

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

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1975

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 565](#)]

CONTENTS

Water Facilities Assistance Act (Bill 36). Mr. D'Arcy.

Introduction and first reading — [566](#)

Oral Questions

Provincial unemployment figures. Mr. Bennett — [566](#)

Education department blacklist. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [567](#)

Proposed steel mill location. Mrs. Jordan — [567](#)

Replacement of Mr. Hemsall on steel committee. Mr. Chabot — [568](#)

Priority areas for industrial growth. Mr. Phillips — [568](#)

Ferry workers' pay differential. Mr. Gibson — [568](#)

Details of industrial development. Mr. Smith — [568](#)

Legality of Daon Corp. ad. Hon. Ms. Young answers — [569](#)

Surrey refinery and/or petrochemical complex. Mr. McClelland — [569](#)

Budget debate Hon

Mr. Stupich — [569](#)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we have with us today Bernice Wong, this year's Easter Seal Tammy for Vancouver Island. She's an old hospital veteran at the age of 12. She was born with a disability called spina bifida which paralyzes her from the waist down. In her few short years she has had approximately 10 operations. She has been at the G.R. Pearkes Clinic since 1967 and prior to that at Queen Alexandra Solarium. She is a grade 6 student.

Tammy is the symbolic name used for all crippled children. Her mother and father are Mr. and Mrs. Bill Wong, who own and operate a grocery store in Victoria. She is the youngest of four children.

Accompanying Tammy are her mother, Mrs. Bernice Wong, and Mr. Al Hayman, who has been a member of the Victoria Empress Lions Club for the past six years. He acted as president of this club for three years. He has been Easter Seal chairman for the past two years. He is affiliated with the Pollution Control Board. Also along with that group is Mr. Jack Smith of the Esquimalt Lions.

I'd ask the House to welcome with me Tammy and those accompanying her.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I'd also like to welcome 53 people from New Westminster, who come on a yearly jaunt to Victoria to monitor what happens in the House that should have been their House, rightfully, they feel. It is their House from a distance, but they feel that it should have been there. Mr. Speaker, would you welcome 53 people from New Westminster?

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome some students who have even a prior claim on this House: Charles Larson, student association president, and David Adams, sophomore class president, along with Linda Bergen, Mike Wuflestad, Fran Stevens, John Terpstra and Wes Giesbrecht, all of the political science class at Trinity Western College, located in B.C.'s first capital, Fort Langley.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Please be assured, Mr. Speaker, that I speak on behalf of the present capital.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think I just recognized the Hon. Member for Vancouver South.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): This is one time when the women have priority. Thank you, Mr. Second Member for Victoria.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if this assembly would welcome 30 grade 11 and 12 students from Sir Winston Churchill Secondary School in Vancouver South. They're here with their teacher, Mr. Ian Harrison. At present they are not in the gallery because the gallery is too crowded, but they will be here later on this afternoon.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: On behalf of the capital city of British Columbia, which will remain the capital city of British Columbia, I'd like to undertake the pleasant duty of introducing Gus MacFarlane, Member of Parliament for Hamilton Mountain. He has been involved in teaching in Canada and, as a sports coach, took the British Columbia basketball team to Yugoslavia in 1970. He was the dean of men at McMaster, and is now the chairman of the liaison group with the youth wing of the Liberal caucus in Ottawa.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that in his early years he was a close friend of Mr. M.J. Coldwell who roomed at his parents' home in Ottawa. He says he became a Liberal because M.J. Coldwell used to take the tops off the Shredded Wheat boxes to stick in his shoes to cover the holes, thus Gus didn't get the Buck Rogers stickers which he should have got. Thus he was unable to get promoted from pilot to space commander in the Buck Rogers' space odyssey, and that made him a confirmed Liberal because he knew at once that he couldn't trust a socialist. (Laughter.)

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I also would like to extend a welcome to Bernice Wong, her parents and the people who are with her. Bernice is a personal friend of my daughter, who is also handicapped, and Bernice and Brenda are continually phoning back and forth.

I would like to ask all the people in the gallery and in the House to remember that tonight is telethon night in Victoria, and that this organization and these young people can certainly use their support. Thank you.

MR. FX RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen): I would like to raise a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you state it, please?

MR. RICHTER: The point of privilege is a mistake in identity of myself.

MR. SPEAKER: I find that hard to believe. (Laughter.)

MR. RICHTER: I did too, Mr. Speaker. This morning I received a document...but I think I should preface that remark by saying that I know

[[Page 566](#)]

that I was ill back in November, and I want to thank you for the very lovely bouquet you sent to me in the hospital on behalf of the Legislature. It was much more than I thought I deserved. I have been pondering in my mind since that time really why I deserved such a beautiful bouquet.

MR. SPEAKER: Did they send you the bill?

MR. RICHTER: No, you didn't, and I thank you for not sending it along. I wouldn't have been able to pay it anyway. But it was such a lovely bouquet.

I received a memorandum from your office this morning, addressed to myself, and containing two pictures. Now the two pictures have my name on the back of them, and it is rather confusing to me because, really, I didn't think I was that ill in November when these pictures were taken. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER: I want to find out why you are so indignant.

MR. RICHTER: I'll send them up to you, Mr. Speaker. They really make me feel that I was ill, if these are my pictures. But they look unmistakably like the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich). (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER: I think in question period we all have to ask the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) what is happening at the photo branch.

MR. RICHTER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Your office, too!

MR. SPEAKER: And my office too, I'm afraid. I apologize to the Hon. Member, and I apologize to the Minister of Agriculture, too. (Laughter.)

Introduction of bills.

WATER FACILITIES ASSISTANCE ACT

On a motion by Mr. D'Arcy, Bill 36, Water Facilities Assistance Act, introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

Oral questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I may point out to Hon. Members that we terminated our question period yesterday afternoon with six minutes left. In the evening when we returned I asked leave of the House if they wished to proceed with that six minutes. Leave was granted but no questions were asked. Now the question is: do we proceed on a 15-minute question period or shall leave be granted? I have been asked by Members from the opposition whether they would be entitled to that six minutes.

So I should put the question in any event: shall leave be granted?

Leave not granted.

MR. SPEAKER: I hear some "noes," so we will start with an ordinary 15-minute question period.

PROVINCIAL

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Economic Development if he could give this House any information on areas of the province that suffer a greater rate of unemployment than the present provincial average, which is up to 107,000 people. The Minister mentioned that he would bring these crisis areas to the House. We'd like to ask if he has that information available today.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): That's your department — the Department of Doom and Gloom.

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Economic Development): I refer the Hon. Member to the answer that I gave yesterday.

MR. BENNETT: The first answer was that you would provide the information to the House; latterly to another question you mentioned that you do cover it in your speech, but not this one.

Supplementary, dealing with the same subject: in view of the fact that there are many regions of British Columbia which are presently suffering an unemployment rate in excess of the provincial average, can the Minister tell the House if he has correlated this information with studies now underway to establish a steel mill in British Columbia?

HON. MR. LAUK: These factors, I understand, are being taken into consideration but are not a priority in the establishment of a steel mill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENNETT: A further supplemental: could the Minister then identify those areas that are under study for a steel mill at the present time?

HON. MR. LAUK: There are many sites throughout the province, Mr. Speaker — in excess of 10 or 11.

[[Page 567](#)]

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BLACKLIST

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: To the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. I regret her absence last night in our continued question period, but I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister first learned of the practice of the apparent blacklist and when she ordered it to be stopped.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): I ordered the blacklist, if you want to call it a blacklist — and I think the terminology is questionable — the apparent list that was put before me, to be stopped immediately it was presented to me. That was approximately a year ago. If you want to give me notice, I can give you the specific date.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, that's perfectly all right, Mr. Speaker. Since then has the Minister had any indication of this practice of an apparent blacklist or something similar continuing?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No, not after the instructions were given through my department to all the field superintendents that we did not condone this. There was evidence of one memo, which could have been considered somewhat in the same light, but that apparently was issued before the members of my department had the opportunity to discuss the whole matter of the issuance of such memos by field staff.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could ask the Minister who indeed had the power to put a name on such a blacklist, whether or not the name of the person who had proposed a teacher or any other person for blacklisting was actually on the list that she saw, and whether it's possible for steps to be taken so that those who have been injured by the fact that they've been unable, to obtain employment over the years because of this blacklist

could somehow get some sort of redress, or have their names cleared, or something of that nature, through the department at the present time.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think you're aware that this procedure obviously had been going on for many years before I became Minister. As soon as it came to my attention as Minister, I had it stopped.

As far as the actual names on the list are concerned, I think something should be made clear here. The terminology of a "blacklist" is rather unfortunate. Some of the names on that list, the B.C. Teachers Federation agrees, were legitimate names that should be placed with reference to teachers who had been in breach of contract. I think we would all acknowledge that there is a responsibility to have certain information relative to the protection of school districts and students extended throughout the field staff. So the so-called blacklist did have on it the names of some people when the B.C. Teachers Federation would not object to.

In discussions with the BCTF this morning, we have agreed cooperatively to work out the proper guidelines for the areas in which any written memo on any teacher should be based. I hope that answers your question.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated it's necessary to have some sort of control relative to the protection of school districts. How now does the field superintendent obtain information regarding prospective employees?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I would presume that he would do it the way any employer would. The teacher who wants to apply for a position in the district obviously has to give references. I'm sure that you in your own work, if you were employing someone, would ask for those references and would inform that person that you were checking through those references.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary because I have been on this subject of the so-called list. Could the Minister tell the House, in light of the fact that two highly qualified educators are unable to obtain employment in this province, if, when she was made aware of the list, the names of either James Young or John Bremer were on that list?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: No, they were not.

PROPOSED STEEL MILL LOCATION

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, this is really a supplementary to the former question to the Minister of Economic Development. He mentioned that there were many sites under study for the possible steel mill in British Columbia.

I would like to ask him if he could explain to this House how, under his jurisdiction, he could allow at least half of these proposed sites — vital recreational and ecological areas in this province, and particularly the Qualicum Beach area — to be even considered as possible sites for a steel mill in British Columbia.

HON. MR. LAUK: Mr. Speaker, when the feasibility study was announced, it was a full disclosure of the agreement; and the technical committee established, a joint committee between the provincial side and Nippon Kokan of Japan, was told that they had a free hand to examine all sites that could support a steel complex of varying sizes. That means that they use as study examples every site

[[Page 568](#)]

that could be available — but as study examples only. I have not received a report from that committee, nor has the government. The government is allowing them a free hand to examine all of the sites and to obtain all of the information so that the government can make a decision based on information, not on guesswork.

The substantive part of the Member's question was strictly opinion on her part with respect to the 10 or 11 or more sites that are being examined.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is a rule of questions that you must not ask what advice a Minister proposes to give to the Crown, or the government's opinion on matters of policy which have not yet been reached.

MR. JORDAN: Is the Minister, on the basis of his statement made just now, willing to assure this House today that he will not allow a steel mill to go into the Qualicum area or into a vital recreational area in this province?

HON. MR. LAUK: Mr. Speaker, when the information from this committee is in, the government will analyse it and make announcements.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope we will get away from hypothetical questions on this subject, please.

REPLACEMENT OF MR. HEMPSALL ON STEEL COMMITTEE

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Minister, a supplementary regarding the steel committee. In view of the short-notice dismissal of Mr. Hempsall, Associate Deputy Minister of Economic Development and also an active member on the steel study committee, what steps has the Minister taken to replace Mr. Hempsall on this vital committee?

HON. MR. LAUK: The Deputy Minister is now actively involved with the committee. Mr. Hempsall resigned from office in an amicable way. The letter is on my desk. We are friends.

Further to that, Mr. Member, I think it is reprehensible that you would say that he was dismissed in the face of what public statements have been made.

MR. CHABOT: He was fired, and you know it.

