; 10, clean-up plans for oil spills.

The next session: One, B.C. harbours; two, coastal fishermen's protection bill; three, deep sea fisheries bill; four, fisheries bill; five, foreign vessels in coastal areas; six, fisheries research boat; seven, new vessels assistance programme; eight, Pacific salmon licences for Indians; nine, laws of the sea; 10, marinas; 11, oil tankers from the

Arctic; 12, Port Alberni harbour; 13, coastal post offices; 14, maritime quarantine bill; 15, licence policy for salmon; 16, salt fish corporation bill; 17, Sayward Island; 18, search and rescue operations; 19, shipping bill; 20, territorial sea and fisheries zones bill.

When the Hon. Member stood up the last time and talked about the grants — go look at *Hansard* my friend, and you'll find right in there, last December, I forget the exact date, it was before he got up and gave that snake-oil speech about Ottawa — what he didn't tell the House was that this provincial government knew 12 months ahead of time that the federal government intended to change its policies.

That the government knew 12 months ahead of time. Did they raise any protest? Did they ask any questions? Not on your life, they didn't. Did he say that, did they say that because there was no protest, the federal government was actually going to spend more money than they have been?

The Member from Comox went to the proper Minister in Ottawa and that's when they changed it and decided to give another six months extension.

The Minister talked about a number of things. He went after the Leader of the Opposition for his comments about Houston. The *Smithers Interior News* — I would like the Minister to listen to this. The *Smithers Interior News* talking about the same thing.

The disaster named D.V.F.I. If it had happened in a denser population, it would have probably been considered good cause to demand a ministerial resignation of two and an election.

As it stands now, a mill which should have cost no more than \$30 million to construct and bring into operation, has gone to an estimate of nearly \$60 million, and still cannot produce profitably.

Then he goes on to say: "It is time to call a halt to this charade." The *Smithers* paper called it a charade, with the Member as one of the main actors. "It is time to call a halt to this charade, to Williston, Bennett, Bathwater, Bowhouse, et cetera, et cetera. The Bulkley Valley community has lost jobs and incomes because of the ineptness and folly of a very small gang."

Ineptness and folly. "They're responsible and as managers they should resign promptly and properly when their misjudgment are disastrous." It talks about — "to provide jobs which this government mouths constantly, as one of its major aims, P.H.A. 4 'should be broken up to allow two or three or four other sawmills to come into being using well-proven means of production and governed by the coast utilisation."

You know, just a year ago the Minister of Lands, Forest and Water Resources told us: "No more transfer of timber rights." No more transfer of timber rights? Not on your life he hasn't. We know who that company represents. He gets up there and he gives us lectures; ziltch 809 cross 4 — double, double-cross. "Never will we allow the transfer of these rights in the future."

The *Smithers Interior News* says:

We wish to see orderly and economic growth in this valley. D.V.F.I. was not orderly, not economic. It dwelled on the edge of the grandiose, of the dreams of empires, of the whims and wit of a very few men, who took upon themselves the non-accountability of divine right. This, the land of the public that is being bandied about, the trees of the public and so on. The public has the right to know.

They want a public inquiry as to what created that mess up there.

Then he made some reference to the earlier speech I made. Well, there's a little paper up-island — I happen to live in a small community myself and I pay particular attention to what the local paper is saying. And the Parksville-Qualicum Beach *Progress* was talking about the situation in Canada and how anyone who dares raise their voice on behalf of Canada is immediately accused by the sell-out artists of being anti-American.

Let me read to you from the Parksville-Qualicum Beach *Progress*, talking of this:

We wish our own way of life, our own culture, our own political and legal system and such wishes can hardly be considered unnatural. Far less can they be considered anti-American. So before we face any charge in this respect and they mostly emanate from Canadians tied to the American dollar, let the charge be correctly laid: "anti-American, not guilty." But it is considered a crime to profess ourselves pro-Canadian and to actively oppose economic and political occupation by the States or any other country, then we are as guilty as Hell.

That's what it says. I'm quoting the newspaper.

We listened to the Minister across the way talk about damning the federal government because of this oil exploration thing around the Queen Charlottes. The federal

[[Page 326](#)]

government has announced that it's cancelling the permits. Is our provincial government going to cancel the permits that they've issued?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to fight for it?

MR. STRACHAN: Is he going to fight for it? Not on your life he isn't. The other day the Minister made some mention of the second Member from Vancouver East and the speech he made in the House. The Minister of Rehabilitation of the Vancouver Hotel didn't refer to what the second Member from Vancouver East had said.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs didn't answer it. All they did was pour out the invective and abuse and crawl along the gutter with every twisted, mind-splitting word they could think of. There's the map, it's very clear.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when this man became the Minister and he proposed a rational, regional development of our municipalities in the Province of British Columbia, it wasn't a very popular idea, let me tell you.

It wasn't very popular but I supported him and I went into the rural areas of my constituency and as the Minister well knows, I faced some pretty rough meetings in my own constituency, supporting the idea of rational, regional development and some sanity around the boundary question of cities our cities and communities.

I stood up for the Minister and at one meeting I had to almost physically protect his civil servants who were there, as a matter of fact, because of the feeling that had been engendered by the people in the rural area.

But I supported him because I believed that he was going to honestly, straight-forwardly do a job for the people and bring some rationale to our municipal development. There's the map, and no matter how much invective the Minister of Rehabilitation of the Vancouver Hotel uses, no matter how much invective the Minister who just sat down uses there's the map. Not one of them has yet justified the reason for the creation of such a monstrosity of a municipal boundary.

The Member gave a cool presentation of this boundary — what it means to regional development, how it came about. He drew the outlines of the boundary and not one of them have ever said that is not the true boundaries of the municipality. Unless they can say that or unless they can justify going back on everything the Minister said he was going to do then anything else they say is absolute rubbish and merely designed to point away from the fact that as developers, as people with responsibility, as people with an obligation to look into the future, they have failed completely.

It was obvious — the Member from Vancouver East said so — that what the Member from Kamloops wants the Member from Kamloops gets, and that made it clear throughout the province — that in this leadership race it's obvious that the Member from Kamloops has more influence in the cabinet than the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

That's what hurts, that's what hurts. It's all in this leadership derby that's going on over there.

Now, we know. Again look at this map. Now we know what the Minister of Municipal Affairs meant when he pointed at that Member and said: "He can look after his own chaos." There it is.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. STRACHAN: But for a man of the cloth to refuse to face the truth, the fact that they are the boundaries of a municipality contrary to everything that's reasonable and rational then spewing invective — Mr. Speaker, we know now who needs the medical attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the budget, start off the picture of the Premier. I like the picture of the Premier. It's the same picture that was in in 1970, same picture that was in 1971, it's a beautiful picture, you know. It's a picture of an old master, probably drawn by an old master.

AN HON. MEMBER: Retouched by one. That's right.

MR. STRACHAN: But what kind of budget is this? You know, Mr. Speaker, I have very often in the past had some problem, when I gave a name to a budget, in overcoming objections made by the Chair through the name I'd applied to any particular budget.

I remember I referred to one budget as "a piece of massive deception." That was ruled out of order.

Another time I referred to it as "a stacked deck." That was ruled out of order. So I had to go through the rest of the afternoon doing this to indicate what I thought of the budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Waldo knew what you meant.

MR. STRACHAN: Then there's balanced budgets and there's tight budgets and there's fuss-budgets.

I didn't want to call this a fuss budget because that appellation really belongs to the Attorney General. You know, a fuss-budget is a person who is anxious about trifles. Look at his record. Here he's all upset about the night clubs of Vancouver.

He has control of the liquor board and we send inspectors all over the country and they go in and they inspect the hotels and if the doorways are half-an-inch too narrow then they've got to change the door.

If the baseboards are only 1½ in. wide they've got to be 1¾ in. wide. If there's only a quarter horse-power fan up in the wall, it's got to be a three-eighths horse-power fan.

He went over there, you see, to send an inspector into one of these clubs — topless, bottomless, everything else you see — and what did this inspector order the owner to do? "Take out that pin-ball machine. Take out that pin-ball machine." Snapped his fingers, he could and that's it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No more shuffle-board either.

MR. STRACHAN: He's supposed to be in charge but this is a job-creating budget and this fuss-budget over here you know what he's going to do? He's going to create jobs.

Look at the R.C.M.P. vote and you'll see it's up from about \$7 million to \$10 million. We're going to hire a whole lot more policemen to police the nightclubs in Vancouver. Then we're going to create jobs by having every policeman armed with a brand new micrometer, and all these policemen are going to be in all these clubs to check the diameter of the G-string. And that's the answer to the job situation.

I finally decided to call this a fudge budget, a fudge budget. The definition of "fudge" is "a made-up story, nonsense, humbug — often used as an expression of contempt."

I think that you know this budget is a made-up story, it's nonsense, it's humbug and it's an expression of contempt for

the people of British Columbia who are really in need. But if you look through it and look at all the little dabs of colour in there, "fudge" also means "a patch of print, as a colour print, or insertion of late matter on a printed page." Fudge is also "a soft, sugar candy often containing chocolate and nuts." The verb transitive of the word "fudge" is fudging, "to patch together, fake or devise." You know, when you look at this budget it describes it in every facet. In every facet. Let's deal with the chocolate first. Rural power subsidy up from \$2 million to \$3 million. The increase in the home-owner grant to \$185 and \$50 for those over 65. Roads, bridges and ferries up from \$80 million to \$95 million. Construction of provincial buildings up from \$12.5 million to \$18 million. Education up from \$398 million to \$441 million. Apprenticeship training up from \$3.8 million to \$5.2 million. Special funds, the green belt \$25 million, power line beautification \$10 million, accelerated reforestation fund \$10 million.

That's a fair amount of chocolate used there. But let's examine the quality of some of that chocolate. Is it chocolate, or is it nuts, or is it fake, or is it nonsense? Is it humbug, is it a device?

The increase in the home-owner grant to \$185, that's not bad — \$50 for those over 65, that's not bad. But the very first paragraph of this budget speech, is a very interesting paragraph, the very first paragraph.

This is the twentieth successive annual budget of this Social Credit Administration and the 19th it has been my privilege to present as Minister of Finance.

The first Social Credit budget was brought in by a man of the name Einar Gunderson. I liked Mr. Gunderson, he used to sit over about there somewhere and I used to sit down about there in that one year that he sat here and I remember there was a debate going on and Mr. Gunderson was leaning back in his chair, eyes closed. But he wasn't asleep and someone on this side of the House was talking and he got to a place in the speech where he said: "People in glass houses...." and Mr. Gunderson without opening his eyes said: "Should pull down the blinds."

You know, that was prophetic because governments should live in a glass house, but they should not pull down the blinds. This government admits to living in a glass house, it claims to live in a glass house, but it keeps the blinds pulled down all the time.

There are always figures missing. They talked about the increase in the home-owner grant to those over 65. They have all the statistics over there — the computers, everything else. Why didn't they tell us how many people over 65 have their own homes, how many of these will get the extra \$50, how many senior citizens are renting? And you know they didn't mention the increased assessments that are going on all the time.

The Minister who is gone, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, talked about debits and credits and extra \$15 a credit. How about the debit? Again on government responsibility, the increase in assessments.

On the last day of the last session His Honour closed that session with a little speech. In that speech he said:

In order to further benefit the home-owners in the province the *Assessment Equalisation Act* has been amended to prevent an increase in assessment greater than 10 per cent per year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you'll remember that last year I told you about Port Alberni, how because of the inequity of the assessment laws of this province the MacMillan Bloedel Corporation with all that terribly valuable waterfront industrial property is assessed at 10 cents per foot on that land. The barber shop up-town is assessed at \$2 per foot and the home-owner is assessed at \$2 per foot.

Any proper equity in assessment would remove from the taxes of the average people of this province millions and millions of dollars of the load. I've spent some time looking at assessments this last few months. This is land only so that you can't say well somebody added something or something was taken away. I'm referring only to land.

I looked at one folio for a piece of land — this is about .6 of an acre. For 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 the assessment was all the same — \$450. In 1970 that went up to \$1,035. In 1971 it went up to \$1,139. In 1972 it went up to \$1,235. Three years in a row an increase in assessment, starting with 1970.

Another piece — from 1963 to 1968 the assessment was \$1,800. In 1969 it went up, in 1970 it went up, in 1971 it went up and 1972 it went up. This is residential property.

Another one. Starting in 1970, 1.25 acres, \$3,200, \$3,500, \$3,800. Starting in 1970 up, up, up. \$3,000 an acre. These are all pretty close to where the Harmac pulp mill is. Harmac pulp mill was built on 99.8 acres. The assessment on the Harmac property in 1963 was \$78,000. In 1964 it was raised to \$97,000, from 1964 until 1971 it wasn't touched. The assessment was not increased one penny.

While the residential and the farm homes all through that district were being raised — some of them by as much as five and six times — not until the Premier had pushed through that *Equalised Assessment Act* last year did they move at all on the assessment on the Harmac pulp mill property. So who benefits?

You can't raise it any more than 10 per cent. That's it, that's it. In 1972 it went up the 10 per cent. But even worse there's a part of the Harmac property that's not included in this 99 acres. It's called accreted land and they've never been assessed on that land that's added by filling or by silting and build up, they've never been assessed on that.

I'll look at some other property, Northwest Bay. I went to look at some to see what the assessment was on the Northwest Bay property — this is where MacMillan Bloedel take all these logs down and they have that great waterfront operation.

You know, there's no indication of any assessment of any kind on that and when I asked why — this is waterfront property on the coast of Vancouver Island, no assessments value showing at all on it — and I asked why. Well it's included in the tree farm. What do they pay on a tree farm? I cent an acre.

Because this is happening to the industrial properties, and the industrial properties are not carrying their fair share, the senior citizens and every other home-owner in this province is having to pay more than their share. Now, the assessors work under the direction of the Minister of Finance and I discover that all those improvements that are involved in these industrial assessments each one has a folio. Very involved things, but even as an M.L.A. I'm not allowed to look at them.

But anyway, the assessors work under the direction of the provincial Premier. I remember last year he issued directions to them all, even though it was illegal, and here's the commercial property in Chemainus, a piece of commercial property 12,000 square feet which is what, just a little less than about half an acre, a quarter of an acre?

In 1963 it was valued at \$7,010. 1966 it was raised to \$7,500, went down in 1970. In 1971 it went up to \$7,700

[[Page 328](#)]

and now it's \$8,000 for a quarter of an acre.

That's commercial property in Chemainus. MacMillan Bloedel have a piece of property, 6.4 acres. It was \$12,800 in 1963, and in 1972 it's still \$12,800. I wonder how many home-owners in Chemainus have had their assessments increased from 1963? Who sets the rules? Another piece of MacMillan Bloedel property in Chemainus — 73 acres. In 1963 the assessment was \$12,045 for three acres. It was \$12,045 right up until 1970, then it went down \$5. They went down \$5. Equal rights for all and special privilege for none. It went down \$5 in 1970, and in 1971 it's still the same \$12,045. In 1972 it's still \$12,045.

Crofton Pulp and Paper Mill have a piece of land — 2.65 acres again. And mind you these are industrial and waterfront properties, 2.65 acres.

1963, \$2,350. Same, same, same, same until 1971 and it's still the same. Then this year it went up from \$2,350 to \$2,390, a \$40 increase on 2.65 acres.

Another piece of Crofton Pulp and Paper property — 12.91 acres, assessed \$2,390. The same, the same, the same, the same. 1972 still \$2,390. Another section — Crofton Pulp and Paper Mill 16.39 acres — \$1,510 is the assessed value of this 16 acres, that was in 1963. Today's assessed value is \$1,510. Where is the equity? Is it any wonder people are complaining of having to carry an increased tax load when the people who own this choice industrial waterfront property have the inside edge and are left completely alone when it comes to taxes?

That's more, there's more. Let's see what else there is. Here's a residential lot in the same period of time, in the same area — 1.36 acres. In 1963 it was assessed at \$350. It stayed at that, that's a reasonable assessment.

It stayed at that until 1969, then it went up \$710. As I say I showed you all these commercial, these industrial properties owned by the big boys not touched. I showed you other residential properties where they started to increase the assessments in '68. I showed you how in Harmac they didn't touch it until they had to put a 10 per cent limitation on it. That's residential property — \$350.

In 1969 they started to put the block to this one. It went up to \$710. The next year it went up to \$1,260, next year \$1,280, and now its \$1,400. For this little bit of residential property there's been one, two, three, four increases four years in a row.

Let's go up to Lake Cowichan. Again nice lake front property — 13.85 acres. Wouldn't it be nice to have 13.5 acres of frontage on Lake Cowichan? 1963 — \$1,035 and that wasn't changed until 1970 when it went up to \$4,500 then \$4,900 and it is now \$5,400.

Again the 40-acre industrial waterfront property in the B.C. Forest Products mill — 40 acres of industrial waterfront property at Lake Cowichan. In 1963 it was assessed at \$29,000 and it wasn't touched one single penny not even last year when they could have held it down to 10 per cent. But this year they raised it by 10 per cent, to \$32,875. Western Forest Industries, Honeymoon Bay — again nice industrial waterfront property — 204 acres, \$76,000 assessment. Wasn't touched until 1971 when the 10 per cent was in.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: You bet your sweet life. As I say it's one thing for a little man and another when you happen to be good friends with that little government over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sweethearts, sweethearts.

MR. STRACHAN: We know who's side they're on, when the little man gets the assessment up year after year after year — when the direction from this government and the big boys, they wait until the 10 per cent limitation is on, and then even then they don't even do it in some of those properties I was speaking of.

I looked into the matter of exemptions for pollution control equipment, I found at Harmac they're getting an exemption of something like \$600,000 or \$700,000 improvements exempted. I've got others here but I won't carry it any further except to say that I've got a letter from my good friend the Mayor of Vancouver. And he was talking about the impact of that 10 per cent assessment limitation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let me have it. I like Hawaiian stamps.

MR. STRACHAN: And he points out, he says: "You take the 15 largest individual land investment decreases on a dollar basis resulting on the application of this 10 per cent that they put on." And who does it help? Well, let's see. The Burrard Building — they got a decrease in their assessment of \$78,000 because of that 10 per cent limitation. That's an 8.3 per cent decrease. The Hotel Vancouver, they've got a decrease of 5.9 per cent. There was a piece of industrial property, he doesn't name it, it got a decrease of 14 per cent, the Bentall Tower — that modest little cottage — they got a decrease of 4 per cent. Safeway a decrease of \$31,000 — 4.8 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Poor little things.

MR. STRACHAN: MacMillan Bloedel, they only got a 3.3 per cent decrease. But as I say now, where does all this come from? It's all directed by the Minister over there. As I say I've been looking into it. I got a letter from somebody saying I'm only entitled to see the normal portfolios that everyone else is entitled to see, just back the last two years.

But they were very generous, they told me I could get these figures back for 10 years. And I was down there and I'm shown a very involved mineographed sheet with all sorts of figures on it and this is the formula by which they increase the assessments in all the different categories.

If they've got that kind of formula how come these other assessments haven't been going up year after year after year? But do you know where this formula has come from? There is something called the Boeckh building cost modifier. But I couldn't get a copy of this other thing you know. I could probably, if I wrote down to the States, get a copy of this. Because that's where it's printed. The recommendations on the formula as to how we reach our assessments comes from the United States, with a special sheet copying B.C. this, this, this, this.

People don't even know what B.C. is, but they make the decisions sitting over there, and it's obvious that the decisions are always rough on the little guy and some of that nice soft candy that's fudge for the big boys. It's a fudge budget my friends.

What's going to happen to the little guy? You know, you talk about this \$15 increase. In the Ladysmith paper: "School taxes are expected to jump by 10 mils."

What's a \$15 increase in the home-owner grant going to do to the residence of Chemainus when they're faced with a 10 mil jump in their school taxes?

[[Page 329](#)]

I think that particular piece of chocolate has a worm in it. Then we go to roads, bridges and ferries — capital up \$80 million to \$95 million. The question is will it be spent?

Let's go back to public accounts 1970/71. We appropriated \$80 million that year, we spent \$61 million and unexpended \$18,959,000. You know I took that definition of the budget "fudge" and I don't know whether that's made up...so that would fit into the made-up story part, and the nuts.

Construction of public buildings up from \$12,500,000 to \$18 million. Jobs, jobs, jobs. What happened last year? Public accounts 1970/71 we allocated \$12 million. How much did we spend? \$6,600,000. Jobs, jobs, jobs, unexpended \$5,301,000.

In his budget speech the Premier says on page 21, "in the Department of Labour \$1,390,000 more for apprenticeship training." And the flippers went and they all pounded their desks, and we had mental pictures of bright-faced eager-eyed young men going off to learn the trades of an honest craft through the generosity of this government.

Let's look at the record, and see whether this is a fake, a device, humbug, nonsense, or nuts.

The last five years in public accounts — apprenticeship training 1970/71 appropriated \$3,600,000, spent \$3,100,000, unexpended \$470,000, over-expended zilch; 69/70 appropriated \$3,600,000, expended \$2,700,000, unexpended \$896,000, over-expended zilch; 68/69 — hey, hey into the big money! \$3,564,000 was appropriated. The Legislature said this was to be for apprenticeship and industrial training for these bright eager-eyed young men to learn an honest craft. Appropriated \$3,500,000, expended \$2,500,000, unexpended \$1 million.

That 67/68 was a great year for industrial apprenticeship training. We appropriated \$4,200,000 for these eager-eyed clean-cut young Canadians going off to serve an honest apprenticeship. How much did we spend? \$2,400,000, unexpended \$1,700,000. Sixty-six was a pretty good year, that must have been an election year. We allocated \$2,900,000, we spent \$2,400,000, unexpended \$545,000. In these five years alone unexpended was

\$4,695,000 of money for apprenticeships and industrial training that they kept taking credit for. Is it any wonder that we refer to these budgets as works of fiction? I could spend three hours in here talking about how the government over-estimates. And I could spend 10 hours here elaborating on how they underspend — what it means to human beings.

The evidence is the more they appropriate the less they spend. Of course, education in this budget speech is up — from \$398 million to \$441 million. But it includes the home-owner grant increases. This is suppose to be a job creating budget and the education is up, as I say. But we go to the *Victoria Colonist* of February 1, and we find that because of the attitude of this government the Victoria School Board were put in a situation where instead of this budget creating jobs it's going to result in that great *Financial Post* word the "de-hiring" of some teachers.

As a matter of fact, because of the policy of this government there are going to be about 45 employees — mostly teachers — laid off in the City of Victoria.

This is a job-creating budget, and that's how they create jobs, my friends. By putting the school boards in a position they've got to lay off 45 people — teachers, special councillors and all the rest of it. "Jobs, jobs, jobs. We care," he says — the 108 per cent formula means about 45 jobs less in Victoria, but of course you can always put the teachers planting trees.

I'll come to the tree planting a little later.

Pollution control up from \$1,100,000 to \$2,500,000 — that's great. But 100 new jobs, engineers, research men, biologists. Now had we had an educational system that had been producing the research men, the biologists, the engineers, we might have been able to fill the jobs. But I remember once before, Mr. Speaker, when the then Attorney General got up and said people were very concerned about the probation system in this province — about the fact they were locking up young people unnecessarily — and with just the same kind of fanfare announced that "this year in the budget we've got an allowance for" — I think it was — "80 more probation officers, and we're all very happy." This was a government that cared, my friend.

We came back the next year and they had two additional probation officers. The reason? "We couldn't find any trained personnel."

Who runs the school system in this province? Who runs the colleges and universities?

Then of course there's the special fund. There's the green belt fund. But of course the blinds are down on that one too. We're not exactly sure who, why, how, when or under which condition it's going to be used.

But the one I like is this power line beautification bill, I really like that one. Why the Premier was almost in tears when he introduced that the other day.

MR. BARRETT: If he wasn't, the Attorney General was.

MR. STRACHAN: I was almost in tears myself. Because I was thinking back to an amendment that was made to the *Municipal Act* in this Province about the year 1908, and this amendment to the *Municipal Act* of British Columbia authorised municipalities to enter into an agreement with any utility — telephone, electricity or anything else — for the putting of the wires underground. In 1908 that amendment was brought into the *Municipal Act*. On the basis of that amendment the City of Victoria, this beautiful city, went to that great corporate citizen the B.C. Telephone Company and made an agreement with them that the B.C. Tel would put their lines underground.

AN HON. MEMBER: You remember, Waldo?

MR. STRACHAN: They made an agreement and as I recollect the details, under the agreement the city had already paid the B.C. Tel the \$50,000 for some work done. But the B.C. Tel didn't like the agreement so there were some arguments back and forth between the City Hall in Victoria and B.C. Tel so finally they made a new agreement and they both agreed to submit this new agreement to the legislative assembly of British Columbia to be ratified and

made the law of the Province of British Columbia so that neither the city nor the B.C. Tel could welch on it.

If you check the records of 1916 you'll see that piece of legislation. But then what happened? Here they walk in, good corporate citizens, good civic government, hand in hand in this Legislature, asking for the authorisation for the beautification of Victoria. That good corporate citizen, the B.C. Telephone Company sent a man down to Ottawa, and it was introduced into the federal House — a bill to grant a franchise to a company called the Western Telephone Company. As you go through the articles of that particular bill, setting up the Western Telephone Company, you find that the federal

[[Page 330](#)]

bill allowed this Western Telephone Company to take over all the assets of the B.C. Telephone Company and then it went on, in its goodness of heart and for the beautification of Victoria, to allow the Western Telephone Company, with the authority of the directors of the B.C. Telephone Company, to use the name the B.C. Telephone Company.

Which meant that the B.C. Telephone Company agreement with the City of Victoria was taken right out of the provincial jurisdiction into federal jurisdiction and almost 60 years after that amendment to the *Municipal Act* we have a bill brought for the beautification of utilities in the Province of British Columbia. With that experience it's no wonder that our cities have been unable ever to get the utilities to do what they should have been doing in the first place. Because in 1908 the government that was here then, the people who represented it, knew that that's the way it should be done. But because of the strength and power of certain sections of the community this hasn't happened.

We have the accelerated reforestation fund of \$10 million. This is where we'll put some of our unemployed school teachers on to work planting trees.

But the first question I have to ask is why do we need a special fund? If the trees need planting they should be planted. We've said that for years — 20 million acres of unplanted tree country in the Province of British Columbia and all of a sudden you're going to try and made good fellows of yourself by saying you're going to spend \$10 million for the planting of trees.

Mr. Speaker, less than two years ago on September 14, 1970, the Premier of British Columbia, the Minister of Finance went to a federal-provincial conference and if you want to read that presentation this is what he said.

He said:

B.C. Is presently planting 25 million trees at a cost of \$3.5 million as part of a five-year programme to plant 75 million trees by 1975 with a budget of \$10 million. This goal only takes care of current needs to provide for areas requiring reforestation and the indicated expansion and annual cut requires an increase in the annual planting programme to 175 million trees which will cost an estimated \$18 million per year.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. STRACHAN: In other words even with this money we're not even keeping up to present needs. The whole future of this province depends on our ability to keep that forest industry with trees to work on.

Not only is the government incapable of handling the allocation of the timber so that it's handled in an economic way, not only do they give these forest companies special privileges when it comes to assessments and put a high tax on, but you leave unplanted areas that should be planted: The government's own presentation to the federal-provincial conference makes it clear that they're falling down on the job and instead of setting up special funds every year, with that kind of money we should be allocating the \$18 million a year for tree planting.

There was actually no reason for any young fellow last summer to be out of a job when we had that 20 million acres and we've got the kind of money we have.

I was going to comment on the B.C. farm produce promotion bill which gives to the Minister of Industrial Developments \$200,000 to supposedly advertise farm produce. But knowing that Minister, I'm afraid it will be like

the last time, there will be more political propaganda than value to the farmer.

Social assistance in this budget is only up \$1.5 million. The grants and aid of local government and homeowner subsidies up from \$46 million to \$53 million. The government makes a lot of talk about that and we heard the Minister across the way say how well off the municipalities are. We look at this social welfare figure and homeowner grant — these two figures are related. The figure allocated for social assistance and the figure for homeowner grants.

I visited the office of the City of Duncan and despite what this government says the City of Duncan are now paying 25 per cent of the social welfare costs. This government just treats every municipality irrespective of what it's costing per capita. An examination of the figures shows the City of Duncan is costing \$43 per capita for social welfare costs. In Williams Lake it's \$7, in Ladysmith it's \$23, in Castlegar it's \$10, in North Saanich it's \$65 per capita, Langley is \$42. So there's a variety of per capita costs involved in this.

Now who are these people on social welfare? There is no municipal authority tougher with social welfare applicants than the City of Duncan. I look at the record, I discover that June, 1971 there were 75 families on welfare, 20 single women, 21 single men, 3 transients received a total of \$16 — so it's not the long-haired hippy draft-dodging pinko people that are putting the welfare costs up.

In Duncan three transients got \$16 in June, 1971. These are people in the community. Then we find that half of those people have been on welfare for over 12 months. These are the people with health problems who are just simply unable to work because of a health situation and the rest are because of the unemployment situation.

In Duncan it's \$43, the per capita grant is \$30. There it is, there it is right there — per capita grant to Duncan is \$30 and the welfare costs alone are \$43 per capita. I could go into that more but I think it indicates that....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: Well, there it is. This is what the municipalities are facing and he goes up and he goes into that snake-dance, and there's the situation.

More than 25 per cent of the social welfare costs are borne by the City of Duncan and they sure don't waste any money. In 1969 the City of Duncan's per capita welfare costs were one of the highest in the province. In 1970 they were increased by a further 42 per cent and that's the way they are going up and these, the Minister says, are the best treated municipalities in the province.

Then we come to the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen. That \$500,000 vote and I'm not going to refer to the vote, Mr. Speaker but I'm going to make a comparison about how the same thing is treated in different ways.

In this year's budget there is something called the B.C. Automobile Insurance Board being set up. If you'll look at your estimates you'll find it's only a nominal sum — \$15,396 — but that vote is spelled out, where the \$15,000 is going.

It says "Salaries administrative officer, class 2 — \$10,356. Clerk steno, class 2 — \$5,050."

The total vote for B.C. Automobile Insurance Vote is \$15,000 but it's spelled out who is going to be hired, what class they are and how much they are going to get paid. And in every other new vote in this budget that's the way it's handled and that's the way it should be handled.

[[Page 331](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: Who signs the cheques?

MR. STRACHAN: The Provincial Alliance of Businessmen signs the cheques. No lay out, no demonstration, no listing of how many clerks, stenographers, administrator officers or anything else. A straight blank cheque for \$500,000 as a personal slush fund for the Minister of Social Welfare and the Vancouver Hotel.

Why does that Minister get this special privilege? That's what I want to know? Why does that Minister get this special privilege? That he is given a blank vote of \$500,000 when every other Minister must list in every new vote who's going to be hired and how much they're going to get.

What has that Minister got on this government? That's what I want to know. That he can get that kind of special privilege and no other Minister has that right. Who is running things over there?

This budget talks about home ownership. This government claims to have bleeding hearts for the municipalities. It claims it provides jobs. But you know — oh, I'm glad to see the Minister of Municipal snake-dancing is back. Because there's a vote in there — housing and urban renewal. Again this brings up a great mental picture of people in slums finding themselves in garden apartments — all those dirty, dangerous back-alleys cleaned up, no more garbage cans, no more dirty ragged kids running around the back alleys. Housing and urban renewal, jobs, jobs, jobs.

What does the record show? Again, let's go to public accounts: 1970-71 we allocated \$5 million. How much did we spend? — \$2.3 million. Unexpended, \$2.6 million.

1969, 1970 we allocated \$5 million, expended \$3 million, unexpended \$1.7 million. 1968, allocated \$5 million — just guess how much was expended. Oh no, \$1.5 million. Unexpended \$3,486,000. How about this? — urban renewal housing, 1967, the vote was only \$2.5 million. We spent \$1.3 million. But when you add up those figures, Mr. Speaker, you find that in those four years we allocated \$17.5 million, we spent \$8.4 million and we didn't spend \$9 million that was supposed to be for urban and housing in the Province of British Columbia.

Now, what would you call that? When they talk about urban renewal and housing. Would you call it nonsense, a made-up story, humbug, or patched together?

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. STRACHAN: That's right, that's right, thanks for your help, my friends. Then we go on to the B.C. Ferries income. This year the ferries' income is \$30 million, expenditures \$34 million. You know, you go back over the years and despite the fact that we've paid all of the capital out of the taxes of the people of this province, in this last five years there was accumulated deficit of \$17 million in the operation of the B.C. Ferries and they get out there and they try to tell people they're making a profit. An accumulated deficit of \$17 million!

This year alone we're budgeting for a loss of \$4 million on it. Even though we paid all the capital costs the Premier says "No bill of theirs ever ran a business." Well it's easy enough to run a business if you get the taxpayer to put up all the capital. So you have no amortisation costs and then you're going to taxpayers again for another \$4 million to keep it going. Anybody can run a business that way. Anybody. But then he's got the colossal gall to try and leave the impression that it's making money, it's making a profit.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: George Orwood is right. Then on top of that he increases the rates to the farmers of the province. Sure, last November, and here's a list of what the farmers are paying. I understand the books. I understand too well for the Minister — that's why he's wriggling.

However, let's go to B.C. Hydro and see what happens. This is where we're talking about this borrowing. We heard all this guff about not borrowing. I'm sorry the Member from Nanaimo (Mr. Ney) is not in his seat again. Oh, gee, he missed that vote last night too didn't he?

You know, on September 14 last year the Member was giving a speech. The headline says "You Have to Borrow to be Successful."

It is almost financially impossible today to be fiscally successful without borrowing, Nanaimo M.L.A. Frank Ney told the Association of Credit Bureaus of B.C. here Monday.

It's impossible to be financially or fiscally successful unless you borrow...he told the luncheon. I don't know whether borrowing means debt or not, but you know we look at the B.C. Hydro and before we go onto that I want to remind the Premier that this is a publicly-owned corporation and for him to be squandering the consumer's money the way he was advertising those bonds when he knew darn well every single one of them was sold, was a terrible waste of public money, especially when you look up the accounts of B.C. Hydro and who has to pay it.

Let's have a look. You look at the public accounts of B.C. Hydro and they talk about not borrowing and no debts. You know, it's just one of the funniest things I've heard in a long, long time.

Gross revenue for B.C. Hydro \$276 million, interest on debts \$104 million. Total income, gross revenue \$276 million, interest on debts \$104 million — less interest charged to construction, \$16 million. So that really only leaves \$88 million, except that interest charged to construction means that you've borrowed the money, you have to pay interest on it, but instead of taking it out of your gross revenue, you borrow some more money to pay that interest. That's what that means.

AN HON. MEMBER: Social Credit finance!

MR. STRACHAN: In actual facts according to their own records the electrical consumers of this province are now paying about 34 cents of every consumer \$1 on interest charges for B.C. Hydro. That's what that means.

Then you say, "Oh no, that's a contingent liability, it doesn't mean a thing, you don't have to pay, it's not going to cost anybody anything." What garbage, what garbage! Let's look at the P.G.E., the sheet we got the other day. Operating revenues \$38 million. Interest on funded and non-funded debts \$10 million — more than 25 per cent of the total revenue. Remember, who can run a business this way?

In 1954 I think it was, we brought a bill into this House and wiped out \$94 millions of the debt we owned the taxpayers of this province. We just passed a bill and said "you don't owe it anymore." That's called self-liquidating debt. Then when it started up an accumulated deficit, the accumulated deficit got up to about \$5 or \$6 million a few years ago, the Premier says, "Well we'll have to get that flypaper into the taxpayers' pocket again." And we took \$25 million out of the taxpayers' pockets and gave it to the

[[Page 332](#)]

P.G.E. We gave another \$35 million last year, we're going to give them some more this year.

That's the way to run a business, that's the way to be a successful businessman. Anytime you are short of cash just go to the taxpayer. Wipe out the debt with a stroke of the pen and a nod from His Honour when he is in the chair at the end of the session.

Then they give us this holier-than-thou talk about debt being such a terrible thing. School debt, every year the Minister of Education has to stand up and tell me that \$25 million of the money that is supposed to go to operate the schools actually goes to pay the government's section of the school debt.

Hospitals, the Hospitals' Regional Board....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: It's time you started listening, my friend. Now this is a funny thing. The government says these are self liquidating debts, these contingent liabilities are self-liquidating.

AN HON. MEMBER: They get bigger every year.

MR. STRACHAN: They brag about how this government pays 50 per cent or 60 per cent of all the hospital construction in the province. It doesn't come out of your pockets it comes out of the taxpayers' pocket but it is not debt my friends, it's not debt.

How do the hospital boards and regions then pay that debt? How is it done? Because the government has to pay 60 per cent of it — they've got no debt but they have to pay their 60 per cent. I'll tell you how it is done.

Every once in awhile the Minister of Finance sits in his little office and he puts on his glasses and he takes out his fountain pen and he writes out a little cheque — "Province of British Columbia, so many dollars" — and he sends it to the Regional Hospital Board.

This is the government's payment on the hospital debt of the province. But then what happens to it once the hospital board gets it? They take this little cheque which the Premier has sent them out of the goodness of his heart and they endorse it and they deposit it in the bank.

Then they pick up their pen and they sit down and they write a little cheque and they send a cheque for the same amount back to the Premier as a payment from the hospital districts. That's exactly how it's done....

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, but it's not.

MR. STRACHAN: Self-liquidating, no debts, what a garbage can of gobbledegook they peddle the people of this province.

And know, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to refer to what Major Douglas said about contingent liabilities and all the rest of it. I won't take the time of the House.

I just want to refer you to the whole tenure of this budget speech. This was the greatest, this was the most magnificent and this was marvellous and everything was upper and bigger and more — tears streaming down their cheeks, thump, thump, thump, and away we go.

For 20 years these people across the way have tried to lead the people of this province to believe that before 1952 there was nothing in this province. It was an aching void, light had not yet been laid on us. Well, you know, I would like to read to you a budget speech of 1952. No pictures, just a straightforward presentation of what was said, no waste of public money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Those were in the humble years.

MR. STRACHAN: This was what it said:

This time is not a matter of specific or local boom. The growth during the past decade has been general continuous and uniformly sound. It had its birth in a burst of productive energy and wise financing, a productive energy that continued notwithstanding currency exchange problems and trade and payment restrictions. It has been achieved because of planned development of natural resources such as agriculture, oil, base metals, water power, and forest products. It has been achieved because of the application of new skills upon the co-ordination of scientific and practical overall measures that placed Canada

and notice the difference

on a level with the highly productive countries in the world.

There is a relationship there between this province and the rest of the country. Another section:

If we bear in mind all of this then we have no alternative but to conclude that the industrial prospects for British Columbia are brighter and hold more promise than of any other economic region in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sounds like Bennett.

MR. STRACHAN: Almost the same language. There was a Province of British Columbia before this government came to power. I'll go back even further. I'm going to read you some brief excerpts from the budget speech of 1912 because believe it or not there was a British Columbia in 1912.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: This budget speech says — I haven't spoken as long as that individual did, and I'm making sense which he didn't:

The increase of the revenue tax marks the growth of the population, the heavy surplus tells the tale of further capital coming into the country to seek investments for the growth in timber licences, royalties and taxes on coal.

There were royalties in those days.

and in fishing and canning licences presents a picture of the rapid exploitation of the country and of the growth of industrial enterprise.

The second point which may be urged is this:

That the acknowledged prosperity of the province, its improved credit and its large balance may interfere with its just demands which we are making to the Dominion Government for better terms.

But what I'd really like to read to Hon. Members is from this document. I'd like to read this document to you — some brief excerpts. "The increase of population in British Columbia since 1939 is reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1939 — 792,000" and so on and so on. "This increase is unequalled in any Canadian province since the tide of western settlements subsided in the early twenties." And it goes on to talk again about British

[[Page 333](#)]

Columbia. It says: "the percentage increase in British Columbia since 1939 is thus shown to have been twice the increase for Canada as a whole and to have exceeded by a wide margin the increase in any other province."