PRIORITY AREAS FOR INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): The Minister has advised the House that high unemployment will have no bearing on the location of the steel mill. Would the Minister identify those areas of the province which have high unemployment and would receive priority for other industries?

HON. MR. LAUK: I am not prepared to make a statement in that regard, Mr. Speaker. We are still analyzing material as it is coming in.

FERRY WORKERS' PAY DIFFERENTIAL

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transport and Communications. I would ask the Minister if it is correct that under the most recent B.C. Ferries master contract there is one category known as "cleaner, vessels — female" with a base rate of \$733 a month and another known as "cleaner, vessels — male" with a base rate of \$778 a month. If so, what is the reason for this discrepancy?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the Member for giving me notice of this question in writing just before the House opened. It gave me a brief opportunity to check for the answer to the question. I think this is a custom which could be followed in this House with great benefit to both sides of the House.

Yes, Mr. Member, that is correct. There is that difference in categories. On inquiring, I am told it is due to a difference in duties, that the duties of the female cleaners are less onerous and less heavy than the others.

DETAILS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): My question is to the Minister of Economic Development. I must preface it with a few brief comments. The July 28 issue of the *Daily Colonist* quotes as follows:

"Industrial development Minister Gary Lauk announced Friday that the B.C. government is extending the thrust of northern development to the northeastern sector of the province and will concentrate on expanding and diversifying economic activity in the peace River area."

Then again on February 19, 1974, speaking in debate, the Minister said:

...the primary emphasis for industrial development will be on three regional areas: the great northwest of this province, the Peace River-Liard, and the Kootenay regions. In those regions, every effort will be made to provide industrial growth on a planned and stable basis. This will be done and projects relating to those areas will be undertaken by the development corporation and by other agencies of government.

[[Page 569](#)]

In view of the Minister's statements and the current critical unemployment situation in the Province of British Columbia, will the Minister provide the House with details of all industrial programmes presently on stream respecting the three areas referred to on February 19, 1974, which will provide employment opportunities?

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out that that seems to be too large for the subject at question period. You're asking a statement of departmental policy in question period, and that's certainly out of order.

MR. SMITH: On what basis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The rule is at page 148 of *Beauchesne*, which says you must not raise a matter of policy too large to be dealt with in the limits of an answer to a question. You're asking for an essay.

LEGALITY OF DAON CORP. AD

HON. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services): Mr. Speaker, I took as notice some days ago a question from the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) relative to an advertisement placed in the newspaper by Daon Development. I told him at that time that in my opinion the advertisement and the offer therein contained did not come within the purview of the Trade Practices Act. I have so confirmed that. The Act specifically exempts real estate, securities and insurance.

MR. WALLACE: Is there any intention of the Minister to increase legislation to encompass these areas that she has just said are not covered by the Act?

HON. MS. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, these areas are covered by legislation that comes within the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald).

SURREY REFINERY AND PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister could tell us whether or not the government has decided to locate a refinery or a petrochemical complex, or both, in the Surrey area.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): I'll take the question as notice.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, while he's taking that question as notice, could he tell us whether or not the government has made up its mind yet to establish a refinery complex in British Columbia, period?

HON. MR. NIMSICK: There is definitely no decision made in regard to that at all yet.

MR. McCLELLAND: In a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources could tell us whether or not studies have been started, when they'll be tabled in this House, whether there are environmental studies, economical studies, feasibility studies for that area, and whether or not the government has the intention, Mr. Speaker, of eliminating the existing refineries in the lower mainland. If so, when will those jobs be...?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, as you know, you must ask one question at a time.

HON. MR. NIMSICK: If I had been able to answer all those questions I wouldn't have answered the first one the way I did.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Interjection.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you sure you're not the Member for Boundary-Similkameen (Mr. Richter)?

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that's a very interesting question to ask me at this point. I was up in that area for a couple of days at the weekend, and a lot of people out there are asking just who is the Member for Boundary-Similkameen. Apparently they're rather desperate to find somebody to represent them, with the many questions that were put to me. But I suggested that they write to Mr. Frank Richter and try to find out from him just who is the MLA for Boundary- Similkameen.

Mr. Speaker, if there's any message that's clear to me and should be clear even to the opposition and certainly clear to the public of British Columbia about the budget that was presented by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), it should be the often recurring phrase that is not included in the budget speech itself but was often included by the Minister in presenting his speech: "It could have been done years ago." Minister after Minister, and issue after

[[Page 570](#)]

issue, the Minister of Finance in talking about the accomplishments of this government in its short two and a half years, talking about the programmes that had been introduced on behalf of the people of British Columbia, kept saying: "These things could have been done years ago had the administration of the day only chosen to do them." Mind you, there was some repentance in August of 1972, just prior to August 30, when many of these things were promised. Nevertheless, they could have been done years ago.

Some time ago a list was prepared of some of the accomplishments of the government. While I don't really want to upset the opposition, I think it's worthwhile reminding ourselves at this time as to just what some of these were.

Right at the head of the list is Autoplan. That could have been done years ago. It has already been said in the House that it is Canada's largest general insurance company. It has already been said that drivers get better service, with none of the usual February 28 lineups. But one thing, I think, that has not been said in this particular session is that the previous administration promised year after year — or perhaps I should say threatened — that if the private companies in the business of auto insurance in the province didn't provide better service and didn't provide service at cheaper rates, then they'd face the risk of government auto insurance.

Two Attorneys-General served while I was in the opposition — Mr. Bonner and Mr. Peterson. And in my six years both of them, year after year, threatened the private insurance companies with government competition or

government action. Mr. Peterson, for example, was a Member of this House for 17 years; I'm not sure, just now, how long he was Attorney-General.

Although he's an ex-Member and, perhaps, one of the old guard, I'm rather disappointed that the official opposition didn't ask the House Members to join in welcoming him today in the gallery. I'd like to ask them to join me now in welcoming Mr. Peterson.

Year after year he threatened private companies that if they didn't do something better in the way of service and rate, they would be faced with government takeover. Nothing better was done: service got worse; rates got higher.

The public threats were there. What was said privately I don't know, but I do know the private companies kept on in business. They didn't improve themselves at all in any way as far as the customers were concerned, with the inevitable result that that administration was thrown out and a new administration was given the opportunity of making these threats good and of bringing into being an auto insurance plan — as I previously said, the largest general insurance corporation in Canada — that has given better service and done away with the usual

February 28 lineup that used to be a feature year after year after year.

It could have been done years before.

B.C. Development Corp. The doom-and-gloom people say that we've done nothing to create jobs. What did they do? We established a B.C....

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Economic Development): That's my speech.

HON. MR. STUPICH: The Minister behind me says that's his speech; I'm just giving him the opening.

The previous administration could have done something, but when they were there they chose not to do anything. We established a B.C. Development Corp. They chose only to criticize it, but it is a corporation that has been provided with \$100 million to stimulate and assist industrial enterprises of economic benefit to B.C. And all we get from over there is criticism; not one positive suggestion as to what the B.C. Development Corp. should be doing, not one positive suggestion from the whole opposition.

Can-Cel. You say we've done nothing for jobs, nothing for development in the Province of British Columbia. Even Can-Cel could have been done years before. Had we not been elected August 30, 1972, there would have been no Can-Cel. The Prince Rupert pulp mill would have shut down; the whole northwestern timber industry would have shut down. Instead of that — new stability, job security, long-range planning for vital sections of B.C.'s No. 1 industry in a very important area of the province. It could have been done year; before.

Consumer Services. We talked about consumer services when we were in the opposition. The government of the day responded by listening, perhaps, sometimes — although they never heard and never did anything. But a Consumer Services department, a new department to assist consumers, to investigate complaints, a debtor assistance office, Trade Practices Act — all of these things could have been done years before.

As the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) said in presenting these one by one — nothing brand new, all things that have been tried in other jurisdictions, but all things that an administration, a tired administration in the Province of British Columbia, was not prepared to do for the people of British Columbia. That is why that administration was thrown out.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Shame, shame.

HON. MR. STUPICH: The disclosure Act that they supported: they talked against it but they supported it finally. It could have been done years before.

A *Hansard*. I recall once, at a very historic occasion in New Westminster when we gave them an opportunity on opening day to accept the idea of an official *Hansard*. Even on that historic occasion they turned down the invitation — turned down every invitation — to establish a B.C. *Hansard*, although they're quite fond of reading it now, quoting from it and reading back some of our own speeches to us, sometimes to our own discomfiture.

Human rights. Nothing new about human rights. I remember when John Diefenbaker introduced it — something new on the federal level. It had been done in Canada before, but not in British Columbia. The government in British Columbia wasn't prepared to do it. It could have been done years before but the government was tired, was not interested in people and wasn't prepared to do anything, so the people took it into their own hands and threw out that tired administration.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Tell the truth.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mincome. Remember Mincome? The old government got interested in Mincome late in August of 1972 — fortunately for the people of British Columbia, too late to stop the rolling tide that went on to throw them out. Now there is a Mincome system, Mincome that is unequalled in the whole of Canada, Minimum wage. It's hard to remember now, but just two and a half years ago when we took office, the minimum wage in the Province of British Columbia was \$1.50 an hour. Now it's \$2.50, and that's in only two and a half years.

Interjections.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Not for women, I'm told. Well, they were second-class citizens then.

Interjection.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Not for the farmers, no — for the old-age pensioners, the ones who found it increasingly difficult to get the drugs they needed to stay alive.

I remember one of my constituents telling me that she required something in the way of \$30 a month for medication for her heart, and there was just no way she could afford to do it other than by going without many other things she should have, and other than by getting help from her own family. Pharmacare could have been done years before.

I recall the Leader of the Opposition at that time, Mr. Speaker, when he represented Cowichan-Malahat, as part of the election programme, in two election campaigns at least, telling the people of British

Columbia how much it would cost to bring in a Pharmacare programme. But the tired government of the day was not prepared to do anything, and the tired government, in 1972, was thrown out by the people of British Columbia.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): The best thing that ever happened.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I recall my very first campaign, Mr. Speaker — 1949 is a long time ago now. We campaigned together — you federally and I provincially.

I was called in by a representative of the government employees' association — riot a union — in Nanaimo, and asked what my personal attitude was and what the party's attitude was towards collective bargaining for civil servants. That was back in 1949, even before the Social Credit administration took office, and that's a long time ago.

Of course the coalition were not interested. There was 20 years of Social Credit inaction in there when the government of the day preferred to be paternalistic with their civil servants, not to talk with them or to them, rather to simply tell them what conditions they were going to have, what salaries they were going to have, what fringe benefits they were going to have, without any kind of discussion at all. There was 20 years of that under the previous tired administration till finally even the civil servants of the province, who traditionally support the government in office, had enough of that tired administration and threw them out of office.

The recreational facilities fund, about which a lot has been said in this session and a report tabled, could have been done years before.

The right to sue the Crown — this was not a new idea, Mr. Speaker. Year after year the Member for Burnaby-Edmonds (Mr. Dowding) used to raise this in debate. Other Members raised it as well — the right to sue the Crown — but it was only after the people of British Columbia were successful in throwing out of office that tired administration that they finally got the right to sue the Crown.

The sewage treatment assistance Act: remember in the last year of the previous administration when they spent the grand sum to assist the municipalities in sewage treatment plants — \$8,000? In one year of this administration — \$4 million. We talked about it; we did something. I'm told that the figure is \$5.5 million and my figures are out of date.

That tired administration is fond now of accusing us of not doing enough about pollution control and not doing enough to assist the municipalities. They forget, Mr. Speaker. They have very short memories. They forget that they thought that \$8,000 was enough to spend in one year, and they criticize us for not spending more than \$5.5 million.

[[Page 572](#)]

Transit services, all of these things — and I have read only a few of them — could have been done years before if the government of the day had not been too tired and if the government of the day was prepared to take this action on behalf of the people of British Columbia.

Now we introduce a budget that shows we're going to continue to do these kinds of things — not new services, really, but we're going to continue providing the services we have lined up in the last two and a half years and improve them in many directions. We're told now that we're irresponsible, that our budgeting is irresponsible.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) — and I'm not sure whether this is something he said or whether it has been said about him.... There was a reference to 12 advisers giving him some....

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): You didn't listen to my speech.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Not what you said? Okay, then, I saw it in the paper — a good source of information sometimes.

He had 12 advisers. Now I know that one of his advisers was not his father, because he would have had much better advice had he listened to his father, rather than the 12 people who told him that this might be a deficit budget.

Interjection.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I was here when you spoke and listened to it. In any case, the Leader of the Opposition has been saying over and over that it might be a deficit budget. Even there he's not even sure. Even with the 12 advisers he's still not sure. If he had listened to his father, I'm sure his father would have told him that the revenue figures we have projected are real figures as to what will be the revenue in the Province of British Columbia. It really will happen.

With no evidence at all you challenge our revenue estimates, but you don't go over them one by one and say: "You're too high on item A or item B or item C." You just suggest that in total the figures are too high — no evidence.

One of the remarks that you did make — and this is not a direct quotation, but to paraphrase at least — was that capital is flowing from the province. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you one area where capital is not flowing from the province, and that's \$210 million in ICBC premiums that are available for investment in the province.

He had no evidence that any of the other money was fleeing from the province either, any more evidence than

he had to say.... He said: "You all know the story about the \$30,000 cabinet table."

Well, nobody did. Nobody heard about it that I know of. He said no more about it and he's said nothing about it since. He just dreamed it up on the spur of the moment and threw it in, hoping that the papers would pick it up and that any denial would never be observed.

Interjections.

HON. MR. STUPICH: At least the Hon. Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder), when he made a mistake because of insufficient research, had the decency to apologize and say that he was in error.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Harvey for leader.

HON. MR. STUPICH: That is something that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not found time to do yet on that, and on another issue about which he will be reminded later on. And the Hon. Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) several times during question period has based his questions on completely inaccurate information that he didn't check out, and not once has he stood up and apologized to the House for trying to mislead the House. However, we don't really expect any better from that particular Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Some of them, some of them.

HON. MR. STUPICH: From that particular Member I don't expect any better.

Money for municipalities: Mr. Speaker, I have a word of advice for the municipalities. When the Minister of Finance first announced his revenue-sharing plan.... Don't forget that the municipalities have been talking about sharing revenues. They want a share of income tax revenue; they want some kind of a share of direct revenue rather than depending upon property tax. For many years they've been talking along those lines.

When the Minister of Finance first suggested that there would be this revenue-sharing plan, many of the municipalities said that this was a great idea. "Let's help the Province of British Columbia convince the government in Ottawa that this should happen."

Since the budget has come out, they seem to be more concerned about attacking the budget and attacking the Minister of Finance. I would suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, that it is time they started talking constructively as to how that revenue should be shared; none of this doom-and-gloom business about "if we get it, if we don't."

The revenue is going to come, and I think the municipalities would be much more gainfully employed by considering ways in which that money should be rationed out among the municipalities

[[Page 573](#)]

because there is nothing in the budget speech that says it is going to follow the per capita grant method. There is nothing that says it won't be, either. But there is nothing in there that indicates the method of sharing this money, and I would suggest that the municipalities take the advice that is offered to them in the budget, which is to start talking to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) about this money rather than listening to the doom-and-gloom boys who say: "Maybe it won't come." Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe — and even more than maybe — it will come.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reference in the budget speech to B.C. Hydro. I'm a bit reluctant to go into this B.C. Hydro thing at this late stage, but I would just like to remind you, Mr. Speaker — and I would also like to remind the Premier, because he was very much involved in this back on February 25, 1966, when I first spoke on this issue of Columbia River financing in the Legislature....

HON. MR. BARRETT: That's right.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I have an editorial from one of the newspapers of the day:

"David Stupich, the NDP MLA for Nanaimo and the Islands, who first raised the controversy in the Legislature, this week renewed his charge that B.C. Hydro will have to pay \$150 million more than Mr. Bennett has predicted for completing the Mica Dam project — not all the extras that were referred to in the budget, but for that one project alone.

"The rebuttals by B.C. Hydro, which insist Mr. Stupich, a chartered accountant, has made a mistake in his arithmetic, do not impress him."

Mr. Speaker, you were in on it as well. I recall talking first to my roommate (now the Premier of the province, then the Hon. Member for Dewdney) and said: "Look at these figures. We're going to run out of money. This is really bad." I was a bit afraid of them. To me, the figures added up. But, after all, the financial wizard of the day, the Premier of the day said differently, and I was just a bit reluctant as relatively new Member of the Legislature to use these figures in debate. But I talked to my roommate. He said: "I don't know anything about finance, but you've convinced me. Go ahead, see what happens."

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): He still doesn't!

HON. MR. STUPICH: Okay, he didn't know anything about finance, but back in 1966 he backed me up and he's not only been proven right but it been proven that he and I were both far wrong then for our figures were far too low. It wasn't admitted by anybody on the government side of the House except one person. One person did not deny what I was saying. That one person wasn't in the House when I spoke because that one person was never in the House when anybody in the opposition side of the House spoke. He was only here when cabinet Members were speaking. But that one person said afterwards...he never denied I was right when I first raised that issue in February of 1966.

HON. MR. BARRETT: He never said anything.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Even a year later the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources of the day (Mr. Williston) was still accusing me of "misleading a whole NDP task force of lopsided pseudo-accountants who specialize in creating negative headlines." A year later. Even by then everyone knew, except him, that I was right — that we were short of money. Unfortunately, we were right.

HON. MR. BARRETT: What did Williston say?

HON. MR. STUPICH: A whole task force of pseudo-economists trying to spread doom and gloom.

Now where is the doom and gloom coming from?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Were they covering up those costs?

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, the question comes up as to whether they were covering up the costs. I don't know, but I'll tell you what they did do, Mr. Speaker. They came up with a Hydro development plan that I said in 1966 — and nobody has contradicted me yet — was not the best for B.C. It was one that was going to produce the minimum amount of electrical power in B.C. because he had to go ahead with the Peace River project to fulfil a political promise and we didn't want too much power coming out of the Columbia development. The McNaughton plan would have produced a lot more power in British Columbia.

We sold downstream benefits and the Hon. Ray a Williston of the day said: "Look, don't worry about it. Maybe it's not as good as we said it was, but in 30 years you can renegotiate."

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a position are we going to be in in 30 years? What do we do? Threaten to take the dams down if they don't give us what we want? Mr. Speaker, we'll be in no position to renegotiate when the time comes.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): You're going to talk yourself out of the Education portfolio if you're not careful.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, with one eye

[[Page 574](#)]

on the clock, perhaps I should leave B.C. Hydro for I the time being and make some comment on agriculture, although I expect there will be some opportunity during the handling of my estimates.

Just a few brief comments, Mr. Speaker. I know the opposition will be interested in this because I'm sure by now they are thinking about how they are going to handle the Department of Agriculture when it comes to estimates. What will they find to criticize?

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): Give us some hints.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I'll give you some hints. In two years of my Ministry in Agriculture we have passed 19 bills. Mr. Speaker, there probably isn't a voter and there certainly isn't a farmer in the province who couldn't name several of those 19 bills. In the previous period of the previous administration for the same length of time, there were three minor amendments and nobody can remember what they were unless they look back in the records.

HON. MR. BARRETT: No one can even remember the name of the Minister.

HON. MR. STUPICH: It has been a year of real activity in the Department of Agriculture.

If I could refer to one programme, the ALDA programme under the Agricultural Land Development Act, formerly the land clearing Act, in the period since I have been in office, 1,305 contracts have been issued for a total of \$6,672,000. In the same length of time under the previous administration it was a little over half: only 879 for a total not of \$6.5 million but a total of \$1,980,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just that the money is available and that we've changed the programme. It's a vote of confidence in the present administration in spite of what the doom-and-gloom people are saying all over the province, a vote of confidence on the part of the agricultural people in the province as to what is going on.

The Farm Products Industry Improvement Act that was so roundly criticized by the Members in the opposition.... They didn't vote against it, but they did talk against it all the way along the line. There are 111 projects either approved, approved waiting cabinet consideration or still being considered by staff.

But there's another one, Mr. Speaker, one that is being talked about clear across the country. It is another one that was opposed by the opposition. I'm speaking now about the farm income assurance programme, something that was opposed by the Members of the opposition. In the second reading of this bill the Conservative and Liberal Members voted for an amendment that would have killed the legislation. They voted against second reading of the legislation. In committee stage all Members of the opposition joined to vote against two different sections of the legislation in the hope of killing it. When it came to third reading, all Members of the opposition voted against the farm income assurance programme.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Shame!

HON. MR. STUPICH: Now I wonder if that's what they're telling the people of the province today.

Funding. Mr. Speaker, it was a new programme. I was criticized at the time for not being able to say how much it was going to cost. Since then, other provinces are joining in. The Province of Quebec came out to B.C. to talk about our farm income assurance programme. As a result of their discussion, they have gone back and have produced legislation that is very similar to the legislation introduced in this House and passed by this House, and similar even to the extent that they do not say how much money. They use almost the same words in saying that the Minister of Finance will provide the funding necessary to establish an income assurance programme for the farmers in the Province of British Columbia. In their first year this is the only way to go, Mr. Speaker. How can you possibly estimate how much these programmes are going to cost at that stage of negotiations, before negotiations even start?

That's the route we went.

This year, it's in estimates where it belongs and where we would have liked to have had it in previous years. But it is there in estimates and there will be plenty of opportunity to discuss the workings and the plans for the farm income assurance programme as we get into discussion of estimates.

The prices for the time being, to say that Quebec is moving in the same direction.... In Ontario, I've had word from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, who invited me to come back there and speak. Well, it's a trip that I wouldn't make for that purpose, but I happened to be back there for an Agriculture Ministers' conference and I took time out to speak at the annual convention of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

I told them about our land preservation programme. I told them about our income assurance programme. A note I have now from a friend of mine who was not at the meeting but who has been listening to the farmers of Ontario and to the federation since then, says: "The seeds you sowed are germinating more quickly than we thought possible. I understand that the Ontario Minister is working on a plan now, undoubtedly for election purposes. Again, many thanks for your help."

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): We need all the

[[Page 575](#)]

help we can get in that election.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, it's the Conservative Party there that's fighting for re-election, and I'm rather inclined to agree with you that they need all the help they can get.

There have been some criticisms about our programme. The Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) was critical of it in general terms, and I'm sure that she will be later on more specifically. But I think it's of interest to note that the Province of Manitoba also is looking at a farm income assurance programme for their dairy industry. This is the one we started with in B.C. because the situation was most critical in the dairy industry.

I think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we're accused of being so free and easy with our programmes, making it so attractive to the dairymen, to find out that in the Province of Manitoba they are being even freer and easier when they're dealing with the dairymen. They are allowing the dairymen more hours of work to produce the same kind of milk. They are allowing them more feed to produce each hundredweight of milk. In almost every instance the proposed plan for Manitoba is more generous than what we feel is a very acceptable programme in the Province of British Columbia. We haven't been that free and easy with the taxpayers' money. We have been responsible.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's a different climate.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, we'll get into that in estimates, Mr. Member. Is that why it takes more hours to produce a hundredweight of milk, because the climate is different? We will get into, I'm sure, a good deal more of that when we get into the estimate discussion.

In any case, we know that legislation is in in Quebec and we know that legislation is being contemplated in Ontario. As I said from the very beginning of this programme: in the same way that it happened for hospital insurance and Medicare, as soon as any CCF or NDP province has prepared to start this and showed an example for the rest of the country and produced a plan that was attractive enough to the eastern provinces, Quebec and Ontario, then the federal government would be prepared to move. And the federal government has indeed tabled legislation.