That's almost word for word with the Premier's speech. Another quote: "The increase in population has been associated with a marked expansion of production of both primary and secondary industries. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows that the net value of production in British Columbia has increased as follows; 1940 — \$36 million, 1951 — \$1,125 million" — an increase of 400 per cent between 1940 and 1951 in production. Forestry production from 1940 to 1951 up 500 per cent and the figures and the things are all here. Mining production up 225 per cent from '40 to '51. Agriculture up 300 per cent — how much has it gone up the last four or five years? — fisheries up 400 per cent.

Then it goes on to say: "Based upon the development of the rich and varied natural resources of the province its diversified manufacturing has expanded rapidly. The estimated gross value of manufacturing has increased as follows: from 1940 it went up from \$311 million to \$1,300 million" — almost 400 per cent increase.

That was from 1940 to 51. This is in a brief presented by Premier W.A.C. Bennett to the Federal-Provincial Cooperation And Economic Development December 14, 1953. That's the Premier of this province talking, the present Premier, about his predecessors and the work they had done. He was willing to do that in 1953, to give credit to the fact that there was a province here....

AN HON. MEMBER: Has it been that long?

MR. STRACHAN: That there had been expansion, that what we've had since then is more of the same.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the record shows very clearly that this government is no better and not much worse than any of its predecessors. But, Mr. Speaker, they should have learned something. This is a different kind of world but they're the same old kind of government. Sometimes they say the right things, but usually when they want someone else to do something about it.

Again, I refer to the federal-provincial conferences. I've got them all here. In the federal-provincial

conference of May 25, 1957, the Premier said: "He asked the federal government to arrange that municipalities can borrow for their proper purposes sums at not more than 2 per cent interest."

Why don't we set up a special fund here to provide sums for the municipalities at not more than 2 per cent? Then you could create the jobs right at a local level. Then we could use those certificates of opportunity, take your special fund, set up a special fund to provide the municipalities with money at 2 per cent.

The Premier wanted it from the federal government. With the kind of surpluses he has why doesn't he do it here provincially instead of all that nonsense about jobs, jobs, jobs?

Let the municipalities get the jobs done they need doing by providing them with this kind of money. The Premier used to like to quote Diefenbaker, and all the statements that John Diefenbaker made about the need to manufacture goods in Canada and to get our own capital in Canada.

Was he anti-American? I don't think so. I think he was just being pro-Canadian.

The Premier's often been critical of federal fiscal policies and so have I. His have always been against tight money but money must be used as an economic weapon. Now I've never heard the Premier in any of his submissions condemn the one-sided unfair taxation policies of this federal government. The unfair policies which give away our natural resources with minimal return to the federal and provincial treasury.

Last speech I gave I told the House about the Schultz Report indicating that the oil and natural gas industry in this province when it comes in from the States is guaranteed at 71 cents on the dollar return in the first year.

Nowhere have I seen the Premier protest that kind of discriminatory tax policy which allows the big boys to get away without paying their fair share of taxation to the Government of Canada. Not once has he ever protested. The federal government allowed the major corporations to set up reserves for future income tax, tax-free loans is what they were. For 1965, it was up to \$1,400 million, by 1968 it was up to \$2,700 million. Welfare for the big corporations, tax-free loans to invest in equipment.

The Premier of this province went to Ottawa in these briefs and in two of them he asked for relief from the oppressive taxation on the forest industry. In one of them he asked for relief from oppressive taxation on the oil and natural gas industry of Canada.

The figures from Colura, that's this report, that have now to be given to the federal government on trade unions and corporations. Above a certain amount these figures show us who paid income tax in Canada and instead of asking for a change to these policies, not only does the Premier give these companies special benefit through his own laws, but not once does he raise his voice in protest against the almost feather-like taxation on nonreplaceable resources. He wasn't a Minister of Finance for British Columbia, he was a Minister of Finance against British Columbia.

Equal rights for all special privileges for none. If you are a businessman in the retail trade in this province you pay income tax on 90 per cent of your income. Mind you, if you are a little guy out there in the boondocks, in the woods working, you'd be paying income tax on all of it except your B.C. exemption. Retail trade 90 per cent of their income, they pay taxes on. The wholesale trade pays income tax on 87 per cent of their income, the construction trade pays income tax on 65 per cent of their income, the manufacturing trade pays income tax on 63 per cent of their income. General mining — that's copper and so on — no royalties, pseudo-royalties, phony royalties. They only pay tax on 32 per cent.

No, that's other mining, that's the coal mining at 32 per cent. Mineral fuel. Metal mining.... I'm talking about the tax that's paid on income in Canada and the special discrimination. Metal mining only pays income tax on 13 per cent of their income and the fuels, the oil and natural gas, they pay income tax on less than 6 per cent of their profits, less than 6 per cent of their profits — and the Premier called that oppressive taxation. He took all these briefs, and not once did he ask for a fair and equitable taxation system so that the people who make the profit out of our irreplaceable natural resources make a decent return through the corporation tax which shows in our accounts as

revenue. Had we had a proper system of taxation, then that return as shown on our share of the corporation tax would have been much larger than it is.

Now we need labour-intensive industry in this province. We have hot-house industries that take a lot of capital and don't provide any jobs and the government's protecting

[[Page 334](#)]

them, they're protecting them and the Minister's done nothing about it.

I'm shocked by the inability of this government to see the change that's required. It's obvious from reading the whole thing that this government is not better, and in many cases much worse, than any previous government in the history of this province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when Harold Wilson was defeated as the Prime Minister of Britain, a year or so ago, I was asked to comment on it and I took it philosophically. I said: I believe it's good for a political system that every once in a while there is a change in the government in power. The British seem to have a built-in political sense by which they do this, which means that always in opposition you have people who have just laid down the levers of power, who know all of the details of the different departments.

Equally important, you have people sitting in the government side of the House who have served their time in opposition and who have some understanding of the meaning and the word of the democratic system and the need for the preservation of that system.

I suggest that one of the problems facing this province today, is the fact that we have in power a government that has had no experience in opposition, doesn't really realise, appreciate, or know how a democratic system should work.

I want to ask this government — what have they done? What kind of society have they produced? Let's just take a look.

The social welfare recipient in British Columbia was once a person who needed help and sympathy and understanding. Now with this government, a social welfare recipient is a dead-beat with scorn and shame heaped on his head. They have turned the whole community against these people no matter what their need or how helpless they may be. That's what the government has done.

They have messed with the trade unions. When I first came to this House, the trade unions of this province were an accepted part of society. It was a proud organisation, accepted by society, participating in the community — and this government has turned every man's hand against them for political reasons.

Let's look at the schoolteachers. You know, when I was a boy in Scotland, one of the most respected persons in every community was the dominie — the schoolteacher. In this province, the schoolteachers were respected in the community and very often they were advisers to individuals in every community. This government has deliberately destroyed their place in the community.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. STRACHAN: Let's look at civic officials in British Columbia. Civic officials in this province were once looked upon as the leaders of the community — since elected this government has attacked, attempted to destroy and undermine the civic official in British Columbia.

Let's look at the doctors in British Columbia. The doctors at one time had the love, respect and admiration of every person. Now the government has made them an object of envy and dislike. I simply want to ask, Mr. Speaker, what kind of sickness motivates this government to embark on these policies? What kind of sickness is it they've brought to the body politic and to the community and the society of British Columbia? A House divided can never

stand and they have divided British Columbia and the people of this province should never forgive them for it.

The other day when the budget speech was being read, we heard the flippers thumping and the shouting, and the shouting, and the shouting: "Go, go, go."

I want those Members to go. I wish they were gone and we'd be better off if they never came back.

MR SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Delta.

MR. R WENMAN (Delta): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in congratulating the last speaker; certainly his own members do recognise that they made a terrible mistake in changing their leadership. My regret to the party for that mistake.

At any rate....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR WENMAN: I can tell my friend I wasn't elected to defend teachers, I was elected to defend all of my constituents, I will defend them as individuals as I would any individual in my community.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Can we have some order please!

MR. WENMAN: Mr. Speaker, reports by the statistics branch of the Department of Industrial Development indicate that British Columbia will have a population of somewhere around 5 million by the year 2000 compared with the population of now of just over 2 million. While the problems of today often bear a pressure that consumes all of our time and energy — or at least too much of it — we have a responsibility as legislators to consider the direction and potential life-styles of the province in this year 2000 as surveyed by the Minister of Industrial Development. Because the foundations that we are laying here today will in large measure determine the quality, as well as the quantity of life in that very near future.

Since by 1980, eight out of 10 Canadians will live in cities, the problems of the future will be even more so than today, the problems of cities. Will Greater Vancouver be allowed or even encouraged to grow to 3 million or 4 million by that time? I hope not. Or is it possible that in some way we may be able to work a kind of decentralisation of the cities — to say instead of that 5 million population, perhaps we could distribute it in 50 cities of 20,000 and 20 cities of 50,000? Some kind of a more logical dispersion of the community of British Columbia.

Will we be able to contain or control the population of the lower mainland and maintain the quality of environment and life style desired, needed, and even demanded by today's urbanised Canadians?

While neither would it be desirable nor possible to stop growth in the lower mainland it would seem imperative that in some way we must bring it under control. Since we are a democratic government, following a free enterprise kind of philosophy, it would seem to me that this method of control must not be so much mandatory in matter as presented in the form of incentives — incentives towards the establishment and expansion of new and existing communities based on solid, economic and social viability throughout the province.

It's an exciting possibility, because there are very, very few towns over 50,000 and we're talking about 20 more

[[Page 335](#)]

cities.

Where will they be? What a great potential in development. The very development of these cities could be the viability that our economy and the growth that our economy will require.

During this next decade, the number of persons between the age of 20 and 29 years of age will increase 28.9 per cent. We would therefore do well to determine what are the amenities, what are the services, what are the needs, that these people, in this population centre — age group of 20 to 29 years — will need.

Fortunately it will be a kind of mobile kind of society because they will be young, and provided that we can give them incentives, the population centre will be between 20 and 29. This could be a young mobile population centre that through incentives could be encouraged to establish these new cities in the northern half or other part of British Columbia other than the lower mainland.

These urbanised Canadians will be more acutely conscious of the quality of the environment and will give it priority over mere capital gain. However, they will still require jobs and homes as well as schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities and values for themselves as well as their families.

I am pleased that the government of the day, in this budget, understands the potential here and is making attempts at opening the green and gold north of British Columbia. Certainly the expansion of the British Columbia Railway, rural electrification programmes and, hopefully, old and new plans for road development in the north and interior of the province, will be sound planning concepts designed to decentralise British Columbia.

As a Member for the lower mainland, I would call for the development of highways in the north. It may seem strange. Certainly I need a lot of facilities in the lower mainland and in my area and I'm going to be asking for those too, but perhaps and probably the priority should be given to northern development of highways and amenities there.

The rate of growth of Canada, which is the highest of all major countries of the world, at nearly twice the rate of the United States, will continue to expand. British Columbia, even with the lowest birth rate and the greatest population expansion, will have to face severe strain and growth in the lower mainland.

It would seem inevitable that if current trends continue unchecked, the probability that greater Vancouver would become such a terrible and unbearable place to live that the population would leave or cease to enter, thereby finding a natural control to a population apex.

We should not have to make the lower mainland an unbearable place to live to control its population, its development, its expansion. This should not be necessary in a modern society which should be able to through sound planning to make greater Vancouver as good a place to live as any other area of the province and I'm not sure as I watch the deteriorating conditions of the growth the expansion of the lower mainland that it is a desirable place to live as the outlying areas.

As for provision for open-space green belt reserves, I don't need to say how pleased I am to hear that announcement in the budget speech. The budget speech if it is significant, in the future will be reflected by this great positive step forward in the establishment of green belt reserves, because it sets a new direction in British Columbia.

A limitation of high-density housing through incentives to home-owners is another sound policy. I think that we should be trying to limit the density of population in the lower mainland and this is a very direct policy of the provincial government. We limit high-density housing when we give incentives to home-owners and I would like to see our lower mainland developed — even if we were to cover it with single-family dwellings, we would still have a density that would probably be too high, so high density housing except in core areas should be discouraged.

However, even more intensified programmes that will reconstruct the city tax base, limit population density, will be required to blend youthful idealism which places such stress today on the quality of life with the practical inevitabilities of growth and expansion. It seems to me in the lower mainland, as well as encouraging outward growth in the northern areas, we should be working towards the decentralisation of the city core of the lower mainland of Vancouver by the establishment of satellite cities.

It seems to me that downtown Vancouver as a commercial core — the core of the centre of the stock market of the financial world, perhaps an entertainment area — should continue to grow and to expand. For retail goods and consumer goods, these should be brought closer to the population centres. The shopping centres and town centres

outside of downtown Vancouver are sound concepts. We should not be taking people to shop for clothes and food and commodities of this type when they can gain them closer to home. If we can keep these people out of the traffic, off the road, it would help the transportation problem as well.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR WENMAN: I think that we need to recognise — no the heart of the city would not be killed, you can never kill the heart of a city and I never want to do that. I'm talking about building down there an office structure, a financial structure, an entertainment structure and an adequate amount of shopping facilities for the people who live there. In order to avoid these other problems, I think that we have to move towards a satellite concept.

I think we have to recognise the access potential and geographic advantages in making even a new secondary core somewhere in the area of perhaps Surrey rather than excessive expansion in downtown Vancouver.

It seems to me, the Member for Vancouver Centre, (Mr. Capozzi), the first Member, is indicating to me that he wants to talk in terms of making green spaces in downtown Vancouver. He has suggested — and I don't know how many he's speaking for — he suggested that this building should not be placed there.

Well, I want to say maybe it should be a green space down there, because we have a place out in Surrey that would be a beautiful spot for the B.C. Building and if they don't want it there, Mr. Premier, we'd be happy to have it out Surrey way. As a matter of fact if you were to put this building out in Surrey....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR WENMAN: Now that's how much you know about Surrey, my friend. Some time come out there and let me show you around.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR WENMAN: You may think it's all farmland but I

[[Page 336](#)]

want to assure you while I wish more of it were farmland, it isn't. Maybe I've overemphasised, maybe you don't realise that we have tremendous highland area with very sound structures and very sound bases. Come out and have a look. Maybe you don't realise that there is something east of Burnaby. Come and have a look one day, east of Burnaby.

At any rate, we'd be most pleased to accept this kind of structure, you know, and right now we're developing in downtown Vancouver one-way roads. We've got all the traffic in the morning going one way and coming out at night. We're wasting half of the potential of the roads we've created in the Province of British Columbia. How about bringing some traffic back the other way by establishing centres, a secondary core perhaps in the Surrey area?

I would suggest that we might also think in terms of decentralisation of industrial bases. I think that we should be bringing the jobs to the people rather than the people to the jobs by encouraging secondary industry in attractive industrial sites in Surrey, Delta, Langley and other areas of the lower mainland. In addition to that, in addition to planning in the lower mainland we must give an incentive, as I mentioned earlier, to northern development and to providing amenities.

I would suggest that in some way we must guarantee the salaries and incentive bonuses to doctors, dentists, and other professionals in order to encourage them to move to these remoter areas. Because as they move there and provide the services the people will move in turn and follow them because they can get the standard and quality of life they desire.

I would suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that in this House we need to establish a northern affairs committee. This northern affairs committee should be encouraged to take M.L.A.'s from this Legislature, from the lower mainland, up

into the north. Because, Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the lower mainland area I feel that I sort of go as far as Prince George or Dawson Creek and then I see a big question mark.

I need help to somehow learn the greater potential of that north through more exposure in this Legislature and through some form of a legislative committee and I would suggest that such a committee should be founded and that we should take and bring a new awareness to all members of this Legislature of the potential of the northern half of this province.

I would suggest that somehow we need to develop and co-ordinate an industrial development plan for the whole province rather than just producing statistics on past performance.

I would suggest that we need to develop and encourage a British Columbian attitude of confidence. Because that attitude of confidence is the mainspring of productivity that gives people the courage and the confidence to move into the development of such a programme.

Another topic that has I have found some concern about is the waning influence of the British Commonwealth. Because Britain's influence as a nation is waning the Commonwealth itself should not be allowed to collapse. The Commonwealth should be maintained, if for no other reason for economic reasons and social reasons such as expanded markets or as an institution for bringing nations together at a time of dangers and nationalism that would break down international structures.

Could Britain remain as a broker between Canada and the European common market? Just because Britain's star is falling does not mean that Canada's could not rise and shine in this sphere of influence.

Again, speaking relating to the British influence in our society it seems unfortunate that the federal government is building a policy that is attempting to make the French part of our culture — which is very valid and very important — more relevant by destroying the British influence in our society.

I think this is an unfortunate way. It's just like that instead of being pro-Canadian so many people are anti-American. Just like we need to be pro-French in Canada we need to be pro-British. By knocking one down you don't build the other up. We need to build both those cultures and all of the other multi-cultural aspects of the Canadian nation rather than knocking each other down.

Last year, one of the Members asked me to comment on teachers so I just have one brief comment at this time. Last year teachers were given the freedom of choice by this Legislature regarding compulsory membership in the British Columbia Teachers' Federation.

I would say that if the Legislature has concluded that this is a good kind of policy, if this is good for the teachers — as it must be since we decided that it was — then who will be the next to be given the same opportunity as the teachers? I would suggest perhaps, for a good start — we always like to start close at home — perhaps we should start with the B.C. Hydro. Maybe they'd like this right or this freedom.

In fact if the Legislature concludes, as it has, that this is sound and fair policy for teachers why should we discriminate against B.C. Hydro workers or any other workers in the province? Maybe we should be looking towards the expansion of that programme. I know I feel that we should and it was on that basis that I supported the legislation last year so I look for more legislation in that vein this year.

Perhaps we could move towards Ontario's charity clause or a version of it whereby a person if they did not wish to belong to a union could make a contribution equal to the amount of their professional or union fees to charity organisations.

Why not in our society preserve the right of the small minority that does not believe in joining unions? Because the vast majority will continue anyway. The experiment with the British Columbia teachers has shown us that 99 per cent of the teachers are members. Why not give that extra one per cent that little bit of freedom of choice? Because each day in our society, every time we pass another law here, pass another regulation, we are usually

limiting our freedom.

Regional districts: Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about regional districts because regional districts could be degenerating into a way to get the public off the back of all levels of government. Regional districts could, I'm not saying they are, I'm saying they could become autonomic, autocratic bureaucracies responsible in practice if not in theory to no one.

I am only going to give this example because it's probably a good and a fair example and all the gentlemen here are honourable and I know they would make their decision not weighted on any minor political bias. I know that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the women?

AN HON. MEMBER: We can take care of ourselves.

MR. WENMAN: I won't be exact, but say that we had an advisory board and this was supposed to represent the whole regional district. Let's take the hospital board, just for example. Well, if there were, say, three members from the

[[Page 337](#)]

Vancouver General Hospital on the advisory board and one member from St. Paul's and one from St. Vincent and one from Surrey Memorial — wouldn't it seem that maybe there was a slight over-weighting in Vancouver? Maybe wouldn't it be little bit hard for them to — well, no, it wouldn't for these gentlemen because they are broad-minded people and they understand the need of the whole region, they're honourable people — but we can't always guarantee that we will have the quality of men we have there. So I would say that we need to somehow make a new plan for these advisory boards so that all areas of the lower mainland are adequately represented not only on the regional board but also on the advisory board as well. That's something that we need to look into to give it a greater democratic structure.

Also, the mayors of the areas that I represent have suggested that maybe the third crossing from Vancouver to North Vancouver shouldn't be built and it should be built in Delta and Surrey as well as an Annacis Island crossing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Humbug!

MR. WENMAN: Now, I'm not going.... I said that's what the mayors have suggested. Now I'm not suggesting that because....

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WENMAN: ...I'm saying that I think, that I think that it's needed there as well. But it does establish a precedent that there are 90,000 people living on the North Shore travelling across two bridges to reach downtown Vancouver. It's interesting that there are 200,000 to 300,000 trying to get across two bridges into Vancouver the other way too, so I'm suggesting that I agree with that priority that we should continue with that bridge. As that bridge is needed, just so is the bridge at Annacis Island. We have to look at the overall picture and the long-term picture and both bridges are needed so I look forward to a recognising by the provincial government.