Now whether or not it will be legislation that will help us, we just don't know at this point. However, we do know that they are working on legislation presuming that it is going to help us. What was the object of the game?

I have parts of a letter to read, from the B.C. Federation of Agriculture, dated March 6. I won't read the whole

letter, but quite often the B.C.

Federation of Agriculture has been asked to what extent it represents the farmers of this province, and at what rate are farmers disappearing.

"In order to keep you posted, we are happy to report that the loss of producers at the rate of one per day in the past 10 years (that was during the history of the previous administration) has come to a halt."

MR. LEWIS: That was during the black days.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, we have statistics to show that the number of dairy farmers in the interior of the province has increased. The number of cattle has increased throughout the industry; the production has increased throughout the industry. Even the number of farms has been increased,

"Our great concern previously had been the unwillingness of the younger generation to get involved. Although we have no figures to substantiate our suspicion, we do believe younger people are indeed becoming involved, primarily because of the more stable conditions in agriculture."

More stable, I suggest to you, since the last two and a half years.

It could all have been done years before, but a tired administration preferred not to do anything for the farmers of British Columbia and preferred to let agriculture go down and down in importance as an industry in this province.

The Land Commission. The latest word I have from the official opposition.... It is not all that late; it is three weeks old so their position may have changed. They change quite frequently on this question of the Land Commission. This is quoting the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) saying: "A Social Credit government would return control over land zoning to regional districts."

This is where we started two and a half years ago. The regional districts had control; that is why we found it necessary to move to save farmland in British Columbia.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): You made the real estate salesmen rich.

HON. MR. STUPICH: The second leader of the opposition, the one who is angling most actively for the job right now, suggests that all we did was make the real estate people rich. Perhaps some real estate people did get rich. But, if that is the cost of saving farmland in the Province of British Columbia, then I think that is a cost the people of British Columbia are happy to pay. The people of British Columbia right now support the Land Commission and support the concept of saving agricultural land. If you go out

[[Page 576](#)]

campaigning and threaten to do away with that policy — if that is going to be your campaign — then I suggest that the Hon. Member for Langley had better go back to his radio station and newspaper because he certainly will not be representing Langley in this House if he goes back to his area and says: "Let's do away with saving farmland."

Mr. Speaker, in the first 12 regional districts that were established, and these are the important ones, of a total area of 14.25 million acres, only one million was saved — only 7.2 per cent. That was all of the good agricultural land we could find in the 12 first regional districts. There isn't much of this.

I don't really think I can get through to the Hon. Member for Langley, but I think I can get through to the people of this province on the need to save this agricultural land. Remember the American humorist who said: "Agricultural land is so important because they ain't making' any more of it." That is the importance of it. Agricultural land is so important....

MRS. JORDAN: Tell the truth!

MR. McCLELLAND: What about the 2,000 acres in Surrey that was turned over to an oil refinery? That was in the agricultural land reserves.

Interjection.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order!

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, I get the impression of interrupting a Social Credit caucus meeting over there. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Social Credit meeting, but certainly the Land Commission has not turned over one acre of land, let alone 2,000, to establish any oil refinery or anything else.

The idea that agricultural land is so important because they "ain't making any more of it".... I think it was an American president who went on to say that even if they were making any more of it, "there just ain't no place to put it."

I would like to quote a few words from William Jennings Bryan in a book, *Cross of Gold*:

"Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy your farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

That is my attitude toward saving farmland. That is why I am so anxious to proceed with that programme. That is why it distresses me so much when people, apparently for political gain — I can't see any other reason for it — are threatening to do away with the Land Commission and turn back to the regional districts absolute control of what is happening to farmland in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, a few words on estimates. There have been some remarks about the extent to which estimates have increased, and I am sure there will be remarks both ways before we are finished.

In the year 1972-3, the last budget prepared by the previous administration — and I say last, rather than most recent because I certainly hope and expect that it will be the last budget that that particular administration will ever have prepared — provided for 376 employees in the Department of Agriculture. In the current budget, we have 568, an increase of 51 per cent. And they talk about us overloading and hiring too many employees.

Interjection.

HON. MR. STUPICH: What has happened to estimates in that time? The estimates in 1972-73, \$11,415,000; this year, \$60 million. An increase of 426 per cent; a ratio of 8:1. But estimates — they were only estimates — even at that, the estimates for 1972-73 worked out to \$30,000 per employee. The current figure is \$108,000 per employee. But those \$11,415,000 were only estimates. The Department of Agriculture had an historic record and habit, if you like, of not spending its estimates. In that particular year, the spending was \$7,800,000, about three-quarters of the total amount allotted in the vote.

The \$60 million is not just a figure to present in estimates. It is what we're going to spend in the Department of Agriculture in the year ahead.

I think perhaps I can't close without saying just a couple of credits, if you like....

Interjection.

HON. MR. STUPICH: It's been suggested I shouldn't close yet, but I've been looking at my time and looking at the clock and I have, I think, four minutes left. But I do want to say a couple of things before I conclude.

MRS. JORDAN: That'll be a change.

HON. MR. STUPICH: That is that we, in all of our programmes, contrary to the attitude and the record of the previous administration who preferred not to discuss things with the people involved in agriculture, who

preferred to meet with them on occasion when the precedent demanded it — not to listen to anything that they wanted, not to do anything with them or for them — our programmes have been worked out in consultation and full cooperation with the B.C. Federation of Agriculture. We continue to work with them and we continue to get their support

[[Page 577](#)]

in developing our programmes and in introducing our programmes in the various commodity groups and in the various parts of the province. There's an excellent relationship between the Department of Agriculture and the B.C. Federation of Agriculture.

One more credit that I would like to give, and that is to staff members. I have shown the figures of staff members working much harder than ever before to continue with the programmes that we presently have in place. I don't think I can perhaps describe the attitude any better than a quotation from one of the columnists in the paper — he's not in the gallery today — and I'm not picking him because he's sympathetic or in opposition to the government. Frankly, I don't know, and I'm not sure that he does. But I'd just like to read his remarks about one of my staff members who was recently taken ill:

"Department of Agriculture marketing chief, Ed Pratt, is on the mend from a heart attack suffered two weeks ago. The doctor told him he'll have to work half days for a while. His response was: 'You mean I'll have to cut down to 10 hours a day?'"

The story goes on to say that the doctor was not amused.

I have had excellent and complete cooperation from the Department of Agriculture staff in the province. Otherwise, there's no possible way that a 60 per cent increase in staff could deal with a 300 per cent increase in money. And it's not just money, but money that is providing services for the agricultural industry in the province.

In the agricultural industry, if the job we are doing is simply to support farmers or to support an industry, it would really not be worth talking about.

MR. McCLELLAND: How many farmers' sons have gone into farming? Tell us that.

HON. MR. STUPICH: What we're doing is producing food for the people of British Columbia. We're producing quality food. To the extent that we're able, we produce food that is needed, wanted, desired and purchased by the people in the Province of British Columbia. And we've gone one step further. We have brought in a programme to invite the people of British Columbia — and, to their discredit, not one Member of the opposition has mentioned this yet — to participate with the government in a programme of world food aid for needy people. Not one comment about that in the whole debate to this point. Not one comment in the press — \$5 million to provide food for the needy people of the world. We're inviting the public to participate and, as I say, not one comment from the opposition about this part of the programme and, to the best of my knowledge, not one comment in the press.

I hope that is not the attitude of the people of British Columbia. I think it isn't because I know I've received in the last months several hundred letters from people urging us to do more in this particular regard. It is my hope that those people will, when they know this programme, respond by matching funds so that we can do \$9 million worth of work for the needy people in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that before this House does adjourn, somebody on the opposition side of the House will stand up and speak in favour of that particular programme even though they can find nothing in the estimates to oppose.

MR. H. STEVES (Richmond): I'd like, before starting off this debate, to pay my tribute to Ned DeBeck who is no longer with us. Ned worked in my riding in the fish canneries from 1897 to 1900, and while I was in the Legislature I had many interesting conversations with him and he told me many anecdotes of life in Steveston and the fishing industry around that time. He worked very closely with the Indian fishermen and spoke Chinook fluently and passed on to me a lot of interesting anecdotes from the turn of the century in our community.

I'd also like to pay tribute as well to Art Laing, also a pioneer of my area. He was born on Sea Island from a pioneering Richmond farm family and grew up there. Art himself, and his family, made a major contribution to our community over the years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in this debate today I would like to concern myself largely with housing. We've been attacked vociferously by the opposition for our housing programme. I would like to go over with the Members here today some of the things we are doing in the Department of Housing and that we are trying to provide here in British Columbia..

I think it's true that we are faced with a housing crisis in British Columbia, but it is not just a crisis specific to British Columbia. Actually, it's all across Canada — Canada, a country of about 3.5 million square miles, with vast supplies of lumber and raw materials, yet with a housing crisis from sea to sea. It's the type of crisis where it becomes impossible for middle-income Canadians to buy single-family homes or even to rent an apartment.

Property values throughout Canada, on an average, have surged ahead by about 22 per cent in the last year. The average house in Toronto in 1966 — a three-bedroom home — was around \$22,000, and last year, 1974, \$57,000. In Vancouver in 1970 the same home would have been around \$21,000, and last year it was in the neighbourhood of \$55,000.

In my area, actually, we've got brand new homes that are for sale, but not selling, for around \$69,000 — three-bedroom homes. What has happened, of course, is that the workers in the communities, the working people, even the middle-class working people

[[Page 578](#)]

cannot afford it. Who can afford to pay \$600 a month on a house to live in? We have in Richmond over 300 brand new homes that are sitting vacant because the working people in my community cannot afford to live there. What this proves to me is not so much that the housing crisis is caused by government but that the housing crisis is caused because people cannot afford the accommodation that is being provided by the private sector at the present time. There are lots of houses available, but most people cannot afford to move into them.

It's similar in the United States. In the United States, I understand, in spite of a need for about two million homes, they have half-a-million vacant homes in the United States today because people can't afford to move in and live there.

Well, people haven't been buying houses in my riding, and I don't think they've been buying houses elsewhere in the greater Vancouver area that are brand new. They've been buying some of the older homes. 'They haven't been able to afford to buy the new homes that have been provided by the developers.

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

So there has been a significant slowdown in housing starts, and, of course, this will actually help to send the prices upwards, because the slowdown of housing starts creates a shortage and will send the prices up again.

I would also like to comment briefly on rental accommodation. In Ottawa, which is not noted for having a great population pressure, the rental vacancy rate is down to 2 per cent. Here in Vancouver it is less than that, around 0.1 per cent to 0.3 per cent. But it's been this way now for 10 years. If we look at statistics — which were actually provided to me yesterday — by the British Columbia Rental Housing Association — by the landlords themselves — it indicates that in Vancouver the crisis actually started in 1966 when the rental housing vacancy rate dropped from 4.0 per cent in 1965 to 1.3 per cent in 1966. So if there's any criticism of this government about providing housing accommodation, I think it's unwarranted. Their own statistics show us that we've had this crisis with us for 10 years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STEVES: If we look further on in the statistics they've provided, we will also find that the housing

crisis that is here in Vancouver is also prevalent in other major cities across Canada. In Calgary the rental accommodation vacancy rate dropped last year from 5.9 per cent to 1.2 per cent — just in six months between June and December. In Edmonton it dropped from 5.4 per cent to 0.8 per cent. Now this province has a Conservative government. Maybe it has something to do with their policies, Maybe they're causing the housing crisis. I haven't heard the Member of the Conservative Party (Mr. Wallace) suggesting that here in this Legislature, but maybe that's what happened because they certainly have the same crisis that we have.

In Winnipeg their housing crisis also started in 1967 when the rate dropped from 4.1 per cent down to 1.5 per cent. In Toronto it started in 1964 when it dropped from 4.0 to 2.6, then down to 1.5 and then to 0.9 in a two- or three-year period. In Montreal recently the housing crisis caught up to them — just in the last couple of years — and it's now down to a 1.2 vacancy rate. Quebec dropped last year from 4.3 to 1.6 in a six-month period. St. John's, if we go further east, had a vacancy rate of 20 per cent in 1970, and that has now dropped down to 0.3 per cent. This is happening all across Canada.

While the landlords hope to show by providing these statistics that it was all caused by rent controls and by the government here in B.C., it's obvious from looking at these statistics — which they provided themselves — that the rent crisis and the housing crisis across Canada are not caused by this government but are caused on a national scale by policies both of the federal government and also of the policies of migration of people across Canada to the industrial centres. If you look at these statistics, you'll find that where the crisis is occurring is in the areas where there's high industrialization where people come looking for jobs, and, of course, they're causing a stress on the housing market.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the previous speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) was up, somebody was heckling that the Land Commission also caused some of the problems in housing.

Actually, recently I was reading some material provided by the Greater Vancouver Regional District, and they listed the Land Commission, municipal zonings and provincial zonings and so on as having a minor influence on the housing market. What they did suggest was that the reasons for the housing crisis were that houses over the past few years have been regarded as a good investment in an inflationary economy. There has been great demand, so people have put their money into houses.

Secondly, they suggested that people since 1971 had homes exempted from the capital gains tax federally, so people felt that if they invested in a home they could make a tax-free profit on the home, which is fine.

Thirdly, they suggested that the World War II baby population boom increased prices of building materials and so on.

But they themselves — this was published by one of the planners from the GVRD, I believe in the *Urban Reader* — suggested that the Land Commission

[[Page 579](#)]

actually played a very, very minor role and that all that the Land Commission did do was delineate what areas would be kept for agriculture and what areas could be developed for housing. Of course, what happened is that the speculators have moved into the housing areas and have tried to jack up the prices through speculation on the land that is now available. Many of them are sitting on the land and not even trying to move it, hoping that the price will go up further.

I had one instance where a person from Hong Kong — actually a buyer from a Hong Kong company — knocked on my door one day last fall. He said he had \$4 million he wanted to spend and asked if I could suggest to him where he could find some land that was available. He wanted some vast acreage of land that he could invest the money in because the owner of that money in Hong Kong wanted to get his money out of Hong Kong and get it over to some place where he could speculate in an urban area and hope to make a profit by the growth of Vancouver.

Of course, I wasn't able to help this fellow out. I don't know what happened to his \$4 million — he really had

my sympathy.

The housing crisis, as I see it, will be slowing up towards the end of the year as the government does put on to the market the housing that is presently planned. Over the past year the government Housing department was able to initiate a number of housing starts and I think the effect of these housing starts or the planned housing will start to be felt towards the end of 1975.

It's interesting to note that the Employers Council of B.C., however, has suggested that the housing crisis won't come to an end at the end of the year, Their reason for this was: "The comparatively large inventories and large potential sales cannot be converted to home ownership due to the high original cost and high-cost financing." What they're saying then is that the housing that the developers and the construction industry have built is high-priced. They aren't willing to drop those prices and they aren't going to build any more housing until they can get the money out of it that they want to get out of the housing they're developing. Therefore they're willing to let B.C. flounder as far as the housing market is concerned.

I think that with the actions that the government is intending to take, this is an overly pessimistic attitude. With the role of the government, B.C. housing will be proceeding along at a pretty good pace by the end of the year.

I think that after one year of the housing industry under the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) we have seen some fairly impressive results. In 1974, his department assisted in the creation of 3,364 lots and housing units which, out of a total of 30,000 built during 1974 by the industry in general, amounted to about 10 per cent of the housing starts. In 1975, as I understand it now — or at least by the end of 1974 — they've got around 18,000 units either in the planning or construction stages or in lots, mobile home pads and so on. So 18,000 units would add up to over 50 per cent of what's normally constructed in the housing field by private industry. I'm sure that that's going to have a very strong effect on the housing situation here in British Columbia.

Some people earlier in this debate suggested that Dunhill Development Corp. has not built any houses. I was quite pleased when the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) suggested that we should have a Crown corporation constructing houses in British Columbia. I think that's a very good suggestion, and perhaps the Minister of Housing might like to take him up on that.

MR. CHABOT: I never suggested that. No way!

MR. STEVES: I'm sure that he would support us if we did set up a housing corporation.

Interjection.

MR. STEVES: Well, he was complaining that they hadn't built a house, and I take that to indicate that he would be very supportive if Dunhill Development did get out and started building houses on their own, I'm sure he wouldn't complain.

Perhaps that's something that the Minister might take under consideration — that we would get support from that Member over there.

MR. CHABOT: I'll have a talk with him.

MR. STEVES: I would like to say, however, that what Dunhill has done is that they've got a lot of non-profit housing going, they've got a lot of cooperative groups in operation. In B.C., before this government came in, I doubt if there was any co-op housing at all in the province. I might be corrected, but I don't think there was any. There's a tremendous amount of co-op housing now underway.

HON. L. NICOLSON (Minister of Housing): In spite of them.

MR. STEVES: The people involved in co-op housing are getting money from the government to buy land. One development that's going ahead in Richmond, Klahanie Co-op, received \$600,000 from this government to

purchase land. They're getting the land from the government on a lease basis.

I mentioned this the other day. These are the people who were evicted from Sea Island by the Liberal government in Ottawa. They're getting this land, and they are going to be able to develop their

[[Page 580](#)]

own community and retain the type of community atmosphere they had in the community they were being forced out of by the Liberal government.

I think that as more people see that they can get into very, very reasonable housing through the co-op method, this probably will become one of the more popular types of housing in British Columbia in the next few years.

Obviously, people can't afford to go and buy their own homes at \$69,000 for a single-family home. They just can't afford it; nobody can afford \$600 a month to make those kind of payments. So I think the co-op method is probably one which we will see people asking for and demanding more in the future.

Of course, the housing problem does require a certain amount of assistance at the local level. We've noticed a lot of the home wreckers around in this Legislature who are opposing our housing policies. We also have home wreckers in the local ridings — I'll have more to say about them later — who oppose the government when it tries to provide housing at the local level. We find that municipal councils drag their heels and put a lot of bureaucratic red tape in the way when we try to get housing developments approved. We find that our plea to councils a year ago to assist in allowing people to duplex older homes and larger homes in various parts of the province have fallen on deaf ears.

The home wreckers over here and the home wreckers over there have all come out in opposition and, of course, this programme has not been very successful. I think it is a programme that could be successful if we got that kind of cooperation at the local level.

However, what is happening is that people on the local councils, for their own self-interest — and my council in Richmond is no exception — don't really want to see the housing programmes of this government proceed. I don't think that Members of the opposition are too keen on it either. They would like to be able to get up in the Legislature here next spring and attack the government again for doing nothing in housing. It is very opportunistic on their part and on the part of their friends back in the ridings to try and drag their heels and prevent us from succeeding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into too much further detail on housing, other than I think that we should continue to try to get the local areas to consider duplexing and recycling older homes.

Yesterday some members of the NDP caucus met with the landlords who came over to protest rent control and so on. Some of the landlords said: "Well, we own older homes in Vancouver and we would like to get out from under rent control, then we'll bulldoze those homes down and we'll build some nice apartments." I asked one of these landlords who was suggesting that: "What's going to happen to the people who live there?" He suggested: "Well, the poor people, they should be looked after by the government. We're going to build nice accommodation, and those poor people should be looked after by the government. They should be subsidized."

My question to the landlords of this province is: who is really responsible for providing housing? Do they have the right to take the cream? In other words, do they have the right to be able to provide housing for the affluent, kick out the dispossessed, send them elsewhere and say: "Okay, that's the government's responsibility." If they are getting money from the housing business in British Columbia, do they not have some responsibility as well?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STEVES: I think the landlords have some responsibility. I think the local city councils have some responsibility and that poor people should not be sloughed off and expect to be subsidized and have to go into subsidized housing. So I think there is some need for serious consideration of the idea of duplexing and recycling

homes — that's repairing the old ones rather than bulldozing them down — because poorer people can afford to get into some of the older homes. They just need a bit of repairing and fixing up; then they make very decent accommodation.

I think too that we should be looking further — and I'm pleased that the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) is doing this — into the use of modular housing, mobile homes and the like. I know his department is also looking into the economic means of energy use in those homes — solar heat, better insulation methods, double panes of glass and so on — so that people can not only live in an economical home but also in a home that will operate economically as well, that will save on energy, save on environmental degradation elsewhere, as we have to provide energy to the homes throughout B.C. So in effect they get cheap housing and cheap energy as well — cheap to operate.

I would like to refer to specifics regarding landlord and tenant matters which apply to my riding. I mentioned earlier the housing vacancy rate — that the landlords themselves were down to the 0.1 per cent level in British Columbia. In my riding and elsewhere in the province we have some landlords who are actually withholding suites from the market. The landlord in particular that I am referring to is George Mulek of West Park Investments. He has a couple of apartment blocks in Richmond in which he has 20 or 30 vacant suites in out of 100, and I think this is a disgrace. In fact, I think it is criminal when people are trying to find housing in this province that landlords

[[Page 581](#)]

should be withholding housing from them.

This, I believe, is also occurring elsewhere through the province, but I raise this specific case because I have documented evidence of what has been happening. This same landlord owns apartments here, I believe. I think it is Orchard House in Victoria and some others throughout the province. Some of the suites have been vacant for almost a year.

One other thing: he has also held suites vacant in low-dividend housing which is provided by the federal government, and where they have waiting lists of poor people trying to get into the low-dividend housing. People have actually been waiting on these lists for a long time, but he has held vacant suites in the low-dividend housing in Richmond in an attempt to convince the people in his other apartments to move there because, basically, he wants more rent than what he is able to get under the Landlord and Tenancy Act.

This particular landlord, only a year ago, on April 9, 1974, made the following statement. He's a director of the Greater Vancouver Apartment Owners Association. He said:

"In postwar years, I have built and operated several thousand good rental housing units in B.C. and Alberta, all of them in the low and medium-price range, and my tenants have been satisfied."

I might say they're not satisfied now.

"In the present legal and political climate I've absolutely no plans for any further construction of rental apartment buildings in B.C. I've talked to other builders and they feel the same way."

Actually he's not only not building but he is withholding suites. He's converting suites to 99-year lease accommodation in order to avoid the rent controls brought in by this government a year ago. The apartment blocks that he has converted to 99-year lease are on Buswell Road in Richmond. Under Bill 155, it's illegal to evict a tenant for refusing to sign a 99-year lease. But the tenants are being told that they are not being evicted but that their apartment is going to be sold to somebody else if they don't purchase the apartment themselves. Then the person who purchases that apartment can evict them.

The tenants first received letters indicating a rent increase greater than 8 per cent on February 25 last year. Later this was amended to be within the 8 per cent rent limit, and on June 28 they received a notice that their apartments were being converted to 99-year lease. On July 5, a further explanation was slipped under their door and

some tenants received estimates of the cost to them under what is called the "Blue Haven Individualized Purchase Plan." Some were told verbally that they had one week to make up their minds if they wished to purchase.

Here's what they were offered. Tenants who had been paying rent in the neighbourhood of \$195 a month in 1973, in February were asked to pay \$225 a month, which was over and above the 8 per cent. In July, in order to get around the 8 per cent limitation, the landlord said: "Okay, your suites are now 99-year lease and the rents you will pay are in the neighbourhood of \$298 a month, plus \$5,000 down payment." The total would be them roughly \$350 a month, or an increase in one year from \$195 to about \$350 a month — an increase of around between 75 to 80 per cent. This is what is happening to tenants in my riding, and it's happening elsewhere in the province as well.