Several years ago to get the planning tax going we established a special bill and special fund putting the money away that indicated yes, we were going to proceed in that direction. Well, I know we're going to do the same thing. We're going to proceed with the Annacis Island bridge — it's right, it's mentioned by the rapid transit people as the potential combination bridge and I know that in the near future that will be part of the planning in British Columbia.

Another problem or idea I'd like to talk about is that relating to family planning. A dramatic rise in the number of therapeutic abortions in the past year points to the urgent need for expansion of family planning services.

British Columbia has by far the highest rate in Canada — 19 abortions per 100 live births as compared to a national average of 7.6. That is for every five children born live in British Columbia in 1971 there was one aborted.

Now the cost of these abortions to the community is rather staggering. In British Columbia in 1971 there were roughly 7,000 abortions. The cost per abortion was approximately \$200 and the total cost in 1971 for these abortions then would be \$1.4 million. Experience in other countries has shown that programmes of family planning can dramatically reduce the birth of unwanted children.

In a current demonstration and research project of United Community Services of Vancouver with a door-to-door campaign and contact it was found that 15 per cent of those interviewed were referred to a physician or clinic as a result of the visit because they desired information on safer contraceptive measures.

Above all we come back to this figure again — for every five children born live in British Columbia in 1971 there was one aborted.

I would suggest that an outreaching programme of birth control be recognised as a basic responsibility of government and current programmes be expanded under the Public Health Department.

I would suggest that new family living courses in the high schools include a unit on birth control. It was interesting that on our high schools all our committees from the province got together. They established a committee. They produced an excellent course for high schools. Then when the course came out with great expectations one section was missing — the section on birth control.

In researching this, talking to high school principals, I understand that if a ratio of 15-20 out of say 600 girls in a high school leave school each year as a result of unwanted pregnancies surely it is time to bring in a whole family living programme including birth control.

I know that this is a sensitive area and politicians have to be concerned about the reaction of people. Some people say that the public do not want this programme offered in schools. As a result on my questionnaire — I asked this question on 20,000 questionnaires put out — 78 per cent said they are in favour of distributing birth control information prepared by the Department of Health to students through councillors or medical teams in our schools.

In searching a local library of a high school and talking to the principals I said to them: "Now what programme do you offer?" In some schools it is offered on a hit-and-miss basis. Some schools are offering an excellent programme.

How about the young people themselves? Do they want this information? Are they looking for it? I say to you if you go to any high school in a library, look up in the index cards "birth control" and you go to the shelf you don't have to be 10 feet away from the shelf. You look at the shelf and you'll know which are the books on birth control because those books on birth control are worn out and they're tattered because they've been used — if they exist at all.

In one of the libraries the only book that was there when I went to look was on the history of contraception in ancient times. It was a completely useless book but it was the only book that was there and it had been thumbed through so many times for information that was wanting and not available.

The teacher, the librarian, also said to me: "When I put anything with any relevance in it it won't stay in the library for two weeks before it is stolen." Young people have to gain the information in this way or through a back-door method and I think that we are advocating our responsibility as educators when we do not provide this information as a part of the whole programme that was presented to the government.

I think that perhaps no matter on what basis you rationalise this, even if it were to cut down on the number of abortions or even if you did it in relationship to abortion alone you would have enough motivation, enough reason to do so, because the psychological and physiological aspects of abortion on our young people can indeed be severe. These will be problems that will be with us for many, many years — as they are with those young people who must

go through that experience.

[[Page 338](#)]

During the past year Canadians have watched the federal government stack the odds against business in Canada in the form of a *Taxation Act*, the *Competition Act*, the floating of the Canadian dollar and many other similar types of programmes.

However, even in spite of this extreme socialistic federal government in Ottawa who seem to want to give rise to an irresponsible and irrational international hostility, the economic outlook for 1972 looks promising particularly in relationship to the stabilisation of the United States dollar and other world currencies.

Since 42 per cent of our productive output is exported in Canada, the health of our economy might well improve as the economy of our neighboring nations improves provided we haven't priced ourselves out of world markets through excessive wage and price increases in current and forthcoming contract negotiations.

There is currently an urgent need for a new kind of economic theory that starts out by examining first of all the world economy and then explains the domestic economy as a part of that world economy.

British Columbia should study world markets, concentrating on both types of markets — both competitive trade nations with relatively high standards and also with complementary markets of underdeveloped nations where a more direct commodity exchange could possibly be implemented. By nurturing this exchange not only will we have found new markets for the exchange of goods but also will we further increase the productivity of both our nation and further enhance the ability of the other nations and their drive to buy our production.

The present administration in Ottawa seems to be more and more intent on steering Canada away from its historic friends and into a neutralist course in world affairs. It seems more and more intent in trying to prove its manhood or some such item to the United States, and flirting with those countries who have nothing in their record in modern times to indicate that they place the same value on human life and freedom that we do in Canada.

Quite apart from the fact that this could be political and economic folly it is philosophically irrational. No one can fairly dispute the view that Canada as a small nation has a unique role to play to help pave the way for a meaningful liaison between the iron curtain countries and the west — that we can take some interesting initiative that we would not be able to take were we a world power. Those initiatives should not however include public repudiation of our best friends and trading partners.

Since 42 per cent of our value of Canadian productivity is exported, aggressive approaches and new and expanded markets must be found through an aggressive industrial development department.

A market of 22 million people entails a relationship to 207 million people, to markets of the United States — let alone the potential of Australia, New Zealand and other Pacific rim countries. We should not fear potentials of an expanded free trade areas. Because strong economies at home are a factor which strengthen, not dilute, nationalistic identity.

The last tariff reductions of the Kennedy round went into effect at the first of last month, and since Britain's entry into the European common market will inaugurate new trade relationships there, it is time to seriously discuss and enter into further free trade agreement in these and new expanded markets as well as markets in the United States.

The basic ingredient of a free trade association, customs union or common market is the improvement of economic conditions of all of its members. This is usually accomplished by a gradual reduction of tariffs, duties, quotas and other restrictions on the movement of goods that work to the detriment of both countries.

With trade restrictions the originating country sells less, and the country of destination pays more for the goods received. For the man in the street it means very simply that his money buys fewer of the things that he wants

for his standards and quality of life.

There are several possible trade zones and common markets that could be established, and it would be interesting to look at some of these. In the budget speech — in the appendix — our Premier has talked about the first concept, the concept of market agreements between Canada and United States and gradually reducing tariffs and trade restrictions between the two, eventually eliminating them after the fashion of the European Free Trade Association or the European common market.

An extension possibly of this is a common market type of agreement involving Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. Perhaps this would appeal to some people who are so concerned with being swallowed up by the United States. Perhaps we should even start here first with some kind of a joint relationship with Australia and New Zealand as well for the common market. Because Australia and New Zealand face common problems to Canada if the European common market shuts out the Commonwealth trade. If Australia and New Zealand were to join Canada and the United States in the common market there would be less feelings by Canadians that they were being swallowed up by the colossus to our south. Certainly a potential for a Pacific rim market exists now and in British Columbia.

I would like to conclude by a very brief statement that I call the "nuts and bolts of the good life" theory.

We have been enjoying a good life in British Columbia, now let's show the province that we are the government who cares not only for the development and the recreational needs of tourists but for also the little guy in the lower mainland who wants to launch a boat.

I want to say to the Honourable Minister of Highways, I want to express appreciation for the opening up of the causeway on the south side. Not only did the barricade disappear, but the grader happened to drag its blade in a few spots and it's very adequate and we the people of Delta appreciate that very, very much.

We appreciate further the action of the Minister of Recreation and Conservation who has had his people out there surveying the area and they have now volunteered a boat launching site for the Delta area. This is at the Canoe Pass area, an old cannery site there, and the federal government has very generously — as an election approaches — decided that they could contribute \$15,000 and three acres of parking space. So I am very pleased to say that in Delta I am confident in the next year we will have a place for the little guy who wants a boat launching ramp so that he will know that this is the government who really cares.

Hon. Mr. Williston moves adjournment of the debate. Motion approved.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that I had an official meeting with His

[[Page 339](#)]

Honour the Lieutenant-Governor this afternoon and he is in good health.

Hon. Mr. Peterson presents the report of the committee to select the names for the special committee on motion pictures.

Hon. Mr. Skillings presents the annual report of the Department of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce for the year ending December 31, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Bennett moves adjournment of the House. Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

The House met at 8:00 p.m.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

HON. R.G. WILLISTON (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Mr. Speaker, it's not very often that Hon. Members of the House get threatened in an easy calm way as they stand up to deliver their speech for the night. But with four speakers tonight and if we carry on anything like we did this afternoon — with four speakers tonight some are beginning to object to the hours that we are keeping.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than take my speech as read or presented I will try and accommodate the other Members this evening and unless somebody disturbs me unduly (laughter) I'll meet all the commitments I've made, Mr. Speaker.

Pending that, first of all one or two words, and some of the Honourable Members aren't back yet from the evening supper.

The Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Mr. Strachan) this afternoon, I was most impressed with the diligent research he had done on the matters of assessments and how the industrial assessments had not gone up but the assessments on other people throughout his riding had gone up. He quoted us right back to 1960 and followed through, and I was quite impressed.

He even brought in Mr. Bonner, or some of the rest of them did, at the time Mr. Bonner happened to be sitting in the House. How he happened to have anything to do with Cowichan-Malahat I don't know but that was at the time it was passed out.

But the only point the Hon. Member made that I found of real significance, is that while the assessors and everyone else is moving through, there's only one person consistently that's been in Cowichan-Malahat over that period of time and that happened to be the present Member because he has represented us all the time. If there are these discrepancies in assessments in the area and they haven't been brought to the attention of anyone until this time, I think the most damaging thing that was brought up this afternoon was the assessment against the Member himself — as to the job he happens to be doing on behalf of the people that are there. Because I can tell the Hon. Member, if there are obvious things of that nature in his own riding and he doesn't attend to them — he's the person who's elected to look after those things and take account of them and not try and press them for political advantage.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader the other day in speaking again to the debate and getting back on the matter of Nelson brought up two things which I wish to deal with tonight.

The first, he was again back to the matter of foul play by this government against the small little community of Nelson — that we were forcing them into a situation. And even as he was speaking in the House he said I had people out there, meeting with them at Nelson.

May I say, Honourable Members, that that meeting was arranged with the mayor at the time of the state dinner and the opening of the House. The mayor was here, and the arrangement was made for the technical people to be there at Nelson speaking with them and clearing the matters so that the Honourable Minister of Highways and myself could go there next Saturday and have another meeting with the technical matters out of the way.

To infer it was a squeeze play coming up at this time after it had been arranged by themselves, Mr. Speaker, indicates that he reaches in these debates a long way to make a point.

The second point, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member was giving advice to my colleague the Minister of Highways as to what he should be doing for his community in Nelson. Let me say it very simply tonight, because if he followed the advice of the Liberal Member he would be one of the first Members in this House to have been accused of a matter which would force him both to resign and cease to be a Member in this Legislature.

If he were to follow the advice of the Leader of the Liberal group, he would be taking a provincial resource, to which they had no basic entitlement, even though that Member tried to state they did. It resulted from provincial moneys and provincial arrangements and provincial dams which set up the water storage behind Duncan dam and behind Libby dam.

He is still making the argument the second time around that the City of Nelson should get the first crack without payment at that water, to place their power plants with water in that position of value even though then it would not more than meet about half the needs of the City of Nelson.

Mr. Speaker, let me say it in another way. If that was a sawmill without timber, and you automatically guaranteed them timber and then you were in a position where it would eventually have to be sold, that mill with a guarantee of timber would be worth a considerable amount of money — because of the guarantee of that timber.

What the Honourable Member is saying, and saying it here tonight, is that a Crown resource which the City of Nelson had nothing to do with, that the storage be assigned to the City of Nelson as a capital gain because the power plants which the City of Nelson has cannot meet the needs of that city.

Mr. Speaker, if the Member did this, or anyone in this House did this and stood in the position of responsibility he would be out, and he should be out as the Member of this area. For the leader of the Liberal group to present this as a point and not only doing it once, but doing it twice I find it....

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign, resign!

[[Page 340](#)]

HON. MR. WILLISTON: The second thing, Mr. Speaker. Even though the other day he didn't understand, even though the fact is that the reservoirs are already created, even though what we need now is to put the machining in without additional ecological fault, the Honourable Member still came back and said: "Forget it, waste it, we don't need it, follow my advice, use nuclear power which we have yet to develop — follow the example of Ontario — bring it to British Columbia and forget that which we have."

If that's the kind of advice we're getting from people who are running for office and want to run this province, Mr. Speaker, I think we've heard enough of them right now and they better go back to other types of activity.

Mr. Speaker, I've made a commitment. I'll stay with it. I happen to be proud this evening that we in this period in which we are living in British Columbia and in Canada, that we have the fiscal resources in this province to produce that budget which was presented in this House last Friday.

One can argue about the distribution of money, as long as we have different points of view that will take place. We can argue about the distribution of the money, and the desired expenditures that we're going to have. But there can be absolutely no argument, Mr. Speaker, that only prudent well-managed financial policies have made such a document possible in the first place.

To fund such a programme of services to people, Mr. Speaker, without borrowing capital and without increasing taxation is a major achievement in itself. Watching the reports of this, Mr. Speaker, I thought the highest compliment that was paid to our Premier as Minister of Finance was that the budget was as to be expected. Therefore it ceased to have any real shock value as news, and since it hasn't, it's been ridiculed and laughed at in some corners.

It was the same old thing, Mr. Speaker. After 20 years just another balanced, challenging, expansionist, job-creating, need-fulfilling, people-centred, recreation-inspired, community-supporting, health-protecting, education-providing, service-oriented, socially-adjusted, cooperatively stimulating, environmentally-directed, anti-inflationary, culturally-responsive, physically-demanding, resource developing, initiative-encouraging, line-stringing and line-burying budget.

And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: Thankfully we've wakened them all up for the evening.

Mr. Speaker, such documents do not just happen. I can readily recall from my days in education that the most important aspect of a teacher's work was the ability to create and maintain an environment in which learning could take place. Without such an ability the classroom, the equipment and the academic accomplishments of the teacher could mean very little.

It is the same in the situation that we are debating here tonight. Budgets do not just happen. They result from direct leadership which is in tune with the needs and the economic potentialities of the area served. I spend little time in eulogising people or things, for I strongly feel that that which is not readily observable by others does not improve with words of praise.

In British Columbia it is readily apparent that we have an outstanding performer who enhances his leadership skills with an unmatched financial capability and understanding — a rare combination to be found in public life these days. At the same time he is able to maintain a positive economic environment in this province which ensures the people of a fair share of the financial returns that are generated.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, budgets do not just happen. To be effective they merely spell out that point in planning and activity where the money will be provided and so can be used efficiently to allow for specific achievement or progress within designated fields.

Because of the emphasis given by this budget to matters relating to the maintenance and the improvement of our environment my remarks tonight will be directed to these programmes in such a way as to show the co-ordination of planning, organisation and purpose which has and is taking place within this area of administration.

Others in debate will speak knowledgeably of other important matters deserving a special attention. I do not intend to try and deal with the total impact of financial policies. I do not try to intend to deal with the total impact of the financial policies as they were presented to the House on Friday last.

However, Honourable Members realise that I do have some interest, experience and administrative background in the field of education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I comment briefly on matters which interest me and I feel are important. In 1956, when I was responsible for this department, the provincial budget totalled \$258 million or a little more, with education receiving \$47 million or 18 per cent of the total expenditures.

On Friday, the Premier drew attention to the increasing share of provincial revenue needed to service this item of expenditure. With respect may I say the figures used were not sufficiently dramatic in illustrating the change that is taking place when one considers "like with like" on the longer base of comparison.

The 1956 budget included a debt repayment charge of \$13.7 million and did not include medicare, pollution control, reservoir control, rural power subsidies, transit subsidies, regional parks and tourism which are now major budgetary expenditures.

If the educational costs were compared on the basis of "like with like" the actual increase would be about 33.3 per cent and not the 30.9 per cent as reported in the budget document. The same type of comparison could be made with regard to health care costs. Such provide the real base for concern as we move into the decade of the 70's.

Ontario recently reported that unless such costs were controlled they would shortly bankrupt that province. The same would be true here if the government did not determine to institute a degree of fair restraint to ensure a balanced approach in meeting the total needs of people.

Mr. Speaker, when I went home at supper time tonight I picked up the latest copy of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* report on business, and there I chanced to read that to get tough on spending Nova Scotia jobs and programmes are affected — and that happens to be a Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker.

I want to read this and then go back to my own notes because I wondered whether the notes were written by myself or written by Mr. Regan. For he says, and he's talking about the increased costs of certain programmes:

[[Page 341](#)]

These programmes, including medicare, hospitalisation, welfare, education and debt servicing, account for threequarters of the government spending in Nova Scotia. Within 12 years the cost of education, medical care and hospitalisation alone will exceed the total provincial revenue unless restraints are imposed right now.

He goes on to show that by that time the total expenditures will be \$750 million and the total revenues will be \$525 million. Unless somebody starts showing some degree of restraint at the present time difficulties are going to occur.

All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to look at our own budgeting and watch right now. One does not have to analyse too many figures or to have advanced training in mathematics to be able to see what's happening right here in British Columbia. To illustrate, use the base year of 1960 as compared to the proposals being considered for 1972/73.

The provincial revenues have increased approximately four times. This must be considered the prime point of reference and control. Because if you haven't got the money you can't spend it.

Education costs have increased seven times. This might not be so serious except that actual level of expenditure was the highest of all the services provided by government. When you have the highest cost escalating the fastest with people determined to take strike action rather than apply some logic and reason to finding solutions, that situation is critical, and it's critical in this province.

Health and social services costs have increased five times. Of equal importance is the fact that they stand second as a total cost item for government.

Together education, health, and social services will take 69 per cent of the budget for the next year, and you notice in Mr. Regan's it was 75 per cent with debt services and his debt services at the moment are about 5 per cent.

If the expenditures for these items continue to advance at a rate of one-and-a-half times that for revenue accumulation, one does not have to be very astute to realise that from the position of 70 per cent of our total to the entire total can be accomplished early in the 1980's.

The budget has included provision for some perpetual funds. Unless some restraint is exercised, Mr. Speaker, these sources of finance may have to meet the needs for special services where all other money is directed elsewhere. Just look at the amount dedicated to the funds and relate this to our everyday business, people have thought it large. The total allocation does not equal this year's increase in education, hospital insurance, and the government's share of the medical plan costs. Stated another way, it would represent but one quarter of the interest payment on debt had the former government's borrowing policies been continued up until the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I accept my responsibilities within the field of resource and related provincial development. Using the same points of reference noted above — that is 1960 compared to 1972/73 — expenditures provided to keep pace within the total resource field, including development resources which is highways, have increased 2.7 times against revenue at four times. Even this figure would not have been possible had not the largest single vote, that allotted to highways and ferries, increased only 2.4 times. This left room for forestry to increase three times and of more importance of late, to allow water resources pollution expenditures to expand 13 times. The escalation of a small amount does not involve very large sums of money but in this case it does reflect the concern of government and people generally with environmental matters.

We should all be sufficiently realistic, Mr. Speaker, to know that when an obligation has been accepted we have a responsibility to organise our affairs so that cost can be met with appropriate increases on an annual basis. It should be realised that under the present fiscal sharing policies in Canada the higher our own standard of wages and services become, the more we must contribute to the national economy.

It is our belief that some nationally-shared investment programmes have not been directed so as to ensure a return which would bring maximum beneficial economic benefit to the individual in need. Only a negative income tax proposal would do this and this budget restates this belief on behalf of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, while we were talking about some aspects of going to the people when costs for teachers' salaries were over 6.5 per cent, I just happened to remember as I was speaking that in Nova Scotia they have clamped a 5 per cent increase in that province to hold cost areas in line and that happens to be a Liberal regime there.

Mr. Speaker, concern for a quality environment has been expressed in several ways in the budget which we are debating. It can be said without argument that the main new threats of the fiscal provision have been within this total field. For many years the fire protection officers in the forest service have stressed the motto "Keep B.C. Green." This budget has made a loud and clear statement of official government policy, — "B.C. Will be Kept Green and Clean." If you say it another way, Mr. Speaker: "We really mean to stay green and clean in British Columbia."

Actions can speak louder than words. Such action has been guaranteed by provisions made through special funds, that is the Accelerated Park Development Fund, the Accelerated Reforestation Fund, the Green Belt Protection Fund, plus changes in departmental administrative policies and the major increases allowed for the expansion of the pollution-control administrative structure.

For a few minutes this evening, I shall discuss the co-ordination in approach to the development of a quality environment which now made possible to achieve because of actions taken in these budget proposals.

Better than 60 per cent of British Columbia is classified as forest land. This cannot be sold unless it can be shown that higher returns can be secured from other uses. Now that forest land is being perpetually managed for the growth of forest crops, plus such multiple-use aspects as recreation, wildlife habitat, and watershed control, that value has increased. Alienation will be even more difficult.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, when the forester uses the land, he uses only one given acre once every 80 years and for the other 79 years other uses and other persons use that land.

Wherever intensive recreational use becomes apparent in forest land, the area is taken from the forest and placed under the administration of the Department of Recreation and Conservation. The special fund allocation will allow faster work on intensive developments. To ensure that such areas are safeguarded in the first place, the forest service now has recreational officers in each district who are responsible for management plans to protect those places which have a high recreational potential. In the interim period allowance is made for developing casual public use of such areas.

The approach between the two departments is one of co-ordination and cooperation and not one of conflict.
Total

[[Page 342](#)]

government interest is reflected through the environment and land use committee, where it is possible to secure agreement as to priority for action on a province-wide basis.

In the early days of British Columbia certain strategic properties were sold which could have helped to preserve green belts in the vicinity of our built-up metropolitan areas and along our main arteries of communication. Some of these lands could be developed with forest cover for incidental recreational use, while others should remain in use as open-type farming areas on a leasehold tenure basis. Where cooperation is shown it will now be possible to bring such lands back under Crown control to serve in enriching our environment. Where cleanup and reforestation

are required another special fund has been established which shall make this possible, as and when required.

In so far as forestry is concerned, the special fund has made it possible to translate multiple-use policy into action without giving primary consideration to direct economic return. True, there are many areas in the province where there is still not a satisfactory stand of second growth forest where there was once prime timber which has been removed by harvest, disease or fire.

Without the special fund, priority had to be given to those growing sites which had the highest potential for the production of commercial timber. And the words that were given this afternoon concerning the programme, Mr. Speaker, by the Honourable Member for Cowichan-Malahat I did not recognise them, I did not accept them.

We have not been on the programme that he announced in this House this afternoon, what he was reading from I'm not quite sure. The point we took of the programme for 1975 is 75 million trees which were committed and were on programme, that is the programme we're on, Mr. Speaker, at the time.

When we reach that programme — that is the committed programme — when we look at our potential programme which we have now as we're going I'm accepting responsibility for that which we have decided on. When you take the total from the 75 million on, that is almost unlimited, Mr. Speaker, that is almost unlimited.

We're looking after the 75 million right now. When we move on from that period....

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: Mr. Speaker, they can say what they will. They roll their heads around, they'll take their N.D.P., they'll take the rest of their people in Canada. There's no programme in Canada today that comes anything like near the reforestation here, particularly where the Honourable Member for Vancouver East has anything to do. They haven't even moved in the area.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: As I said, without this special fund, Mr. Speaker, priority had to be given to those growing sites which had the highest potential for the production of commercial timber. It will now be possible to rehabilitate sites, particularly those close to highways, or those having aesthetic relationships to the development of a quality environment. This does not mean that attention will be diverted away from the prime growing sites. The total programme will be enhanced to accommodate other indirect and intangible values which the public now desires.

A few words, Mr. Speaker, about the environment and land use committee. Public concern with environmental matters has resulted in a co-ordinated approach to the planning, organisation and administration of our land and water resources involving all concerned departments of government. This is carried out through the environment and land use committee which was established through statutory authority at the last legislative session. The basic organisation is three-tiered consisting of a committee of ministers, the technical committee of deputy ministers, and such technical sub-committees as may be required to work on specific study assignments.

The ministers' committee has the added task of providing a means for the general public to present points of view on environmental matters which may not necessarily be technically supported. And this, Mr. Speaker, is a point of understanding which must be reached because when technical men are sent out on technical hearings — the hearings are technical — and in many instances, particularly at the forestry hearings a year ago, there were efforts made to turn them into political hearings and not technical hearings.

Those people, technicians and the experts they have with them, are not to resolve political problems and political policy matters. That is a matter for the....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: Mr. Speaker, if he'll listen tonight he will just find exactly the opposite that are in

there. While we were carrying on tonight it was indicated that we have two very distinguished visitors in the Speaker's gallery — I should say besides my wife who is in the other gallery. But we have two distinguished guests in the Speaker's Gallery, Judge Branca and Judge Nemetz are both here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the ministers' committee has the added task of providing a means for the general public to present points of view on environmental matters which may not necessarily be technically supported.

A co-ordinator has been named at the deputy ministers' committee level through whom reports and recommendations are channelled for action.

Concern for the environment has become a watchword in the administration of all departments of government that work within this field.

A few examples, Mr. Speaker, of the action within the last year. The Vanderhoof-Hazelton land capability study was completed. The resulting colour-coded, transparent overlay atlas gives capability and existing use information with general assessments for agriculture, forestry, mining, recreation, fish and wildlife, and water resources. The potentials are graded in terms of high, medium, or low.

The Vanderhoof guide has been used for the East Kootenay study which is now in progress. During the period of study, a land-use moratorium has been established which is expected to last one year from last September.

Meetings took place with the 28 regional districts to co-ordinate and improve administration of land resource matters. Specific district concerns are being isolated and made the subject of technical studies.

The committee carried out a detailed study of the Libby reservoir to try and resolve conflicting land use problems, particularly those related to the competition for Crown range as between ungulates and domestic livestock.

The Ecological Reserves Act was developed under the

[[Page 343](#)]

committee with the deputy Minister of Lands serving as the co-ordinating administrative official.

And a report is out, Mr. Speaker. Some of the Honourable Members may wish to keep check on the ecological reserves as they are established, the regular reports come out and are available if they contact the deputy Minister of Lands for copies and they will keep Members up-to-date on the action which is proceeding within that department.

Now policies concerning Crown land waterfront policy have been developed in cooperation with the Department of Lands to ensure adequate preservation from alienation, restriction of ribbon development, together with public access and proper pollution control.

It may be of interest, Mr. Speaker, because most members are not aware of this change and this will affect most of them wherever they happen to be in the province.

As of May 1, 1971, the lands service and the forest service placed a 10 chain map reserve around all lakes in the province. In future, the public will be able to express an interest in a lake by completing a nomination form at the land commissioner's office. No direct applications will be accepted.

The first consideration given in the planning of the use of lakefront lands will be to ensure that adequate Crown lands are reserved for public enjoyment. All subdivisions will be undertaken by the lands service and the priority on subdivisions will be dedicated by the interest expressed by the public through the filing of nomination forms as well as through recommendations from field officers.

Before any subdivision will be undertaken on a lake, the department will determine the pattern of alienation

already existing and will not undertake any further subdivision if less than 25 per cent of the linear length of the shoreline remains unencumbered. No subdivision will be carried out on a lake without first considering its impact on the environmental quality of the lake, both from the point of view of water purity and fish and wildlife values.

All Crown subdivisions will be serviced by road and laid out by survey, subsequently disposed of by public competition on a leasehold basis only.

Where topography permits, Crown subdivisions will be laid out in clusters, interspersed with green areas, set back from the waterfrontage a minimum of 10 feet to ensure public access is not denied at any point.

To maintain essential control over large land areas for future generations — this is important, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned this in a speech a year ago. If some Members in rural areas missed other points, don't miss this.

To maintain essential control over large land areas for future generations it has been decided to alienate Crown lands on the basis of leasehold only — large areas of Crown land. Last year in my address to this Legislature I stated that consideration was being given to such a policy and that final action would be taken as a result of the reaction to my announcement. I can report that very little expressed opinion developed in objection to the proposed procedures and for this reason it has been decided to invoke the new policy as of April 1, 1972. There's always a backlog of applications being processed through the department and in fairness to the applicants and to the administrative staff, adequate lead time for a major change must be allowed.

We're still within the environment and land use committee, Mr. Speaker. The location of major industrial sites will be prefaced — here you are Mr. Member — in all cases with public hearings plus on-site examinations to be followed by inspections of the enterprise in operation. Examples to illustrate include the recent hearing concerning the relocation of Ocean Cement to Metchosin from the present site in Victoria Harbour.

A right-of-way hearing has been scheduled for Richmond — some of you are pouring the notifications in and it's already been decided — concerning the conflict between a transmission line and a nature park. Notice has been served for the lead time required for a hearing on the proposed new coal mine development on the Elk River and I may say tonight it has been determined we need at least a four months lead time before the hearing takes place to complete the necessary technical work.

Coastal, commercial oyster development areas are under study. One of them was actually completed today, too late for inclusion in my remarks this evening.

A survey was made of all unauthorised garbage deposit areas in the province and plans made for their systematic rehabilitation at public expense. On-going situations will be covered by permit. It may surprise Members that our investigation this year turned up more than 1,000 garbage pits over the province — unauthorised garbage pits and garbage dumps which it has been made policy will be rehabilitated, cleaned-up at government expense, and from this point on we will proceed by permit.

Within the co-ordinated administrative umbrella specific activities are carried out under the authority of the department or statutes, such as the *Pollution Control Act*, the *Litter Act*, the *Health Services Act*, the *Motor Vehicles Act*, and legislation under the Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources.

The purpose of this brief report is to outline some of the results of progress through the committee approach with total involvement rather than through the appointment of a single responsible minister — a move still being advocated by Opposition members but abandoned by administrations which have come to grips with trying to find a practical method to secure results in this field.

I notice that the Liberal Party which are still in the airy-fairy stage are still going to appoint their Minister of Environment who is in some way going to rule from above even though at the federal level they found that it doesn't work and they're getting back.

In British Columbia, the preservation of a quality environment — and I restate this, Mr. Speaker — in British

Columbia, if we believe it, preservation of a quality environment must become everybody's business not just the committee's.

The programme of the government to ensure a quality environment can secure ready response when people can see results close at hand and when they are not called upon to participate personally either through restriction in action or through the payment of substantial sums of money directly or through taxation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we're all very, very willing to see our environment improved if somebody else will do it and pay for it.

The *Pollution Control Act* has the task to secure participation on the part of people in this latter sphere where they wish to participate or not. An examination of the budget details will show that this branch has received the strongest personnel support of any department to expand its activities with relation to responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I'll detail this in a minute but this enables us to more than double our staff work during the coming year. Meaningful action in this field is dependent upon the development of administrative procedures which, in turn,

[[Page 344](#)]

require research and technical advances within a very broad range of disciplines.

The costs involved are so large that the actions demand "trial and error" procedures with no assurance that obligations for on-going and unknown expenditures will have been met. Some provinces have agreed to this approach here, after a specific sum of money has been spent, the obligation for control has been discharged, whether or not a satisfactory system of treatment has been installed. Mr. Speaker, we do not accept that approach in British Columbia.

Within the responsibilities set forth in the *Pollution Control Act* we do now have some fair assessment of the magnitude of the technical pollution control problems that we face — particularly with regard to the existing backlog.

Under the Act, the existing liquid and waste discharges not under permit were required to be registered by December 31, 1970. The registration of air contaminant discharges was required by December 21, 1971. The director of pollution control received nearly 1,300 registrations covering liquid effluent discharges and 470 solid waste dumps. Further investigation indicated that nearly 1,000 effluent and 1,100 waste discharges had not been registered — despite repeated announcements. It is apparent that not all of the public shares concern about environment quality.

Many of the non-registered discharges are of relatively small amounts. Registration is proceeding and it is my intention to regularise this action through an extension in time for registration rather than take action of a punitive nature. That may have to come later.

We are facing a backlog of some 2,300 liquid effluent discharges and nearly 1,600 solid waste dumps. In many cases technical control requirements still have to be determined before the necessary permits can be issued. In addition to the above, we now have approximately 3,000 registrations covering air contaminant discharges up to the end of last December.

There will be no short-time answer to the complete resolution of the problems presented, Mr. Speaker. In this regard British Columbia can receive some comfort from the fact that no other country has been able to draft a programme which could be completed within a very short space of time.

Capital requirements to complete the programme will be large. Between \$250 and \$300 million is needed to bring municipal treatment alone up to a satisfactory level. To this must be added a further \$500 million for industrial waste treatment, of which the forest industry must share at least 50 per cent.

On a per capita basis the programme now underway to 1975 in the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District stands at \$80 per capita as compared to \$50 for that initiated on the Great Lakes with federal

government financial support. I may say on the side, Mr. Speaker, when we speak up for British Columbians in shared programmes that Vancouver area alone is on a \$80 per capita programme at the present time. All the fanfare we've had on the Great Lakes programme involves a per capita programme of \$50 and that's shared by the federal government.

When we talk about sharing in British Columbia with the federal government people cry "cry-baby" and everything else. We do not, and I repeat, we do not get treated in a similar manner to other parts of Canada. We're made to go it alone and don't kid yourself.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. WILLISTON: We're not crying, we're not crying and we're doing it. The job is being done and done at a far higher rate than it's done there.

Major projects have been completed in the Okanagan basin where the three largest cities have introduced tertiary waste treatment for the purpose of nutrient removal from effluent and one of those plants was the first such plant to be installed anywhere in Canada at the time.

A speculative estimate would indicate that we must plan for an annual expenditure, Mr. Speaker, of between \$25 and \$30 million for municipal sewage works alone and from \$20 to \$25 million for industrial pollution control alone on an annual basis. When we take these costs and other costs in relation to environmental matters and so on it's going to take some realistic thinking on our priorities in future to accommodate the costs which we are demanding at the present time.

The problems of finance are going to be serious and will increase our cost of living and the costs of industrial production.

The conflicts of the dam builders and the recreationalists capture the headlines in the battle for a quality environment. But it is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this will only be won if it involves the individual at the local level. The combined action of the majority will bring the most positive results.

As I indicated earlier, now that we have some realistic indication of the task to be accomplished, appropriate staff is being provided through the current estimates. This does not mean that we have been standing still.

In 1971-72 the staff of the pollution control branch was nearly doubled by adding 40 new positions to bring the total to 85. Present estimates will add 100 more plus an additional 15 to the recently reinforced chemistry laboratory staff which now employs 32 people and works two shifts a day out at the research council.

Permission has been granted for early recruitment so that no time will be lost once the estimates have been passed. May I say that this is a point of direct comparison with the federal government when it comes to environmental matters. We have assessed our problem, we've rated it, we're in a position to move effectively, we're providing the personnel now to do the job. Different from that at the federal level — there they provided the personnel to do the job and they've flooded them in, in the hundreds, even in the Province of British Columbia, before they had specified the organisation and the work that those men had to do and that is being accomplished at the present time.

If you want the effective use of manpower in the environmental field, make sure you know what the men are supposed to do and are going to do when you put them on the job.

The public enquiry conducted last year by the director of pollution control into the forest products industry produced objectives which on amendment, have been approved for pollution control requirements in this field. Liquid, solid, and air emissions were covered. Various levels of treatment were detailed with the highest required by any new installation.

Upgrading of existing discharge will be determined on an individual basis having regard to the existing

quality of the environment at each particular location. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be done on this basis because we're taking into consideration the fundamental need insofar as the total environment is concerned and I have tonight a wire from Rayonier Canada Limited. In this instance it refers to the wood-fibre pulp mill on Howe Sound — an agreement has

[[Page 345](#)]

been reached by which we will together put priority on the air effluent discharge control at the wood fibre mill.

They have authorised the expenditure of \$2.2 million. Their engineers indicate the job will be able to be accomplished in 16 months and we're putting this on the priority basis above the water treatment because the federal fisheries tell us the water problem there is not serious. The air problem is serious both at the wood-fibre mill and in Squamish and I think this is an indication of the type of work the approach we're making in this general field.

The results of the actions taken, Mr. Speaker, have been widely acclaimed all through the forest industry. We've been asked for copies of our findings throughout the States and elsewhere across Canada. It marks a first for Canada and will speed the issuance of permits in the future. To some extent the actions demanded must still be proven under operating conditions. If results are still not satisfactory, there is provision and authority for further upgrading of the waste treatment requirements. In other words, Mr. Speaker, where our Acts differ from most other Acts is that until the end result is reached the obligation has not been discharged.

A similar enquiry into the mining industry's technical pollution control requirements will be held this March followed by a May enquiry involving the chemical and petroleum industries.

The board issued minimum requirements for refuse disposal to land and minimum requirements for municipal and domestic waste water disposal to surface waters. These form the basis for the issuance of permits by the pollution control branch.

Besides our local responsibilities we have been involved with national and international environment control problems. Both called for cooperation with the federal government. Co-ordinated provincial action is being developed through the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers.

The province acknowledges cooperative arrangements with the federal government — the federal Department of Environment under which technical expertise in such fields as fishery, atmospheric and marine sciences will be available to the British Columbia Pollution Control Board. The federal agencies receive copies of applications for permits and made recommendations to the branch within their areas of expertise.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has shown certain activity in establishing pollution control technical standards. All governments are still developing their policies in pollution control and environment-quality management. There is room for co-ordination and cooperation with the aim of eliminating duplication and over-lapping activities. British Columbia shall work to this end and this is my pledge.

My brief resume, Mr. Speaker, has shown two areas in which federal assistance would do most good and would give the most direct assistance in the battle for pollution control. First, knowing what to do requires research beyond the ability of a single provincial jurisdiction to handle. Doing the job requires finance. I realise that both have little direct ballot appeal and could lose favour as a consequence. Both are absolutely necessary to ensure steady progress in the battle for a quality environment.

Mr. Speaker, those remarks at five minutes to nine conclude what I wish to say this evening and put me, I hope, in good stead with all of my colligues.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to take my place in the budget debate. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Premier has at least left before I got started this time.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: It's a pity that the Premier finds that I'm not a very good representative of him in Oak Bay and that he doesn't wish to listen to his own M.L.A.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: My immediate reaction, Mr. Speaker, to the budget speech and indeed my continuing reaction has to be one of disbelief. Throughout the budget speech the Premier kept repeating the fact that his "is a government which cares." Touching. I would suggest that if a government cares and if a man cares and if the people in a government are really interested in human matters, in human dignity, in human suffering — if they care the money should go to the people who need it most.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker that by over-taxing this province to the tune of \$266 million and then spreading it around in various directions without a nickel to the poor, that in itself denies any concern in my opinion.

The Premier is either ignorant of the needs of the poor people or he is ignorant of the fact that we've had a Senate report which took three years to compile and which relates to the people of Canada and this province that one in four of our citizens are living in poverty.

He either chooses, Mr. Speaker, to remain unaware of this report or in my opinion — and which is worse — he chooses to show a callous indifference to the needs of these people in our society when he is dishing out money right, left and centre and in many other directions.

I consider, Mr. Speaker, that this is sheer hypocrisy to call this a government which cares and a government concerned about the needs of people and to present this particular budget.

The former speaker, the Hon. Minister of Lands and Water Resources, has said that the budget has been under nothing but ridicule. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the face of the needs of the people of this province, and those most in need, that the crumbs which have been dropped from the Premier's table in the form of a homeowner grant, which I favoured, is surely a very minuscule fraction of what might have been allocated from \$266 million to the people in real need.

The government has often been accused of favouring big business and industry and while I am not particularly in complete agreement with that point of view I can only say that it is working hard to give the public that continuing impression.

My main complaint, Mr. Speaker, regarding this budget is that it shows a shocking lack of sense of priorities. At a time when a very up-to-date study of poverty is available and when the public generally are aware of the need this government shows a shocking lack of regard in terms of real financial assistance and the manner in which it distributes such an enormous surplus — in the manner in which it is done.