The landlord was criticized by myself and by the tenants, and we got a lawyer in the case. In fact he even advertised the apartments as "Blue Haven Strata Apartments." He never had permission to have them stratified but he advertised them as such. He is now advertising them as 99-year lease apartments.

The next thing he did was file a libel suit against the lawyer that the tenants had and against the local newspaper which was carrying the stories. That stifled the press, and the press then was afraid to carry any further stories. We hear that we have a free press in British Columbia. But when somebody is able to slap a libel suit on them simply for carrying a story about what is happening, I think that's pretty despicable. That's what happened in Richmond.

Anyway, the landlord has deliberately, and I think quite methodically, searched out loopholes to avoid the rent control Act. We find that while the legislation was being drafted and going through this Legislature last year to ban 99-year leases without the consent of the local council, Mr. Mulek went and transferred his property from property being owned by George Mulek and Brian and Violet Hitchen to West Park Investments. He did that last May, and the Act banning transfers under the Landlord and Tenant Act was proclaimed on August 9. He did it while the legislation was going through this Legislature but before it was actually proclaimed by cabinet.

The interesting thing about this is that the landlord went and leased the apartment block to himself. West Park Investments Ltd., we find, belongs to George Mulek, Brian and Violet Hitchen. In order to avoid the Landlord and Tenant Act and the rent controls, he went and took his own apartment building, owned by himself and the other two people I've mentioned, and set up the name West Park Investments, which was actually, the investment company which they had owned previously. Under that name he went and transferred it from them directly to the company that was owned by them. So he's leasing the apartment block to himself on a 99-year lease basis.

Recently he proceeded to give eviction notices to the tenants, and I've asked the Attorney-General

[[Page 582](#)]

(Hon. Mr. Macdonald) to carry out an investigation through his department. This is presently proceeding. As it appears, he has actually converted the apartments to 99-year lease and so the tenants are very much concerned about what rights they really have, because he has been able to, I think, somewhat avoid the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act by leasing the apartments to himself.

Now he's leasing the apartments out individually, one at a time, to new people. The new people are coming in and then they last week started sending eviction notices to the tenants. The new tenants in effect are evicting the old tenants. People are pretty upset about it in Richmond.

The reason I'm bringing this up is that this apartment owner owns apartments elsewhere in B.C. and there are other apartment owners, landlords as well, who thought they might get away with converting to 99-year lease throughout the province. If this one succeeds, I think we're going to be facing a major problem in B.C. with suites where the landlords rushed in and changed over the tenure of the apartments before the Act was proclaimed.

Even while it might be legal, I think it wrong that a person can lease a property to himself in order to avoid legislation. I think it's wrong that he should be able to use new tenants to try and evict the people he couldn't evict under the legislation if he was following the legislation properly. I think it's wrong that he should be able to use this

system to jack up the rents by 75 per cent. Ironically, the way the Act reads right now, the old tenants who are being evicted by the new tenants don't even get moving expenses to which they are entitled under other terms of eviction.

What I would like to suggest, and the purpose for bringing this to your attention today, is that until the housing crisis is over — and I don't expect that will be too long — there should be a freeze on 99-year leases here in B.C., leases that are given out on an individual basis.

Presently, the 99-year lease conversion of an apartment block has to be approved by the local council. But in cases where this was avoided and a leased building is now being leased out apartment by apartment, I think this type of leasing should be frozen at least until the crisis is over. This may take a year or two, but the question is: where do these people go? As the conversions continue, these people are just thrown right out on their own. Most of the ones in the apartments I have been mentioning are old-age-pensioners. There's no place for them to go.

I think it's also a crime that so many vacant suites are being kept in these apartments. If the 99-year leases were frozen so that they cannot convert the individual suites on a 99-year basis, then the landlord would have to rent his suites out rather than having them sit there vacant while he waits for somebody to come and buy them. I think this would also prevent other landlords from carrying out the same kind of method that this particular landlord has tried to use to hassle his tenants and get them to leave. A lot of the tenants did leave. As I mentioned, about 30 of them just couldn't take the hassle to try to get them to pay a 75 per cent increase in rent.

Before closing I would like to talk briefly on education and the Education budget as it pertains to my riding. As it presently stands, Richmond has about the worst situation of any school district in the province as far as pupil/teacher ratio is concerned. Among all the school districts we will have the greatest increase in pupil/teacher ratio in the province in 1975. The increase as it now stands will be from 19.8 pupils to one teacher in 1974 to 20.8 in 1975, an increase of 4.8 per cent in the pupil/teacher ratio. This would put us in the bracket of having the second highest pupil/teacher ratio in B.C.

Due to the fact that the finance formula also includes non-teaching staff, and enrolment in special classes is fixed — special classes such as industrial education and so on; they won't allow any increase in those classes — due to these reasons some of the ordinary classroom teachers, such as English teachers and so on, in high school and standard classroom teachers in the elementary school, could be faced with an increase in September, 1975, of around three to five pupils per class. Other school districts have been able to maintain or improve the pupil/teacher ratio because their actual school enrolment is down.

In our case, because we're a rapidly growing community, our enrolment is also growing rapidly and will increase further this year or next as the hundreds of homes which are nearing completion are filled, and all the ones that are sitting vacant - which I was talking about earlier — are filled.

In past years, because assessments went up, the local school boards and the councils were able to say, okay, they'd cut the mill rate down and taxes haven't gone up. But due to the fact that the assessments are now frozen, the school board in Richmond was faced with increasing the mill rate. In doing so, they just increased the mill rate by 7 mills — just enough to meet the normal inflated costs, but with no money at all to reduce the pupil/teacher ratio, or even maintain it at the 19.8 level set in 1974. In fact, in reality, the Richmond school board has budgeted for the 1973 level of educational quality in Richmond.

As a teacher and a parent with children in the Richmond school system, I find that most appalling. I still maintain that we should be continuing our commitment to reduce the pupil/teacher ratio as a priority. I recognize that this isn't possible this year due to the present recession, but I hope that we'll be able to continue that programme in the near future.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) to seriously consider the special grant section 1n her budget this year, and through

that section to seriously consider a special grant to Richmond so that the present pupil/teacher ratio can be maintained. I would also like to suggest to the Minister that perhaps she might nudge the Richmond school board a little bit because I don't think they have been doing their job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STEVES: I think they've been really dragging their heels, just like some of the people on the council in Richmond, which I was referring to earlier, who have been dragging their heels on housing.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The school district lost a lot of good teachers.

MR. STEVES: Yes, they lost a lot of good teachers.

I'd also like to comment on something that seems to be topical here today — blacklists. While I've never seen an actual blacklist, I know that blacklists have existed in the past.

Interjection.

MR. STEVES: The Hon. Member over there says that he's been on one. Not an educational one, I think, but probably one dealing with carpenters.

Well, actually, I've been on one dealing with teachers. It may not have been written, but it certainly was verbal.

Usually it was used against teachers who are of different political persuasions from the previous government, the Social Credit Party, and it generally applied to teachers who were trying to make educational changes in the education system.

How I happened to know that I was sort of on the list was that my wife, who is probably even better qualified as a teacher than I was, couldn't get a job in Richmond. She tried for about three years. Finally one of these school supervisors came around to the school and said to me after school one day: "Look, your wife can't get a job in Richmond simply because of her last name. You've been active in trying to get some educational changes." Actually, I'd been campaigning for the collegial system in the schools, and a lot of the principals didn't like that very much. "Also you've been involved in the NDP, and she can't get a job in Richmond. But if she goes and applies in another area, I'll put in a word for her and she'll get a job."

Interestingly enough, three years after she got out of teacher training at UBC she finally got a job. That's the way she got it. He said that that was just a fact of life. She was not welcome in Richmond. She had to go elsewhere. Basically, she was blacklisted in Richmond because she was married to me.

I don't know whether I was blacklisted or not, but I had tenure and they couldn't get rid of me. Some of them would have liked to and some of them tried.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Who made that statement?

MR. STEVES: As I mentioned before, I did try to use the collegial system. In fact, I even spoke in a public meeting at one time. I made front-page headlines over the idea of teachers working together, running the school together, working with students, not having a hierarchical system where the principal and vice-principal told you what to do.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Who made the statement that she would have to move out of the Richmond district?

MR. STEVES: This was one of the supervisors in Richmond. I haven't talked to him, so I'm not at liberty to give his name. He is now retired. He mentioned that to me personally in the hallway after school one day. This was about five years ago. She went and applied in Delta, as he suggested, and she got a job in Delta.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Did he give his reasons?

MR. STEVES: He said it was largely because she was married to me. That's the way he put it. He inferred the other reasons. I don't know about the changes I was trying to make as far as the collegial system was concerned and my political activities, whether that had some bearing on it. My feeling is basically that that is what it was all about.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Did you speak to the Minister after you were elected about that?

MR. STEVES: No, I never brought it to her attention. Perhaps I should have. I really didn't expect that the blacklist would continue. Perhaps it did.

Anyway, I shouldn't be going on with a personal private conversation back and forth. I've got a couple of minutes left.

I am pleased, as far as the recent firings are concerned, to note that Ken Novakowski, one of the people who was fired, who happens to be a personal friend of mine and also a close political friend as well — we have similar ideas — has gone back to where he was teaching before in Langley. He not only is going to be back teaching in the school system in September, but they took him on immediately in Langley. I think he started about a week ago.

Interjections.

[[Page 584](#)]

MR. STEVES: I'm not going to comment on harassment. I'm not sure just what you are dealing with there. I would like to ask the Minister, however, to continue with the commitment to the community school and collegial system of education. This is one of our policies that I have held for a long time. It is one of our party policies. I hope, in light of the recent firings in her department, that this does not mean that the programme will be scrapped. I've had a very strong personal commitment to this programme for years. I hope that this programme will be continued. I never want to see us go back to the system we had under the old government that depended upon a system of fear in the school system. This is what these blacklists and everything mean. If teachers are afraid to speak out, if teachers are afraid to try new ideas in the school system, it is a system of fear. That is what we had under the old government. I have been happy to see this go. I would never want to see those guys back in here again bringing that system back into British Columbia.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: We lost the research division just last week.

MR. STEVES: In conclusion, I would like to say that we have had the wrecking crew working in this Legislature. They are presently working in my riding right now. I inferred this the other day when I said that the local council had a number of Socreds on it and they are all fighting for the Social Credit nomination. They have actually passed the buck, as I mentioned earlier, on housing programmes in Richmond. They have dragged their feet in the neighbourhood improvement programme in the Steveston area that some of us have been promoting. Strangely enough, Ernie LeCours, the former MLA, has been supporting us on this one and some of the others.

The Socreds in council were dragging their feet on accepting recreation money from this government. We had an indoor pool that they could get a third of a million dollars for. They have been dragging their heels on that one. They have actually opposed outright the establishment of a day-care centre into which the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) was going to put \$20,000. We are trying to find some way now of building that without the municipal approval.

They have rezoned a major farming area in Richmond for industry contrary to the wishes of the community and a 9,000-name petition. This has been going on quite consistently on the part of the Richmond council.

The home wreckers, the wrecking crews who are operating here in this Legislature and back in my riding, are not too much interested in their own community as much as who will be the Sacred standard-bearer in Richmond.

Fortunately, I hear that they are going to have the nomination and get it over with in the next week or two. One of them is a carpetbagger from the Liberal Party; he's one of the main contenders. Another one is a carpetbagger from the Conservative Party. They are holding joint, dual memberships in both parties.

Fortunately, the people of Richmond are beginning to see through their antics, are beginning to see that the Socreds are no longer the populist group they try to pretend they are, are beginning to see that they are a wrecking crew, are beginning to see that the people in Richmond who are running for the Socred nomination are just like these people over here. They are beginning to see that we have got a new breed of Socreds, no longer the populists but people who are only interested in power and their own opportunity to gain. They try to promote doom and gloom; they try to promote fear. They jump from party to party to try to maintain the old establishment in power in this province. I think the people in my riding and the people in this province elsewhere are going to see through this and are going to reject that kind of nonsense.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Would you please deduct the applause from my time? You know, since this government brought in closure, they're very conscious of not having anybody speak.