A very important issue is raised early in the Premier's

[[Page 346](#)]

speech and is subsequently ignored throughout the rest of his speech. This concept was re-emphasised and approved by the former speaker tonight. Namely, the concept of a guaranteed annual income. The assertion may be true that a guaranteed annual income is the salvation of all our poverty problems. I doubt it. But time may prove this true and I'm willing to keep an open mind and be objective in trying to evaluate all the pros and cons. The Premier and the former speaker, the Hon. Minister, have made it clear that they are shelving the problems of poverty for the people of this province in the meantime — until to and behold we'll have the federal government introducing a guaranteed income plan.

My question is very simple, Mr. Speaker. What are the poor people supposed to do in the meantime? What

help are they getting from this budget? Are they expected to go on just waiting and suffering and putting up with the miserable standard of living? Waiting for the federal government to implement this famous plan?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier having made a very general statement early in his speech should at least have given us some specific information as to when we can anticipate this plan, what considerations or negotiations are presently taking place with Ottawa, what definitive information could we have that such a plan is not somewhere 10 or 15 or 20 years ahead, but is somewhere in the near future.

I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Senate report on poverty.

Poverty is the great social issue of our times. Unless we act now, in a new and purposeful way, 5 million Canadians will continue to find life a bleak, bitter and never-ending struggle for survival. The poor do not choose poverty; it is at once their affliction and our national shame. The grim fact is that one Canadian in four lacks sufficient income to maintain a basic standard of living.

I would mention what I mentioned in the throne speech debate, Mr. Speaker — that this report also dismisses the myth that poor people do not wish to work. The clear facts of the poverty report show that 60 per cent of our poor people are employed. They are in fact struggling desperately to survive at jobs where the wage is not in fact a living wage. It is defined as the minimum wage but it is not a living wage.

The other fact which I mention for the benefit of the citizens of all countries and all provinces is that 90 per cent of welfare recipients have no choice, Mr. Speaker. They're welfare recipients because they are handicapped, they are disabled, they are deserted wives with children. They have many reasons from which they cannot participate in the labour force.

What does this budget do for these people? Nothing. Not a thing. The Premier may be correct in stating that the long-term solution of their problems is the guaranteed annual income and I repeat that I am not convinced that this is the great salvation for people in poverty. But I would just repeat: what do these people do in the meantime to feed and clothe themselves and put a roof over their heads while inflation continues to wreak havoc with their meagre finances?

I would like to comment on our present payments to poor people, and at least make it clear how the Conservative Party would attempt to provide them with a fairer share of the provincial wealth. The Member can smile, nobody's even touched on this on his side of the House, not touched on it. These people can't be members of the labour force....

AN HON. MEMBER: Let them eat cake!

MR. WALLACE: ...and you just say give them welfare and pass them off. Disregard them, don't worry about them, just smile.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: You'll pay for this at the next election.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: I would repeat as I've done before, Mr. Speaker, that while we are in deep sympathy with the needs of the working poor and those on welfare we are not in favour of giving taxpayers' money to those able-bodied persons who are capable of work but who refuse the jobs which are available.

The present system of providing welfare allowances is far from satisfactory. It is a patchwork, piecemeal arrangement where the recipient all too often has to rely on the individual good will of the social worker to extract from the system the maximum allowable in overages or in any other flexible part of the programme.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Don't try and side track us here. You know very well what we're talking about. We'll talk about the doctors later.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: I'm talking about poverty. We'll talk about the doctors later.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. WALLACE: The plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the basic allowances for rent, food, and clothing were set many years ago and have not been adjusted adequately upward in the face of inflation. I understand that the last basic increase was one of \$5 in 1970 which is two years ago. The problem of overages I understand also generates an increasing number of appeals and a great deal of unhappy dissension.

Food allowances do not recognise the difference in cost for a family of teenagers compared to pre-schoolers. Apparently clothing allowances are not in any way related to the age of the children. There is great inconsistency in the handling of applicants and as a result, injustices occur and this leads to further appeals and further dissension and acrimony.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've been made aware of a report which Mr. Boyd presented to the standing committee on health and welfare of Vancouver City Council and I understand that this proposal is designed to remove these inconsistencies, to eliminate the fact that social workers are often left to make judgments which really should not be in their field. The proposal should also produce living cost allowances which are more in keeping with present-day prices.

But in keeping with something I said from the day I entered this House, I don't think that any member of government or opposition should ever come up in this House with bright ideas as to how to solve problems without stating

[[Page 347](#)]

the financial cost and I would simply quote these figures and I'm a little disturbed at the figure in the Press tonight as being well away from the figure that I was given. But the costs of the proposed new benefits for welfare recipients would be \$15.5 million.

Now, I read in the Press tonight, just tonight, the figure of \$20 million is being bandied around. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the new schedule is directly related to current basic living costs and does recognise the variation in costs related to age and size of family.

I have also been approached by the B.C. Federation of Citizens' Associations who claim that the new proposals will result in the abolition of overages. But they seem to be overlooking the fact that if the basic allowances are increased to bring about that very happy result that overages will not be argued about except for emergency situations such as fire of a household or eviction.

It brings me to the other point, Mr. Speaker, that I have made regarding the realistic use of standing committees in this House.

When I spoke in the throne speech debate I expressed the opinion that one of the big defects of our present parliamentary system is that the individual and the organisation do not really have realistic access in terms of face-to-face discussion with the elected representatives.

I would think that there is a very good example of how interested citizens and groups could appear before the standing committee on social welfare and perhaps not only bring information to us but have us explain some of the problems of government to them.

I don't suggest that there is any easy solution but I would simply say that at this time the budget as outlined in the House does nothing to assist the segment of society who are in very serious need.

Because the Hon. Minister has re-emphasised the government support of a guaranteed income concept and since the Premier has mentioned it, I think it is important that this be given the widest possible public discussion, Mr. Speaker, and I think some comments are timely tonight.

An interest in the guaranteed annual income concept exists because Canadians are aware of wide-spread poverty in a prosperous society. They are aware of the fact that the present system of welfare payment does not seem to meet the needs. Inasmuch as the guaranteed income represents a whole new approach to welfare I would suggest that immediate and urgent further consideration be given by this House. The immediate initiative has to be taken by the federal government but since provincial cost-sharing is involved I believe that this province should be seeking early discussion with the federal government.

The Economic Council of Canada suggest that poverty exists when a family has to spend over 70 per cent of its income on food, shelter and clothing. From these statistics it would appear that one in every four Canadians live in poverty.

I have mentioned some of the drawbacks, Mr. Speaker, to the present system inasmuch as there is often a universal approach. Benefits as categorised are given to everybody in the category even when there is some lack of need. There is also the very important point that if somebody is guaranteed an income there is a real tendency to deprive them of any incentive to work. I think it is fair to give credit to the government in its present policy that in British Columbia single persons can earn \$30 a month beyond their welfare payment and a family can earn \$50. If there is any criticism I suppose it would lie in the fact that perhaps they should be allowed to earn more but at least I give credit to this government for recognising this important principle. But it is absolute stupidity to encourage a welfare recipient to work and then to deduct from his cheque the equivalent amount of his wages.

The concept of a guaranteed annual income is one possibility where the minimum income level is decided relative to the size of the family. Income below that level is supplemented and income above that level is taxed. It seems rather simplistic and it's the very simplistic way in which it's presented to us, Mr. Speaker, which gives me some cause for concern. Because I think this is a tremendously difficult problem, trying to tackle poverty on a national scale and this simplistic approach — that you set some magic figure relative to the size of the family and below it you add and above it you subtract — it just frightens me a little bit as being too simple. But at least I'm willing to keep an open mind.

I think the reason that most of us are probably somewhat puzzled is the fact that there are really three main goals in a guaranteed income and some of these goals rather conflict with one another.

You are trying to guarantee a minimum income sufficiently high that every Canadian will have a decent standard of living. But you are also trying to provide incentives to encourage the recipient to work.

Third, you are trying to prevent a uniform approach whereby every group receives help and some of these people in that group might in fact receive more help than they need.

So these three goals have to be considered very closely for the simple reason, as I say, that while you might achieve one goal in the process you are conflicting with the others.

The total cost is extremely difficult to calculate and some people would oppose the plan purely on the basis of tremendous cost. The scheme, however, would replace in large measure much of the present unsatisfactory system and would allocate money to those truly in need while minimising the leakage of funds to those who are not in need.

The rationale for the plan, Mr. Speaker, would be for the federal government to provide a basic national floor on which the provinces could build programmes for different categories. The federal government would take primary responsibility for the working poor while the provinces might want to supplement this allowance but would have their prime responsibility turned to the real welfare cases that I have already mentioned.

One thing is painfully clear, poverty is our prime social evil out of which many other social problems develop such as crime, mental illness, alcoholism, family breakdown, and juvenile delinquency to mention but a few. While a forward looking policy to create such a guaranteed income plan may prove to be the long-term answer, I repeat — what are we doing in the meantime for the poor in British Columbia?

A Conservative government would set basic payments realistic to the present-day cost of living. This does not mean that we would follow to the letter the recommendations of Mr. Boyd's proposal and again with credit to this government I am aware today that the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Welfare has just met with officials in Vancouver and is indeed considering this proposal.

For the record, and to make our position very plain, the Conservative Party would set basic payments realistic to the cost of living, something along the lines of the report which is now available. Furthermore the Conservative Party would adjust the rates annually by a percentage amount related to

[[Page 348](#)]

the percentage increase in the cost of living.

We would expand in every possible way jobs for the 10 per cent on welfare who are capable of working. We would raise the minimum wage immediately to assist the working poor who generally are not organised into unions and depend entirely on government to help them cope with the continuing rise in the cost of living.

Since adequate housing is not only difficult to obtain but is expensive, we would launch a wide-spread programme to provide subsidised housing for families who cannot afford shelter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, some mention has been made of this by the Minister earlier this afternoon as to a wide range of programmes making differing types of accommodations available and this is certainly the general direction which the Conservative Party would follow.

But I think it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, if I could quote that from January to November, 1971, British Columbia used only \$1.6 million of federal funds for subsidised housing as compared to Ontario which used \$10 million of federal funds.

Now this is a ratio of 80 — 1 although the population ration is 3-1, so it would suggest, that certain other provinces are making much better use of the federal money that is available for subsidised housing.

Another point of perfectly legitimate concern has been expressed — that when you build subsidised housing you segregate a whole bunch of people with similar incomes in some sort of slum, or some property which will soon become a slum. I don't think this is at all necessary or unavoidable. There are choices and some initiatives, I'm sure, could be taken to subsidise the purchase of homes scattered throughout a community and providing rent allowances where indicated.

I would repeat as I did in the throne speech debate that we would remove the educational fraction of property tax from all homeowners over the age of 65.

But, Mr. Speaker, of all the areas of social need crying out for help which the Premier has chosen to neglect surely it must be the elderly sick who spend the last days of their lives occupying beds in nursing homes and private hospitals. While I see this every day, I took the trouble to get my facts and figures absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker, so that there again should be no criticism at least of the underlying facts and figures.

I have the documents with me, and the available rates here in the City of Victoria for a public ward bed — the absolute lowest cost that I could find, was \$330 per month with the rates rising to a maximum of \$550 per month. And of course, and don't think that this is unusual, Mr. Speaker, in cases where a husband and wife both require a nursing home, the cost of course is double, the cost is a minimum of \$660 per month.

AN HON. MEMBER: Home-owners' grant.

MR. WALLACE: Unfortunately the home-owners' grant doesn't help that. And the usual fate, Mr. Speaker, of these patients — and believe me, I know what I'm talking about in this field — the usual fate of these patients is to use up what savings they have and then they go on welfare.

Is this the good life? Is this wonderful budget so wonderful, so perfect, so beautiful in Beautiful B.C.? What about the sick persons in the nursing homes?

These patients require justice, to be treated by government in the same light as any other sick person elderly or otherwise. One of the fundamental errors, Mr. Speaker, of this government and the provisional health services is its fragmented approach. It's just incredible to me that in 1972 a patient either gets help or doesn't get help depending on the type and severity of his illness.

I am referring, of course, to the fact that in an acute hospital or an extended-care hospital, the patient pays \$1 a day but in a nursing home he pays \$350 to \$550 a month.

Now, I just asked a simple question. Why does this government discriminate against this segment of society in which elderly citizens in the latter years of their life are losing their physical health and strength? Never more, never more in their life did they ever require just a little bit of sympathy and empathy and understanding. At the time when they most need it, they find that the government only helps two-thirds of the problem, two-thirds of the patients. Is this the action of a government which cares?

The Minister of Agriculture — and I notice the Ministers are disappearing fast tonight, I don't know, perhaps some epidemic has hit them — but the Minister of Agriculture the other day referred to his assessment of the Premier as being one of the greatest humanitarians he's ever met. And all I would ask, and all I would hope, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Agriculture is a better judge of potatoes and barley.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Well, corn too, maybe he's judged the corn too.

But the blunt fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier of this province has shown a heartless disregard of the sick elderly citizens of the province who have no choice but to live in nursing homes. When you ask the Premier, as I have done, why doesn't he cover these people? If he has \$266 million can't he find a few bucks to help them? We get the old pathetic argument "Oh, but the federal government doesn't share in the cost of intermediate care."

Really, Mr. Speaker, while this is no valid argument even if you look at it on the basis of figures — and I like to get the figures and the facts and dollars straight — if we look at it on the face of things, even if the federal government paid half of the bill as it does for acute and extended care, what would be the cost to the province for the other half?

Here again, Mr. Speaker, the figures show that there are presently 3,114 beds in nursing homes and private hospitals. Now, assuming an average daily cost and here we cannot be absolutely spot-on, but assuming an average cost between that of extended care and the welfare rate which is being paid, the daily cost would approximate to \$14 a day and so the cost to the provincial government to pay half of the bill would be \$8 million.

Out of \$266 million which he spread around like Father Christmas to impress the populous of the province, he can't manage to spend \$8 million out of \$266 million? I think we can leave the people in the province to answer that question. Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Yes, I'll find out and I'll be happy to find out in Oak Bay. At least I'll go down the drain — if I do go down the drain — with honour, my friend, honour and principle.

If I go down the drain in Oak Bay, there won't be any

disharmony and unhappiness in my part, my friend. Not one thing I've said or done since I entered politics that I have to apologise for — not one, and you can't say that, you can't say that.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Well, I'm quite happy to leave the people of Oak Bay to decide.

The government's performance in the realm of intermediate and extended care is in my view and in the view of many a piecemeal, fragmented approach where in fact, Mr. Speaker, an integrated well-devised and co-ordinated plan of all the health services or all the people involved in providing health services is required.

The Honourable Minister who preceded me in this debate, Mr. Speaker, has pointed out quite rightly that the cost of health services is rising steadily and that this becomes an ever-increasing concern to government and I accept that this is so. But on the other hand while I have lived in Canada, governments where I have lived and where I now live have made it clear to the public that they will make medical and hospital care available to every citizen and this is a noble goal and one which I support.

But now that research and technology and science are placing such tremendous weapons of treatment and investigation in the hands of medical people, the politicians are now saying: "We don't know if you can have all these things, Mr. Public, because we don't think that we can afford them." Now, the sooner everybody in this picture, including the citizen and politician and medical personnel, realise that this is the point that we are reaching — and I agree that we are making progress — but the implication so often from the politician is that there has to be a cutback on the medical service being provided or the hospital service being provided.

All I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is the facts are so obvious that for anyone to try and hold back the research and all the technological and scientific advances of the last few years and the years which lie ahead of us, it is indeed pantomime to try and hold back the times.

While I won't go into great detail on medical matters tonight I think we have to face the facts, that man's knowledge and expertise and his technical ability in dealing with physical and health problems is just simply becoming enormous. There very shortly seems to be little that will not be possible to do to enhance one's physical condition and one's mental condition also.

While I don't wish to get off on this tangent, I do feel that while the Honourable Minister tonight certainly emphasised the government's awareness of the tremendous cost of health services I think we should try and keep the whole thing in context and realise that to some extent, not completely, the very changes of our time and the tremendous expansion of knowledge is such that we cannot hold it back, unless we decide to settle for a lesser standard of care.

My friends over there, when they talk in these terms, are not really settling for a lesser standard of care. They are saying to themselves "what dollar value do we place on a human life?" And this is a very difficult question in terms of the elderly who frequently face the practicing physician with a big decision as to how much in the way of treatment should be applied.

Now, that's becoming too specific. I would just like to mention and make a few comments on the whole question of extended care.

Many persons are puzzled by all the terms we use. "Extended care" relates to the most seriously disabled person on a long-term basis who requires continuing nursing care and I would simply say that it is this fragmented approach of this government which concerns me because the borderline between qualifying for extended care and not qualifying for \$1-a-day coverage is very narrow. We even have the very unfortunate cases where a patient enters an extended, care hospital and because of the enthusiasm and the attention given by the nurses and the physiotherapists the patient improves just a little bit and no longer qualifies for extended care.

The result of this is that they then have to go into one of these nursing homes or private hospitals. Then because, in my humble opinion, the treatment there is less efficient than in the extended care hospital the patients at a variable time later then again qualifies for extended care and has to go back on a waiting list. I just feel that it is worthwhile making these points, Mr. Speaker, to point out that what we need is a uniform integrated approach to all levels of illness.

And to put it on the record, a Conservative government would immediately give all intermediate care' patients hospital coverage similar to those in acute and extended care hospitals. We would also expand what this government has already started, namely additional incentives to non-profit organisations, to church groups and to service clubs, to construct and operate facilities for those requiring intermediate care.

I have just made a note here, Mr. Speaker, that one of the speakers this afternoon mentioned the subject of abortion. He was talking in a different way with which I didn't agree entirely on encouraging family planning. But I think, again if I might interject, that here is another area where whatever your moralising or your judgment pro or con abortion, provinces and the nation as a whole have been faced with a sudden additional expenditure of money because a procedure which was previously illegal is now legal.

Now, I'm not getting into the morals or anything else at this time. I am just saying that as a hard statistical fact of economics we have hospitals — and I can talk certainly of Jubilee Hospital — which have to function and operate on X number of patients every Saturday which is an additional expense on its budget.

Again, I give credit to this government. It did put up the financing to do this but I would like to use this as a simple example of the fact that it is not just a question of simple statistics. It is the question of the new statistics that are appearing all the time. While abortion is one example, the whole utilisation of sterilisation operations is another additional monetary factor which we just can't get away from, nor maybe would we wish to.

But we can't have our cake and eat it as well. If we have to have what we consider to be worthwhile social reforms — and I go along with the very much improved attitude towards sterilisation, I go along with that entirely — but if we have to have these changes in social attitudes, they are going to cost us money, they are going to cost somebody money. And if the government doesn't want to raise extra taxes and if it doesn't want to ask its patients to pay, then we have to expect a lowering of standards or a long waiting list for the treatment.

Along with others in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have been aware of hardships which many people have, particularly those on low fixed incomes, in attempting to buy prescription drugs. The Conservative government would in

[[Page 350](#)]

fact provide free drugs to all persons over 65 and below that age it would use the criterion of those patients who are receiving subsidies on their medicare premiums — in other words if they have subsidised medicare premiums they would be at the same time entitled to free drugs.

Now having spoken for quite some time on medical matters, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on the Conservative Party policies regarding economic expansion.

The party regards the province as being a large territory laden with vast resources of timber and minerals. And it is their feeling that we have scarcely scratched the surface in the matter of resource development.

The Premier has spoken of economic expansion, but we would ask: Where are the exciting and imaginative programmes for expansion which characterised the earlier years of the Social Credit administration? Where has the drive gone? Where is the spirit which drove the province ahead in the earlier years of the Social Credit reign?

The budget, despite its emphasis on spreading surpluses around in many directions, does very little to spark the next step forward in the development of our resources. The citizens of the province are looking for expansion which besides opening up the north lands and developing our resources will be creating many jobs and will reduce

the number of employable persons on our welfare roll.

Any close study of this budget or any other budget in the past years reveals very clearly — and here again it is on record and the figures are there for all to see — that the Minister of Finance intentionally underestimates his revenue and overestimates his expenses. As a result, there is an annual surplus of many millions.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Yes, I voted for it. I'm not disputing what the facts are, just listen. I'm just stating facts, figures that's all.

The present example of the Minister of Finance being in a position to inject \$266 million into the economy demonstrates the surplus method of bookkeeping. The Premier mentions perpetual funds used to finance school and hospital construction. I think that municipal taxpayers borrowing these moneys to build schools should realise very clearly they are in fact borrowing their own money which they paid in the form of excessive taxation in the first place.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: So when the Minister of Finance loans perpetual fund money he is not the Santa Claus he would have us believe he is. In fact he is lending back to the municipal taxpayers excessive tax moneys which they paid to him in the first place.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Without any increase in taxes, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there will continue to be an annual surplus somewhat in excess of \$100 million.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: This is all in the budget. You can read it in the budget if you take the trouble and time to do it, Mr. Member.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: At any rate, the point I'm trying to make to the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre is that the surpluses do exist. I'm not necessarily saying that they are bad. I'm simply demonstrating that they do exist.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: It is the policy of the Conservative Party that since they will continue to exist, that without any further increase in taxation the Progressive Conservative Party would use part of this surplus to create a provincial capital development fund which would provide money at reasonable interest rates to small and large businesses and to industry to expand their activities.

In using these funds, Mr. Speaker, we would also be creating jobs and judging by the figures in the paper tonight, I tell the Hon. Minister there's a job somebody should be doing to solve the unemployment problem.

As an example of the use of these funds the Conservative Party — and I think that since I'm spokesman for the party I should recite to you what the party believes in, policies other than my own. This is something that I am frequently asked: "Who are you speaking for? Who wrote your speech?"

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, I can inform the House that in this particular area I am reciting the policy of the Conservative Party of British Columbia.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: You'll find out at the next election. Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Our economic future in British Columbia rests on our ability to trade and the party will seek to take part in cost-sharing programmes with the federal government to develop the ports on the west coast — such ports as Prince Rupert and further development of the Vancouver port as a vital outlet for shipping Canadian products to the Pacific market.

The port authority would design, finance and construct the port in a cooperative venture with the federal government with benefits to all of western Canada but in particular to B.C. Such a development would create jobs and reduce the number of employable persons on our welfare rolls.

The party believes that coupled with this, Mr. Speaker, it is important to have an accelerated development of highways and railway construction in the northern part of the province, again not only to create jobs but to enhance access to the natural resources over a wide area and hasten the general development of the north country. It is felt that this programme would also encourage further the booming tourist industry which brings the province considerable revenue, with moderate outlay in cost.

The Conservative Party in relation to this budget states that the Kootenays have been neglected by this provincial government and that Trail, Nelson and other centres have been ignored. Our party would work in cooperation with the local authorities in establishing a healthy economic climate in the Kootenays for primary and secondary industry. The

[[Page 351](#)]

securing of land for development of steel and chemical plants would be investigated with the local authorities to create jobs and expand the economy.

In the Okanagan it is felt that the fruit growers require assistance, possibly through lower irrigation costs, access to markets and the encouragement also of secondary industry.

The party also believes that pollution and environmental control is a must in this province but it also feels that commercial development and pollution control can go hand-in-hand and must indeed go hand-in-hand.

This capital development fund would make available funds for various forms of research into domestic and industrial pollution. It would make money available to municipal and regional authorities to install improved sewage-treatment facilities. In steel and chemical industrial development, low interest loans would be provided to assist in the installation of modern pollution control facilities.

Other techniques such as accelerated capital cost writeoffs and provincial guarantees for capital expenditure on pollution control facilities would be introduced.

New secondary industries could be granted a reduction of property taxation in their first few years, and the fund could be used to ensure the municipalities no loss of revenue.

The small businessman, Mr. Speaker, is all too often forgotten in today's society despite his very considerable contribution to employment and the expansion of the economy. Low interest loans would be available to both small and large businessmen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has stated that there will be no increase in tax rates and while literally there is no increase in tax rates, Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a tax increase in the form of the proposed gift tax. While the federal government has vacated the traditional death duty field and gift tax, the federal government has introduced capital gain which certainly applies to any gift involving appreciation of assets. Therefore I think the people of British Columbia should realise that in fact we do have an additional tax in this province.

If I could just mention a word about succession duties, Mr. Speaker — not to talk about the bill or to interpret the bill — but it is the feeling of the Conservative Party that taken on the over-all approach the income or the revenue derived from succession duties is not very large. It is a small fraction of the total revenue.

The province requires capital for economic expansion, and there are many wealthy people who consider retiring to British Columbia who would bring with them considerable amounts of capital. But unfortunately in many cases since Alberta has no succession duties there, persons either choose not to settle here or if they do they place their capital in another jurisdiction thus denying British Columbia the use of much-needed capital for economic expansion.

The Conservative Party would abandon the field of succession duties and gift tax, thereby encouraging an inflow of capital into this province, such as has happened in Alberta.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the first Member for Vancouver Centre on two of the issues which he raised.

The government building in Vancouver is quite unnecessary. The fund money should be diverted and used to beautify False Creek and the ground should be donated to the City of Vancouver for park development. Point number one in agreement, Mr. Member.

Point number two. While the home-owner grant increase is most welcome, particularly to those over 65, the government has left the tenant to face increasing rents without any assistance. We as a party would support any reasonable measure which gives the tenant equitable treatment in relation to the homeowner.

Mr. Speaker, the party for which I am spokesman, takes pride in its title of Progressive Conservative. The citizens of British Columbia are looking for progress which has been defined as the development of new ideas. I think that's a very persuasive, correct definition of progress — "the development of new ideas."

This budget shows very little in the way of new ideas and indeed falls far short of the imaginative programme required to meet the challenge of the 70's. The Progressive Conservative party cannot support this budget, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister without Portfolio, the second Member from Vancouver–Little Mountain

HON. G. McCARTHY (Minister without Portfolio): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the last few minutes, or would I say the last hour I've given up my place in the debate to allow the Member from the Conservative Party of British Columbia to speak.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Look at your speaking list, Mr. Member.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: I was surprised at the comments, just a little bit surprised because here's this pillar of integrity, this Conservative Member who has talked of honesty, integrity, the most self-righteous Member that this House has probably ever seen talking about voting with integrity and that he has never ever been ashamed of anything he has done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are speaking on the budget debate. This very Member has voted twice with the government on past budget debates in this House. Tell me, where was his integrity then? Tell me. Mr. Speaker is it not surprising too that in the past few minutes that we have heard this dissertation from the Conservative Member that he has given us the total Alberta Conservative Party line. That speech he admittedly said was not all his in his aside this evening. Is he not his own man any longer?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he's a wolf. He belonged to the medical profession before that.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: ...May I say, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the Member that just took his place. I think this is a great budget. Not only that, I think this is an election budget. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the leader of our party has just come into the House when I repeat I think this is an election budget. Why, I've spoken in this House to five budgets, Mr. Speaker, five budgets on behalf of the residents and citizens of Vancouver-Little Mountain. We haven't always followed each budget that I have spoken to with an election, but we could have, we could have, Mr. Speaker.

Let me tell you that's its just great to be on the Social Credit side of the House because we know, Mr. Speaker, that we could follow any budget produced by the Social Credit

[[Page 352](#)]

administration of this province and we would not ever have to worry about the outcome when we take it to the people of the Province of British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member from Oak Bay won't even eat after an election budget.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Now, I suppose that the criticism that has come from the Opposition side of the House is to be expected. It's to be expected.

HON. MR. BENNETT: Sour grapes.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: But I did think that the drama that was offered by the leader of the N.D.P. was almost comic when one considers his remarks about this government's financial policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are you going?

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: He cannot name one provincial administration in this country today that has a financial policy as sound, so economically sound as the Social Credit administration of this province.

Let me tell you that even includes the N.D.P. governments in Canada, the two N.D.P. governments, and let me refer you to page 27 of this budget, this 1972 budget, this table for the comparative provincial government tax rates as of February 1972, Mr. Speaker.

The N.D.P. In Saskatchewan, the N.D.P. government takes 25 per cent more in provincial income tax, right out of the workers' pocket, Mr. Speaker. Right out of the workers' pocket. The Hon. Member from Cowichan earlier today said: "Who puts flypaper into the taxpayer's pocket?" Who, Mr. Speaker?

In Saskatchewan 25 per cent more than in British Columbia, Saskatchewan residents pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's N.D.P. policy.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Let's take a look too, let's not be selfish, let's take a look too at Manitoba. Another N.D.P. government. Would you believe that they take 40 per cent more than British Columbia takes?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Right out of the worker's pocket. Right out of the worker's pocket. These friends of the workers. These friends of the little people. Here in British Columbia when you consult this table, Mr. Speaker, who is the lowest in Canada? Who claims the lowest in Canada?

AN HON. MEMBER: The federal government.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: ...The Province of British Columbia, and, Mr. Speaker, the important thing that all of us should remember is that this government through this budget and many other budgets in this government's term in office have all been done without any increase in taxes. Without any increase in taxes.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: ...I'm going to say something about that, Mr. Member, I certainly intend to. I see that we don't have the Hon. the leader of the Liberal Party in the House but he made some remarks yesterday too.

AN HON. MEMBER: He infrequently comes in.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Surely he cannot hope any of us in this House and even his own Members to believe that he can really be taken seriously when he talks about sound Liberal Federal Administration and fiscal policy. Truly not.

AN HON. MEMBER: You know, he's a real joker, that fellow.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: You know, there was a Member of this very House spoke yesterday on the radio before the Hon. the Liberal leader spoke in this House. It was broadcast all over the lower mainland just before the House opened and he was remarking about the fact that the Honourable leader of the Liberal Party would be giving his own budget speech. This is what he said, Mr. Speaker: "Pat does this every year — it has become a standing joke in Victoria when Pat McGeer gives his mock budget."

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Well, now, what do you think? Which Member in this House? Would it be an N.D.P. Member that would say a thing like that? Would it be a Social Credit Member that would say a thing like that? No indeed, Mr. Speaker, who described the Liberal Leader's mock budget as a standing joke? Why, it was the Honourable Member from North Vancouver — Seymour (Mr. Clark). Isn't that incredible? One of his own Members, if you can believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's a horizontal joke.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: I think that Member was very right. It is a joke to think that any Liberal Member could hope to manage the affairs of this province after the sorry record of Liberal mismanagement in years gone by in this province and the incredible financial mess we have in Ottawa today.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who watched the stunning performance of Karen Magnussen televised from the world winter Olympics in Sapporo must have been very proud of this young athlete from North Vancouver. You know, in — all areas of sports, British Columbia is making a very real impact on competitive meets the world over. I think our perpetual physical fitness and amateur sports fund, which is a creation of this government's policies, is responsible for creating an aura of optimism among our British Columbian athletes. The purpose of the fund — and I'm really pleased to note that it is being increased this year — is not to create Olympic stars, Mr. Speaker, but to aid the young people of this province to become involved in any number of sports activities.

I believe in this policy, but at the same time believe that we could go the extra mile to provide for the Karen Magnussens and the Nancy Greens because they do provide inspiration for the rest who do not aspire to the Olympics. I would hope that a very special award would be considered by the fitness committee so that the athletes who do reach such a place in their career are recognised properly by the citizens of British Columbia through a presentation of a special British Columbia award.

[[Page 353](#)]

We've had many outstanding athletes — and recognition is fleeting at best — no one could dispute Cyclone Taylor's claim to fame, for instance, or Leslie Cliff of swimming fame. In this past year, the British Columbia Sports

Hall of Fame opened its new quarters and that was made possible by \$105,000 grant from this government. We do more in this province, Mr. Speaker, for amateur sports than any province in Canada.

Now, I know of your very keen interest in the cultural fund, and may I say that the expert distribution of the interest on this fund, this perpetual fund, is due in no small measure to the dedication of the chairman of the fund, and may I say this hard-working committee. (Laughter).

I would like to comment just briefly on just one of the programmes made possible by the cultural fund last year. The Shawnigan Summer School and International Festival. The August 14 issue of the *Victoria Times* says it all, and let me quote:

Nowhere in Canada is there a parallel opportunity for students to use vacation time to study with, and be influenced by, international artists of such magnitude.

Concerts given by the distinguished faculty in Victoria, at Shawnigan and in Vancouver, form a rich summer harvest for the public at economical prices.

But there is more. Anyone who spends a day with the school cannot help but realise the future potential. Shawnigan, if the people and government of British Columbia so will it, could become as famous throughout North America as Aspen and Tanglewood in the United States, and more influential than Banff.

I cannot help but mention, too, that the cultural fund, as all the perpetual funds set up by the Social Credit of this province, distributes \$750,000 annually — and this will be increased next year — without one cent of the fund going to administration costs, not one cent. These perpetual funds in themselves are revolutionary in their concept, unique in the world and are additionally unique in that they do not build a bureaucracy around them to help spend the money. No other province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, can make that claim.

I believe all Members of this House would agree with the apt description that has often been given to the city which I represent: "Once in a world, a city like Vancouver".

Few places in the world can match its incomparable setting of mountains, sea, prolific growth and natural harbour. There have been many comments in this House in the past few days about the traffic problems and pollution problems which we have seen destroy other North American cities, and it is time that action is taken. And Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is almost too late for the action but it will never been any sooner to rid the downtown core, the inner city of Vancouver, of non-essential traffic.

The problems faced by large North American cities in downtown areas are those of parking and pollution. I would like to see an auto-free inner city, with promenades, birds, bees, trees, flowers, and park-like settings and boulevards of green.

A new transit system should help us create a new way of life in Vancouver, to create a virtually automobile-free city centre which would be the envy of all North America, if not the world, Mr. Speaker.

What a remarkable opportunity we have to do this today in the City of Vancouver. Can't you see the streets and promenades? Parking areas within buildings could be converted into recreational people-oriented activities for recreation or small shops to provide goods and services, or club meeting rooms or entertainment.

The inner city of Vancouver could become a community of malls joined together by an inner transit system and again the most prominent feature of our environment would be trees, flowers and promenades, not cars. Surely this is financially possible. A model city proposal should certainly attract federal funding, certainly it would attract federal funding. Isn't this the most attractive proposal for urban redevelopment that has come before the federal government?

AN HON. MEMBER: Their funds dried up years ago.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Less land paved over for streets and parking lots, less cars, less smog, less accidents. Why not give Vancouverites the choice to have an inner city with places for fun and noise and recreation as well as easily accessible Meccas of peace and tranquility? Given the choice, I think Vancouver would favour an auto-free downtown core.

Mr. Speaker, both Opposition parties talk of helping the old age pensioner and one even suggested in the address to the budget yesterday that this provincial government should raise the old age pensioners' monthly income to \$200. Now is there anyone in this House who would disagree with that? I wouldn't disagree with that, no one in this House, Mr. Speaker, we're all honourable men and women in this House, all Honourable Members. Nobody would argue with that, even the Liberals who support a Liberal administration in Ottawa who very benevolently gave 42 cents to these same people.

But what kind of fuzzy-wuzzy thinking is there over there that would have every senior citizen in Canada flocking to British Columbia for the highest monthly allowance in Canada, what kind of fuzzy-wuzzy thinking is it? Surely, the Opposition is trying to hoodwink the aged of this province. It's less than honest to hold a carrot out to senior citizens when they know that cannot be done. That cannot be done without a national policy, Mr. Speaker, and they know that and they want to hoodwink the aged of the province.

Unless all provincial governments in this country have the same policy, you know that it is an absolute incredible hoax on the aged of this province to claim anything else.

Who has been, and who is this very day, in this Province of British Columbia and in this country of Canada, who has been the most effective spokesman for guaranteed annual income, to help the old age pensioners have a decent living way?

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, who has been the most effective spokesman in this country for the guaranteed annual wage? The Premier of this province.

Who was the first at a premiers' conference, at a federal-provincial conference, to suggest that the federal government of this country should bring in a guaranteed annual income? The Premier of our province.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, who is committed to carrying forth across Canada to Ottawa, to the federal administration, a pledge and an on-going commitment for a guaranteed annual income, not just for British Columbia, but for the people of Nova Scotia, for the poor of Alberta, for those in Newfoundland, Quebec, Ontario? Why should we

[[Page 354](#)]

want to keep just that for ourselves, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Manitoba and Saskatchewan?

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Who needs it more, Mr. Speaker? The Premier of British Columbia is the man and the government that is committed to a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm really happy to see some relief given to those people on fixed income who are trying to hold on to their family home. The policy of giving an added \$50 in addition to the \$185 annual home-owner grant is one which again, Mr. Speaker, is done without any increase in taxes. There is no government in Canada can do or has done what this Social Credit government has done and what is enunciated in the budget of 1972.

It is only possible to have such a programme of progress for the people of our province for two reasons: We are not paying like all other governments annual interest charges and in the past 20 years we have lived within

balanced budgets and removed the direct debt to the taxpayer.

And I say to you this budget is great, it could be an election budget and it is the most beneficial budget for people that will be presented in the whole of Canada this year by any provincial government.

In spite of the fact that federal taxes keep increasing and hitting the people who can least afford it — those people in the middle income groups — the provincial government budget of 1972 embodies all these new programmes and an increase in each programme for people.

Now just take environmental protection, Mr. Speaker. A \$10 million accelerated parks development programme without an increase in taxes. A \$25 million green belt protection fund without an increase in taxes. A \$10 million reforestation fund without the taxpayer carrying any further burden, Mr. Speaker. A \$10 million power line beautification fund to place power lines underground — no increase in taxes, Mr. Speaker. A rapid transit subsidisation programme to help reduce traffic congestion and pollution. All of these programmes to protect our environment without an increase in taxes.

And in health services, let's take a look at health services. Health services will be increased by almost \$50 million without an increase in taxes. Hospital services increased by another \$25 million, without an increase in taxes. Medical services plan, covering almost all of our citizens — certainly 98 per cent — with medical coverage is now a remarkable \$85 million budget without an increase in taxes, Mr. Speaker.

Let's look at education. Fifteen and a half million dollars more for universities and colleges, \$16 million more in grants for school districts, the total education budget in 1972 is now a record \$448 million and represents 30.9 per cent of the total budget — the highest in history — almost 31 cents of every tax \$1, without an increase in taxes, my friend.

Let us look at the housing programme. Nowhere in this country does each home-owner receive \$170 annually and now \$185 annually, nowhere in this country — 84,000 families, Mr. Speaker, have received under the outright grants or low interest second mortgage programme through our home assistance plan and may I say that it is only in this Province of British Columbia and only because of the policies of this Social Credit administration that a family living on a low or moderate income can have the opportunities for home ownership without an increase in taxes.

What a contrast in this budget of the Social Credit government to any that have been offered to the Canadian people by the Liberal administration in Ottawa. But, the moment of truth is near, Mr. Speaker. No longer will the whole community, the unemployed, industry, job-providers, home-owners, housewives, consumers be kept in a nervous state of uncertainty — for the Ottawa Liberals, I understand, intend to have an election this year.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: Mr. Member, don't you accuse me of ever having anybody else write my speech. I not only write them....

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you read them? (Laughter).

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: I'll deliver my own, thank you, and I won't ask you for any help.

No longer will the Canadian people then, with the federal election in the offing have to hear statements from the Liberal government that everything is going well in Canada. Let me just refer to you a few of the statements that have been made.

Why it was just in 1971, January 20, just over a year ago when the Finance Minister in Ottawa....

AN HON. MEMBER: He used to be.

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: He used to be Finance Minister, he said, and I quote:

"I am firmly convinced that as a result of strong fiscal and monetary stimulus progressively injected into the economy during the course of the past 10 months the stage has been set for a substantial improvement in production, employment, and real income."

and then he went on to say that

"prosperity is just around the corner. Inflation has been successfully brought under control."

he said. That was on January 20, 1971. Then on January 22, the day following Labour Minister Brice Mackasey....

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is he?

HON. MRS. McCARTHY: He was another one that got sort of shook about. But he said this to the C.B.C. TV. programme "Encounter", in a cross-Canada television interview:

"Canada has turned the corner in the fight against both inflation and unemployment."

He said he was certain the trend toward full employment would become obvious in April.

Well that was in January, 1971 — January 22. Then in May, 1971 no less than the Prime Minister of Canada made a statement about the policy of the Liberal government.

The federal government deliberately created some unemployment to save more jobs jeopardised by inflation, Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau admitted Monday night. "We accept the blame. I'm not trying to pass the buck".