I want to say that it's certainly a great privilege and a great honour for me to stand in this Legislature this afternoon and take my part in the budget debate. It's a great honour and a privilege to represent that great constituency of South Peace River, which is part of the greater land beyond the Rocky Mountains, the area with the large, flowing oil wells and the spurting gas wells which supply much of the energy for this province, the area with the turning turbines generating two-thirds of the power for this province...

MR. LEWIS: Hot air!

MR. PHILLIPS: ...the area with the flowing wheat fields, and cattle standing knee-deep in grass. Mr. Speaker, you know what it's like. You've been up there. That great land beyond the Peace! And it's my pleasure to serve that great constituency.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's been an interesting session so far. We had a throne speech which went back into the past record of the present government. During the debate on the throne speech we had cabinet Ministers standing in their place in this Legislature desperately trying to protect the work they have done in the last two and a half years. One would think that either there's going to be a cabinet

[[Page 585](#)]

shuffle or there's something else in the wind. But you know, Mr. Speaker, as well as I know that some of the old cabinet hinges are becoming a little rusty.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, than when I look at this budget which we have before us, this 1975 budget proves beyond any doubt the unique ability of the doctor of welfare from St. Louis' ability to completely tax the people of the Province of British Columbia. The budget we have before us is almost unique in distributing poverty not only in the year 1975 but an increasing amount of it in the years ahead. Although it's supposed to be a job-security budget, there is not in this budget one single proposal for long-range planning that will provide the much-needed jobs that are going to be needed in this province in five to six years from now. A job-security budget, Mr. Speaker? It's just the entire opposite.

But I want, this afternoon, to commend the Premier. He's trying desperately to change his image.

MR. FRASER: Where is he?

MR. PHILLIPS: I Want to commend him for going out and going on a fishing trip and trying to learn what the life of a fisherman is like. I understand that on Friday he's going to work in a lumber mill — I commend him for this — on the end of a green chain.

MR. FRASER: In the Cariboo.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's time the Premier of this province understood what it is like to earn a week's wages by the sweat of his brow, because he's never really done it in his life. Our Minister of Finance has spent his life giving away money that other people have earned.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): What an insulting thing to say!

MR. PHILLIPS: He has never had a true appreciation of what it's like to go out and earn a week's wages and have it taxed away from you.

MR. LEWIS: Oh, shame!

HON. MR. COCKE: Shame! Shame!

MR. PHILLIPS: What the Premier should do is go out and sit in the offices of some of the small businessmen in this province, some of the small businessmen who are faced with meeting their bankers at the end of the month; some of the small businessmen who are faced with meeting a payroll; some of the small businessmen who are seeing their assets eroded away by inflation. And this budget is adding more fuel to the fire.

No, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Premier going out and trying to find out what it's like to do a good, honest, hard day's work.

MR. LEWIS: Are you saying that a social worker isn't honest?

MR. PHILLIPS: But I'm saying that he should also try and put himself in the offices of some of the many thousands of small businessmen in this province today who, because of this government's policies, are finding it increasingly difficult to say in business.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair]

HON. MR. COCKE: An honest day's work — a used car salesman!

MR. PHILLIPS: But not only is he trying to learn what it's like to do an honest day's work; he's trying to change his image. He's trying to come up with a new, low-key, sincere, high finance, executive type — clean-cut. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a blue suit from George Straith won't fool the people of this province. He's trying to change his image, Mr. Speaker, from being no more the court jester, the stand-up comedian, the clown-comedian or the Henny Youngman of the Legislature. He's really trying, and he's trying desperately, to change his image not only in this Legislature but in the province at large.

With this new image and with this new budget, we have a new planner who has come to the forefront in the Province of British Columbia. No more are the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) and Dr. Gaffney directing the planning of the province. No, unfortunately for them, but fortunately for the taxpayers of this province, we have a new man now directing the stage, a new stage producer to direct and increase the receipts at the box office — in other words, increase the taxation on the people of British Columbia.

This budget which we have before us is the first programme from this new director — Mr. Eliesen.

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: The exodus from Manitoba, Yes, this is the first new direction, and if it's the direction that we're going to be heading by this new planner, the people of this province can look for new and increased taxes next year and the year following.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: But still our Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) is still the star performer. He's the magician who can take away your pocketbook and give it back to you with the other hand and make you

laugh.

Then we have another outfit in this province, an advertising agency — I believe the name is Dunsky — who have now been given the name of Minister of deception. They're assisted by two men in the Premier's office by the name of Twiggy and McNelly.

They're putting out full-page ads in the paper and they're putting out government newsletters and releases to the press. All of them don't tell the entire truth.

I was very interested to look at the picture on the front page of the budget. It's a picture of two young children. I would suppose that the picture would depict the future of these children in this province. I wonder if these children, whose picture is on the front page of this budget speech, really realize that their future is being eroded away by inflation and the inflationary policies contained in the budget.

MR. LEWIS: Oh, garbage!

MR. PHILLIPS: I wonder if the children on the front page of this budget realize there are incentive-killing taxation policies contained within this budget. I wonder if these children realize that the policies contained in this budget are going to lead to mass unemployment by the time they come into the picture. I wonder if they realize that by the time they get old enough to buy their own home, their freedom of choosing land and owning their own land in British Columbia is going to be gone. I wonder if they realize that by the time they are taxpayers, a vast majority of the taxes of British Columbia will go to pay interest on huge debts which this government is incurring. I wonder if they realize that in the lower mainland there will be nothing but slum apartment buildings for them to live in, a situation created by the policies of this government. I wonder if they realize that they might have to move out of the province to find employment. I wonder if they realize that they may have to work on a state farm or in a state henhouse or on a state cattle ranch or in a state sawmill...

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Don't talk nonsense.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...or that if they want to work for this government they must carry a party card.

If they have a complaint against this government, they will have to wallow and wade through the mire of bureaucracy to get to the source of their problem. Their future will be deep in the heart of taxes.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines): Why don't you give us the solution then?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm going to give you.... Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a man — the Minister of Mines — who, above all people in this House, should ask for solutions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PHILLIPS: We've preached to that man and preached to him and given him solutions, and you might as well talk to the desk that's sitting in front of him.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: This budget is a dying final attempt to buy the people of British Columbia with their own money — a dying final attempt on the part of this government. It's an attempt by the Minister of Finance to keep the people of this province from the realities of what is going on.

I want to speak for just a few moments on northern development. It's mentioned very briefly in the budget speech. In the budget speech, it says:

"Our government is developing policies for the northern region of the province through consultation with those most

intimately affected by such policies, the northern residents."

That's what it says here in the budget speech.

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: It says:

"Government departments will expand the public consultation programme, undertake studies on matters of particular interest to the north, such as social problems, special community needs and individual living requirements, and generally ensure communication of northern affairs."

For \$403,000, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEWIS: Hear, hear!

MR. PHILLIPS: But I've listened to the Members from the north speak in this debate. I listened to the Member for Atlin (MT. Calder); I listened to the Member for Skeena (Mr. Dent); I listened to the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly); and I listened to the Member for Prince Rupert (Hon. Mr. Lea).

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a new department that this government brought in: a department of northern affairs. I'll admit I was asking for a department of northern affairs. There are four Members in this Legislature representing northern Tidings. I listened very carefully to their speeches, Mr. Speaker, and heard not one word from any one of them about the department of northern affairs, the department that is supposed to be the liaison between the people of the north, the Members of the north

[[Page 587](#)]

and the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand very easily how Members from the north can be embarrassed with this department because the people who live in the north look on this department of northern affairs as a complete farce, and they laugh at it. So I can understand why the Members, including the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea), didn't mention it in their speeches.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that for all the good that this department of northern affairs is doing, it would be far better if they took that \$403,000 and spent it on roads in the area. I'm telling you the people would be a lot happier.

The Minister of northern affairs (Hon. Mr. Nunweiler) does not know what is going on in the cabinet, he is not accepted in the cabinet and he is not told what the future plans are going to be. So how is he going to live up to what it says in the budget speech? How is he going to consult with the people in the north? He is not in harmony with the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk). The Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) hasn't got time for the little Minister of northern affairs. But the Premier consults with him. He takes him along on his trips, Mr. Speaker, to carry the bags.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. PHILLIPS: The Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) doesn't even know he exists, and the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) won't even tell him what's going on. So how do you expect that poor Minister of northern affairs to consult with the people in the north?

Mr. Speaker, this portfolio was handed out to pacify the voters of Prince George, and it backfired. It's a complete geographical and political appointment; that's all it is. He's a Minister of northern affairs in tokenism only.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You should be ashamed of yourself. You're against the north.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not against the north. I asked for a Minister of northern affairs, but I wanted a Minister of northern affairs who would be accepted into the cabinet and who would know what the future plans of this government are so that he could go out and consult.

Mr. Speaker, all this Minister of northern affairs has done is hold meetings in the north and frustrate the very people at those meetings because he doesn't know what's going on. When asked questions he can't give them any information. But he sure set up a good bureaucracy. What is it? He's got 12 people in his department?

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

MR. PHILLIPS: Fourteen people in his department. And what has he accomplished, Mr. Speaker? He's accomplished absolutely nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: He takes minutes of meetings.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we have a strong and solid liaison between the people of the north and the rest of the cabinet because, if you cut a line from Prince Rupert through to the Peace River area, you're looking at a land mass which is almost 50 per cent of the Province of British Columbia and which probably contains over 80 per cent of the natural resources.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the promise to consult with the people in that area has been a complete farce — just so many words. This is not happening. The people of the north have no idea whatsoever of what this government's intentions are. In the northwestern part of the province, where the government came out and said they had great plans to create 24,000 jobs, the people of that area have no idea what is going on. They see surveys being done for roads; they know that other surveys are being done. But the Minister of northern affairs has not told those people what is going on.

Had it not been for a leaked provincial government document dated February 18, 1974, the people in the northwest would still be in the dark. This leaked government document, Mr. Speaker, instead of alleviating their fears, enhanced their fears. This document, which is a document which was supposed to be an agreement between the federal government and the provincial government, tells them that it is going to create 22,000 new jobs over the next 20 years. It's going to be the promotion of the northwest autonomy by (a) localizing services and market facilities, and (b) developing a transportation network. But they don't know where. They haven't been consulted. It mentions creation of an urban centre, probably Terrace, but they don't know whether it's going to be in Terrace, Smithers, Vanderhoof, or Prince Rupert, and they haven't been asked.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to this: British Columbia Railway, Fort St. James to Dease Lake by 1975; BCR from Klappan to Telegraph Creek; CNR from Terrace to Groundhog; BCR from Dease Lake to Lower Post. It goes on to list the roads and port facilities.

Why has not the Minister of northern affairs consulted with the people in that area? We're looking not only at roads and railroads and super ports, we're looking at sawmill expansion, we're looking at a copper smelter, we're looking at hydro power development for an influx of 22,000 workers, an

[[Page 588](#)]

increase in the population in that area of some 75,000 people.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, if this government is sincere about their development of the northwest portion of this province, the Minister of northern affairs owes it to those people to go up there and consult with them. Even the Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) doesn't know what's going on. The Members from those ridings — the Member for Skeena (Mr. Dent), the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) and, indeed, the Member for Prince Rupert (Hon. Mr. Lea) should be consulted on the future plans of the government.

Because of the unemployment in that area, the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) should

quit dragging his feet...

MR. CHABOT: Through the mud.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...and he should get down to Ottawa and get these three agreements signed. Mr. Speaker, we're sick and tired of hearing in this Legislature: "Blame it on Ottawa."