That was in May, 1971 and then of course the people who had been told that things were looking brighter and things were looking up read to their dismay on October 14, 1971 that the jobless toll was the worst in 10 years.

Then tonight, Mr. Speaker, we've heard, too, from several

[[Page 355](#)]

Members in this House and certainly to the concern of all of us — "Tuesday, February 8, 1972, unemployment soars 25 per cent in one month". It is a sad or comic picture, Mr. Speaker, depending on your sense of humour. The federal Liberals have succeeded in the destruction of the government of Canada's economic credibility.

In concluding my remarks to this budget, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am proud, very proud as are all Members on both sides of the Social Credit side of the House that this British Columbia budget is a budget for people, for people who need help in health and hospital care, for people who need opportunity for housing, for people who recognise that we must protect our environment. If it is an election budget, Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit Members on both sides of this House are ready.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Richmond.

MR. E.A. LeCOURS (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy the speeches of the good Member, the Hon. Lady Member who preceeded me. But I can assure you that I'll be looking at the budget through a different type of glasses than the good Member has. However, I do have a couple of good things to say and I'll get them off first. To get them out of the way.

I would like first of all to thank the Hon. the Minister of Health....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There he goes, there he goes.

MR. LeCOURS: ...I would like first of all to thank the Hon. the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Loffmark) to whom I referred a problem approximately two weeks ago, less than two weeks ago, and I was happy to have a call at the weekend telling me the problem had been satisfactorily solved.

In view of the fact that this involved a lady who has suffered a great deal at the hands of officialdom in the past I am doubly thankful that her problems here have been solved so quickly.

I would also like to thank the Hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Hon. Mr. Williston) for arranging for a right-of-way hearing in Richmond. I know the people of Richmond are very much concerned about this right-of-way. I'm hoping that they may find their way, through the new provision in the budget, to completely solve this right-of-way problem which has been bothering a good number of people as it concerns the nature park which is ready to be desecrated by an ugly power line.

We have throughout the throne speech debate heard many views from both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker. I think we can say they have been sincere views of sincere concerns and I give credit for all Members for coming here with sincere concern of one type or another and bringing their points before the Members of this House as they should do. That I'm happy about.

I'm especially happy about their remarks of my two friends on the right who happen to be absent at the present time, the Hon. the Member for Langley (Mr. Vogel) and the Hon. the first Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Capozzi). I will be dealing with those topics at a later date but I certainly endorse — and I had planned on speaking on it last year and will speak on it this year — the Hon. Member for Langley's viewpoint with respect to a third crossing between Vancouver and the North Shore.

I think the most logical approach — and I endorse the Hon. first Member for Vancouver Centre — with respect to the B.C. Building in downtown Vancouver, of all places with room for 5,000 people and 600 parking spaces, which doesn't make much sense to me.

Richmond would not be suitable, but there are other suitable areas in Vancouver. In the area of the present city hall, for example, where you could devote an entire block for parking and have an adequate building quite easily. I endorse also his proposition with respect to Shaughnessy Hospital. I think it would be a very helpful tool in solving some of the medical problems which are solved through the university and give them an opportunity to have a wider range of patients to deal with.

I must say though in looking at the budget that this budget, as every other budget that's been presented in the past 20 years, has had some spectacular aspects to it. It always looks like an election budget. No matter what year you have it, it always looks like an election budget and I know that in this budget, of course, there are many good things as well and I'll be talking about them.

I expect to talk on the estimates of almost every Minister of the cabinet so prepare yourselves for a long stay, my friends. It's a threat, and I have lots of time and I refuse to be rushed. I'm here to serve the people.

So as I say, and I said this during the throne speech debate, when examined in terms of what happens in other jurisdictions we are most fortunate to have the type of leadership we have. To have the type of Minister of Finance we have, we're most fortunate. Everyone will recognise that.

However, if we look, for example, at what happened in Northern Ireland a short 10 days ago — August 7 — the so-called police riot in Gastown seems a rather trivial affair, a Sunday school picnic, perhaps, in comparison.

True, if we compare what is going on in Vietnam with what all-too-often happens to some of our native Indians, well we would have to say that our native Indians are quite well off in term of what's happening to the Vietnamese. If we compare our poor with the poor of India or China our poor are affluent people. But that's not enough. It's not enough to say — well, there's only about 20 per cent of our people who are poor. That's not enough, that's not good enough.

There's no reason — and I'll defy anyone to tell me one single reason — why we should have poverty in a country which produces as much as China produces for over 700 million people. Certainly we have a lot to be thankful for. We have the ability and we have the industrial capacity to produce a great deal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Blessed are the poor.

MR. LeCOURS: The Lord meant "poor in spirit." Even if the number of unemployed goes down one or two percentage points in a period it's no less tragic for those who are unemployed. No less tragic. Even if the number of poor we have in the country is now much less than what we had during the hungry thirties it's no more acceptable to those who are poor than it was then. They are here with us. We know it. No manner of trying to hide the fact will be successful because we see them every day. We've got to do something about it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I know that in the past when I've tried to develop some economic theories to demonstrate why we have poverty and why we have unemployment I haven't met with much success. I haven't made much of an impression on Members on either side of the House. As a matter of fact, I have tried

[[Page 356](#)]

for three years to impress members of the Press that poverty and unemployment were unnecessary. They have chosen to ignore my arguments.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. LeCOURS: I thought they were here as reporters, not as censors. Whether they agree with me or not shouldn't enter into the question. They should be here to report what I say, whether what I say makes sense or doesn't make sense. (Laughter). I think it does make sense and I challenge anyone either in the House or outside the House, economists or others, to debate the issues with me and I extend that challenge right across the country. I have spoken to economists, I have spoken to university professors, and I've spoken to a good many people over the last 38 years and a great many have been impressed with my logic if not my knowledge of economics.

Logic is what we need, I think, Mr. Speaker, in approaching the matter of the cause of poverty and anyone who looks at the wealth of this country and says we have to have poverty has something wrong with his head.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LeCOURS: Of course I haven't made much of an impression on the Liberals and Conservatives and that's understandable, Mr. Speaker, because they have a 105-year record of not only tolerating it but promoting it, so you can't expect much from them. They've been promoting poverty and they've been promoting unemployment ever since they've been in power in Ottawa and they've been the only ones there, so how can anyone possibly charge them in the hope that anything better can be expected?

Just the other day the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party was in town. Again he was on a hot-line and he was asked: "Well, how about all that unemployment in the late 50's and early 60's?" Oh, well no one could do anything about that. That was the answer of the leader of the Conservatives. That poverty extended all over the world. I say what a lot of bunk, what a lot of bunk. Poverty can be eliminated in any country that wants to eliminate it. Any country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure, Hitler did it.

MR. LeCOURS: So did Mussolini.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. LeCOURS: But I don't want to do it that way. They can do it peacefully, they can do it logically, and they can do it successfully. As long as there's work to be done, and as long as there are people who want to work, the idea of having people sitting and doing nothing, and going hungry is absolutely ludicrous.

The N.D.P., I believe, are well-motivated but unfortunately they haven't a clue as to what they should do. I've challenged them, I've been on the same platform with them. They don't know a thing about solving the problem of unemployment or poverty, not a thing. All they can do is say, "give people a lot more and tax them a lot less", and

that's about as stupid an approach as you can ever come to. That's their approach.

Look back at their platform in the 1966 provincial election and you'll see that their suggestions are not worthy of consideration.

That's as far as we can go. Unfortunately there's another group that I have problems with. The Social Credit group, and there's a reason for that, Mr. Speaker. There are too few Social Crediters sitting in the Social Credit benches.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them, name them!

MR. LeCOURS: It would be a lot easier to name those who are Social Crediters.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them, name them!

MR. LeCOURS: One hand would cover it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them, name them!

MR. LeCOURS: I'll do that for you in caucus if you really want it.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): Name them now, name the Social Crediters.

MR. LeCOURS: Mr. Speaker, I well remember my good old friend....

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't paint us all with the same brush.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. LeCOURS: I'm not naming anyone so you might as well save your breath.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LeCOURS: I well remember, Mr. Speaker, my good friend, one of the former Speakers of this House the late Tom Irwin, who wrote me once and said: "The trouble is, Ernie, we have a Social Credit government, but we haven't government by Social Crediters", and I'll agree with Tom Irwin.

While we have a good budget, as I said, in comparison to other provinces it's the same comparisons I drew between Vietnam and our Indians, between Ireland and our Gastown.

I want a Social Credit budget. I joined Social Credit in late 1934 because I could see that there was something wrong with the financial system. I could see people going hungry in the midst of plenty.

My friend here, who knows a good deal about it, just whispered "that's federal." But I say we can do something on a provincial basis. We can do something. We can't go all the way, but we can show the way. Then others can go farther. I want to refer to just two or three things with respect to the budget.

Rather than give \$50 extra home-owner grant to those over 65, I would like to see the monthly pension increased on a need basis to \$200 or more — on a need basis. As it is now we're going to give an extra \$50 to H.R. MacMillan and people like that who I'm sure could do without it. And I say that that money would be much better spent — and the federal government we know would pay half of the increase — and we could give these people a minimum of \$200 a month and \$250 preferably. That would mean that those

who are renting quarters and sometimes paying considerably for them would have some help towards their rent and

they could afford to eat like human beings. What we're doing now is....

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you do it?

MR. LeCOURS: Of course we could do it. If we couldn't do it I wouldn't suggest it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're right.

MR. LeCOURS: Well I've told my friend I've agreed with what he said...and I agree with what he said and I'm just enlarging on it a bit.

There's one other thing we could do, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should do. We should give a \$2,500 across-the-board tax exemption on income, income tax on the provincial share and then go after the federal government to do likewise. No one can live for less than \$2,500 a year. Wives even got \$2,500 tax free.

If you can't live for less than that why isn't it tax free? Isn't that common sense? And if the federal government refuses to do it let's shame them into doing it. Let's cut ours back to \$2,500 and then go from there.

Let's add a bit to the top, let's take a bit more from the fellow who's making \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year to make up for it. It's a simple process, it won't hurt them.

The fellow who's earning \$40,000 and \$50,000 and \$60,000 and \$100,000 can afford to give a few more bucks. It won't hurt him.

One more thing, and I've said this as well during the throne speech debate, and that is that as long as people are going to be allowed to make \$7 and \$8 and more per hour then we must have a higher minimum wage. I said then 60 per cent of the maximum wage. Maybe that was a bit high, but certainly our minimum wage should not be less than \$3 an hour, not less than \$3 an hour in terms of what they're getting up at the top bracket.

You've got to either keep it on an even keel, keep it equitable or regulate everyone — that is what I recommended earlier, regulate all prices, all profits, interest rates, wages, the works and make this a just society if people are too greedy to make their own just society.

We have a responsibility — we're a responsible government, let's accept our responsibility.

Now one other thing with respect to the budget. There's a mention of borrowing \$500 million, at least authorising the borrowing of a further \$500 million by the B.C. Hydro. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is completely unnecessary. Completely unnecessary. Because we're going to pay anything from 7 to 8 to 9 per cent interest on it, and we can borrow from ourselves interest free. How? It's a simple matter.

The B.C. Hydro can issue its own credit slips. If you go to work with Simpson-Sears, or Eatons or the The Bay, or any of those stores they can give you a credit slip which you can then come into the store and cash for merchandise. Absolutely legal. You can go into the store and cash your credit slip for merchandise.

It's just as legal for the B.C. Hydro to spend, let's say \$50 million a year, perhaps more. The revenue is \$270 million — some, I believe the Member said this afternoon. They're going to have that income every year. There's no reason why they shouldn't issue credit to the tune of \$100 million a year.

Because they would get them all back by way of rates, gas and electric rates. They'd get them back and all they would have to do with them is tear them up and throw them in the furnace and forget about them. They've done the job that money wouldn't do without paying one penny of interest. It's Social Credit and I'll assure you that it will work.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LeCOURS: I beg your pardon? I believe in it, that's what counts. And I challenge the government, and

I challenge the B.C. Hydro to show us why it will not work satisfactorily, why they do not have the same authority as any store has to issue a credit slip providing they are prepared to accept it in lieu of cash in payment for the services which they offer the public. And that's all that's required.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LeCOURS: It's exchangeable. We're talking about British Columbia. You know, Mr. Speaker, if a person wants to be blind it's easy to be blind, and my friend over here is sometimes blind. But he too can learn if he studies a bit.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LeCOURS: It's bad when you're both though. Now that's an awful way for you and I to finish up after the nice things I said about you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the Honourable Member please address the Chair?

MR. LeCOURS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LeCOURS: Well, we just have to have a little aside once in a while, just to liven things up.

To get back to the serious discussion of the budget I think the Members will agree that there are some Members of the cabinet who have a tendency to moralise from time to time. And I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to moralise the first thing you must have is charity.

I'm not too hot at Bible quotations, but I do know that I read not too long ago, the Bible tells us something that goes along these lines — that we may have many virtues but if we lack charity we are but like sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. I think that's how it goes, something like that. The Members know what I mean in any case, they understand what I mean. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Christ were a Member of this cabinet....

AN HON. MEMBER: He is. He's sitting right there. (Laughter).

MR. LeCOURS: I wonder if he'd be more concerned about advertising liquor and tobacco or whether he'd be more concerned about the poor we have with us. His example, I think, would show that he was more concerned about the poor people. As a matter of fact, he provided the wine for the wedding. So I think his concern would not be with the filthy advertising of booze and tobacco. A law which has made us a laughing stock right across the continent of North America. Made of us the laughing stock.

[[Page 358](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: You voted for that Act. What are you laughing for?

MR. LeCOURS: And not only the laughing stock, it has deprived....

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. LeCOURS: I'm sorry. I apologise to the Speaker. We'll drop that right there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LeCOURS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he'd be more concerned about the topless bottomless girls or about the old people who are living in hovels? The hundreds of old people who are living in hovels. Incidentally when the Attorney General first mentioned that question of topless bottomless girls I thought I'd better do some research on that problem

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you find out, what did you find out?

MR. LeCOURS: Incidentally, my wife is in the gallery so it was a family-approved project. (Laughter). I visited some of the clubs, three of them as a matter of fact in one evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh! At your age you better be careful.

MR. LeCOURS: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't impressed with the figures I saw. But neither was I shocked.

AN HON. MEMBER: That isn't what he told me. (Laughter).

MR. LeCOURS: Neither was I shocked Mr. Speaker, because I think....

AN HON. MEMBER: Get any pictures?

MR. LeCOURS: No, I left that for other people that followed me.

MR. SPEAKER: Could we please have some order and allow the Honourable Member to complete his speech?

MR. LeCOURS: As a matter of fact I always like to let my imagination go a bit wild and when you keep it covered, when it's covered up, you can shape it to your own thinking.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. LeCOURS: Mr. Speaker, so I repeat let the Members of the cabinet moralise if they will, but let them take off their blinkers and not worry about what the girls take off. Let the Members of the cabinet examine their conscience — and I trust they all have one — and determine whether or not they are practicing or simply talking the Golden Rule. I think every Member of this House, including the lady Members would enjoy seeing a beautiful female figure walk through this chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Go, Honourable Members, go, go, go!

MR. LeCOURS: Mr. Premier, you missed the show. (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: Too late, too late. Rerun, rerun.

MR. LeCOURS: I want to be off my feet by 11 o'clock but I won't do it the way we're going. But I want to get back, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to my remarks and they were made seriously. There is no reason at all why the Members should not concern themselves more with their observation of the Golden Rule than some of the things that they have taken upon themselves to try and determine for other people.

I think it is up to the point now where some of our young people are worried. As a matter of fact, when I spoke at a school last fall and I was asked about this law on banning the advertising of liquor and tobacco, one of the students put his hand up and I asked him what he wanted and he said: "Is the reason for this banning due to the Premier's puritanical viewpoint on life?" I said: "It could be very well be, because he doesn't use tobacco or liquor." Someone else put his hand up and says: "Does the Premier have any children?" And I assured him he did and that seemed to satisfy him. But I think people are worried about moralising. I think they are worried.

Now I want to get back to talking about the poor people. There was, a time, Mr. Speaker, when one couldn't plead on behalf of the poor without getting some kind of a label tacked upon him — usually a left-wing label of some kind — because it is easier to tack a label on a person than to solve a problem.

That's some people's way out when they get caught by the short hair then they pin the label on the other fellow to try and get out of the jam they are in. They scoff at that which they do not understand or they scoff at things which they are unable to answer otherwise.

I still remember and I am very happy to have known the first great leader of Social Credit in Canada, the late William Aberhart. I know he had his faults as we all have but I still regard him, Mr. Speaker, as a great Christian, one who was really concerned about poor people, one who made every possible effort to help the poor.

His efforts were disallowed by Ottawa, unfortunately, but he made the effort and he lacked the ability to do some of the things that he could have done but nevertheless his intentions were sincere and he did what he thought was right in trying to solve the problem and he came along at the right time.

I'd like to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not blaming this government for causing unemployment. Not at all, we know that the cause lies in Ottawa. They are the ones who have admitted deliberately causing unemployment and deliberately causing poverty and they have told us they were going to do it because they claimed that's the only way they can stop inflation. Which is absolute stupidity because you can stop inflation by putting price controls on and they know that as well as you and I. But they have failed to do it, nevertheless.

Last year I asked a number of questions of the Members of this House directed particularly at the cabinet. I asked: "Do you believe that poverty is necessary? Do you believe

[[Page 359](#)]

that unemployment is necessary? Do you believe that these things are desirable?"

No one stood up. I would take it then that no one thought that these evils were necessary nor should we tolerate them. And I again challenge them now. Is there a member of this government, of the cabinet, who believes that poverty and unemployment are necessary in such a great land as Canada? "No way" is the answer I have and I'm sure that all Members of the cabinet will subscribe to that.

I'll be challenging the Members one by one in the same fashion when they come up with their estimates to make sure that I haven't missed anyone — to make sure they all have an opportunity to answer the questions. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, if they agree that neither poverty nor unemployment are necessary what the heck are they doing about eliminating them? What are you doing about eliminating them?

The headline in tonight's paper is "Unemployment Up 25 Per Cent In The Past Month". That's in Canada, no doubt. But I'm sure it is up in B.C. as well. So, if it's up, what are we doing about it?

Now we can forget two so-called plans that have been brought in by two of the Ministers in the past few months because statistics show that they haven't solved anything. Statistics show that unemployment rates have gone up — they haven't gone down. So these plans have been failures. They may have put some people to work but they haven't solved the real problem. So let's not be concerned about them.

And I again ask the Premier as I asked, I think, last year — and we'll see how sincere our friends over there are — to keep all the Members of this House after the session ends for a week or two weeks or as necessary to discuss fully at our own expense the reasons for unemployment, the reasons for poverty and come up with something — a committee of the whole House. And I call upon the Premier to do that.

We have time to spend on behalf of the people. Let's spend a week or two to thrash out the entire matter of poverty and come up with some answers. When we have those answers then we can be proud, we can say we are really a responsible government doing our job for the people who sent us here to be responsible.

I'd like to see Members from both sides of the House unite in doing this and I'm satisfied that the Members will. Those who do not want to take part in it, because I presume there are some who are not concerned about poverty — those who do not want to stay — will be free to go home after the session is over but those who want to

will stay behind and tackle the problem and tackle it properly.

Let's forget about the phony Senate committee on poverty which solves nothing unless you read the minority report which hits on some of the problems. Let's tackle it right here. Let's not depend on the Senate committee, let's us tackle it. We have intelligence, at least I hope we have intelligence. Or are we going to admit that we're too stupid? I would not admit it — I think we can come to grips with the issue. I think we can find the causes of poverty and I think we can eliminate those causes.

Let's stop playing games with human suffering. Let's do something. And when we come up with some answers then we can tell Ottawa: "Here are the answers we have come up with. You can solve the problem for all of Canada by implementing these solutions." And if Ottawa refuses to accept our guidance in that respect after we have all come to some logical conclusions, I say let's get out and do it ourselves. We can do that, too.

Hon. Mr. Skillings moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Bennett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

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

Copyright © 1972, 2001, 2013: Hansard Services, Victoria, B.C., Canada