The people of that area were promised that they would be consulted. They haven't been consulted, They were promised development to alleviate some of their unemployment problems and absolutely nothing has happened except, Mr. Speaker, that the first irrevocable step towards the northwest development occurred when the Burns Lake timber sale allotment was awarded to a 74 per cent foreign-owned consortium...and I think it's the Burns Lake timber sale also. Those are irrevocable steps, and the people of those areas were not consulted.

Had it not been for this document, which was not obtained from the Minister of northern affairs — I don't know how it was leaked out — these people wouldn't have an idea at all. We've had the Premier go up there, we've had the Minister of Economic Development go up there and we've had the federal Minister in charge of DREE (Hon. Mr. Jamieson) go up there, but the people are none the wiser. They want some answers. They're sick and tired of the Minister of Economic Development dragging his feet.

The Premier went up there, Mr. Speaker, and he didn't consult. He didn't even consult with the local civic council, let alone the people. They had to pass resolutions and urge the Premier to do something.

Now I'd like to deal for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, with the northeastern section of the province.

HON. MR. COCKE: Where is that?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's a typical question — the Minister of Health asking where the northeastern section of the province is. He has probably never gone up there. He probably doesn't even know that it exists.

HON. MR. COCKE: I went up there and they told me all about you.

MR. PHILLIPS: But you know, Mr. Speaker, we were going to have great action from this government. We were going to have from this government some action on the Fort Nelson–Port Simpson highway. What do we get from the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea)? Nothing. Blame it on Ottawa. When Ottawa gets to the border, so will we.

In the conferences being held by Mr. Justice Berger in the North West Territories, it has been brought out that British Columbia stands to gain as the prime supplier for the MacKenzie pipeline, if and when it's ever built. It will be built, Mr. Speaker, but how will British Columbia ever reap any of the much-needed tax dollars supplying all the social programmes that this government has brought in if we don't do some economic development?

Mr. Speaker, the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) and myself stood in this Legislature many times and warned the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and warned the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) in charge of the British Columbia Petroleum Corp. that the petroleum reserves of British Columbia would fall if there were not incentives for the oil companies to continue exploration.

The Members over there say: "Well, why don't you give us some positive suggestions?" We told them exactly what would happen. What has happened? British Columbia petroleum reserves fell by 15 per cent in 1974. Why? Because there were no new major fields located in 1974. And the reason there were no new fields located, Mr. Speaker, is because there was no exploration.

This government effectively drove the petroleum exploration companies out of British Columbia by their punitive taxation policies. That's one of the reasons today why our unemployment rate is the highest in Canada. That's one of the reasons why our unemployment rate increase in the month of February was 10 times that of any other province, Mr. Speaker.

Of course we have the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) over in his seat laughing as he usually does, laughing about those on unemployment, not capable of grasping the situation as it exists, Mr. Speaker, and trying to protect his own department and his own political future by laughing at the problem instead of standing in this Legislature and saying: "Yes, we're going to do something positively about this." Instead of going to the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources, instead of going...

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): You're

[[Page 589](#)]

incredible.

MR. PHILLIPS: ...to the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) and saying: "Look, Mr. Minister, you've got to come up with some sound policies to alleviate unemployment in this province." No, all he wants to do is blame Ottawa.

We warned the government, and now I'm sad to say that our warnings were not heeded and the things we warned about that would happen have come to be. Now British Columbia has the highest unemployment — one of the highest unemployment rates — in Canada.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Economic Development what the holdup is in getting the surveys done in the Peace River area. Why is British Columbia the only province in Canada that has not signed detailed agreements?

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'll tell you. It's because of the lack of action on behalf of that do-nothing Minister of Economic Development that British Columbia suffers this high unemployment rate, that British Columbia suffers the highest unemployment rate in Canada.

HON. MR. LAUK: A vicious attack! Vicious attack!

MR. PHILLIPS: Why doesn't he do something? That Minister was given money, he was given a department, he was given the British Columbia Development Corp., and what has he done? He's sat in his big plush office and hired a bunch of staff and hasn't done one thing positively to create employment in this province.

HON. MR. LAUK: Are you attacking the civil service?

MR. PHILLIPS: He takes off on a crisis trip to Japan. Mr. Speaker, I defy the Minister to name me one industry that has located in British Columbia as a result of that crisis trip to Japan. I defy the Minister to stand up in this Legislature and tell me how many people are employed in this province as a direct result of that crisis trip he made to Japan.

MR. FRASER: Zilch!

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, we had to adjourn the Legislature so that he could go to Japan.

HON. MR. LAUK: Well, if you don't want an answer....

MR. PHILLIPS: If he wants to go on tourist trips around the province while the unemployment rate in this province grows, the responsibility will rest squarely on his shoulders.

MR. McCLELLAND: However narrow they may be.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's a job-security budget, is it? No new mines in the province since 1972. Planned

expansion in the pulp and paper industry in the next three years, to the end of 1977.... Now listen to this: in British Columbia, with over half of the softwood growth in Canada — softwood reserves, over half — how much money are we planning on spending in expanding our pulp and paper industry to the end of 1977? \$168 million.

MR. FRASER: Shame!

MR. PHILLIPS: In Ontario and Quebec they have committed to the end of 1977, for planned expansion in their pulp and paper industry, \$1.35 billion. That's eight times as much money, when we have 50 per cent of the softwoods.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver–Little Mountain): Corporate welfare.

MR. PHILLIPS: The Minister of industrial development should hang his head in shame, because he has done absolutely nothing. How can investors be keen on investing in British Columbia when the government powers are of such uncertain intent, particularly in the lumber industry and in the mining industry? We've heard Member after Member after Member of the NDP side of the House stand in this Legislature and say that the reason mining is down and no claims are being staked, no new mines opening, is because of the price of copper. That's not so, because I read in the paper just the other day where a mining outfit in British Columbia is opening up a new mine in Mexico. Oh, they're leaving British Columbia.

You want positive suggestions? We told you this would happen.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: But there's no planning. In our particular area the government moved in on the Sukunka coal project. Oh, yes, they're going to become 50-50 partner. What did they do? They held up the development of that much-needed energy for probably another two or three years. I don't think they intended to become partners when they went in

[[Page 590](#)]

there, but they effectively held it up. I'd like to ask the Minister of Economic Development what research is going on in British Columbia to turn coal into liquefied gas.

HON. MR. LAUK: I like your suit.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, I'd just like to quote for the Minister some statistics that he might not be aware of. Coal represents more than 40 per cent of Canada's total fossil fuel reserves; yet less than 7 per cent of it is used for energy today.

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: No, I'm not reading Frank Oberle's speech.

I'm saying that the Minister of Economic Development should read this, and he should pay attention and see that some research is done in this regard. But, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, nothing like this will go ahead. No plans will go ahead until those three contracts are signed. I wonder what happens when the Minister of Economic Development goes to Ottawa.

Since we have closure in this Legislature, I want to rush through that and talk for just a moment about the Department of Housing. I want to say with regard to the Casa Loma project...

HON. MR. LAUK: Can I leave now, Don?

MR. PHILLIPS: ...I was dumbfounded to hear the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) talk in tear-jerking terms in this Legislature about projects for providing housing for

our senior citizens, particularly with regard to Casa Loma.

There were other alternatives in the area. There was another attitude this government could have taken with regard to Casa Loma. But the government was so concerned about what was legally right that they completely forgot about what was morally right. It was not morally right for this government to deal with the people who own Casa Loma until those subcontractors were paid off at 100 cents on the dollar.

Maybe what Casa Loma did was legally right, and I'm not so sure about that. Some of the contractors were paid off at 100 cents on the dollar. Why weren't all of them? Maybe it was because they were small subcontractors and didn't have financial reserves to take their case to court.

This government could have moved in this regard with a great deal more integrity than they did. In giving some sharp financiers three-quarters of a million dollars worth of profit, they have practically ruined the lives of 40 subcontractors who had to settle for 40 cents on the dollar. What about the wives and families of those subcontractors? What about the wives and families of some of those subcontractors who went broke?

It might have been legally right, but there are too many questions left unanswered in this whole Casa Loma mess to suit me, and we haven't had the straightforward answers in this Legislature that we deserve. We haven't had the straightforward answers that we deserve. We are going to have to have some straightforward answers from the Minister of Housing before this Legislature prorogues.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Who got paid off?

MR. PHILLIPS: Still, to date, we don't know when Casa Loma and Dunhill first talked to each other. Was it before the creditors were paid off or was it not? We also want to know how come the government can justify paying out to Casa Loma \$565,000 when, if the deal backfires, they have no hope of recovery because the principals of Casa Loma tried in every mortgage house and in every brokerage house in North America to get financing for that project before the government stepped in and rescued it.

So, if the deal falls flat, if it isn't rezoned, I would like to know how the government is going to recover their money. Casa Loma couldn't raise money before. They are going to have the government's money invested in it now.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): The taxpayers' money.

MR. PHILLIPS: That's right — the taxpayers' money. And they haven't got a firm commitment from Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. No, there are too many unanswered questions.

Mr. Speaker, you should be very interested in it; it's in your riding. The government by condoning this operation by Dunhill, even though it was legally right, is condoning the very type of dealing that it professes to condemn.

The Attorney-General said in this Legislature that we want to wreck the Casa Loma deal. This seems to be part of the flak we get over there every time we want some straightforward answers to some straightforward questions. They call us the wrecking gang. Sure! And they come out with tears as big as you-know-what, Mr. Speaker, talking about no matter what they do, as long as it is for the senior citizens, it doesn't matter how much it costs the taxpayer or how immoral it is. No, they are going to have to pass through these curtains of flak that the Attorney-General is talking about: we want to know what Dunhill is doing.

[[Page 591](#)]

There are other deals that Dunhill is involved in that we want to know about.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): Why don't you ask?

MR. PHILLIPS: Ask! You might as well talk to the side of the wall as talk to that Minister of Housing. When he does answer, Mr. Minister of Highways, we are not sure that we are getting the right answer or getting all

of it or getting the whole story. I'll tell you.

Mr. Speaker, we're here to protect the taxpayers and we want those answers. But they bring in the old deal of a message of urgency. No, there are a lot of questions to be answered.

I just want to spend a few moments on some remarks that were made during the budget debate by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich). The Minister of Agriculture spoke in glowing terms about the Land Commission and Bill 42.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you turn it back to the regional districts?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, he made a lot of glowing comments, but he didn't say that Bill 42 is for the people out there to abide by and not the government. Two sets of rules — one for the government and one for the people in the province. He didn't mention the acreage on Tilbury Island — agricultural land — that the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) is trying to buy up for an industrial site.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's taken out of the ALR.

MR. PHILLIPS: No, not yet, but it will be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, in the back yard of the factories you're going to have agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: Doom and gloom.

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh yes, doom and gloom, sure. If you mention the facts in this House, Mr. Speaker, you're doom and gloom.

interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: He didn't mention about the 20 per cent of the 1,800....

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, would you calm the Minister of Agriculture down? I know he's very touchy on this subject. I know he's very touchy. But he didn't mention anything about the 25 per cent....

MR. CHABOT: Santa Claus is touchy.

HON. MR. LEA: You people would take the right to vote away if you got back in.

Interjections.

MR. PHILLIPS: He didn't mention anything about the 1,800 acres being purchased in Surrey, 25 per cent of which is agricultural land, with four dairy farms, four turkey farms....

MR. McCLELLAND: Leo never told him about that.

MR. CHABOT: Yes, but Delta says only 25 per cent.

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, we're going to have an oil refinery here right in the middle of a turkey and dairy farm. That's preserving agricultural land. Two sets of standards.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): That's nonsense. You don't know what you're talking about.

MR. PHILLIPS: What about the 426 acres of land just south of Kamloops that the Minister of Economic

Development is trying to put together for another industrial park?

Interjection.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, the best agricultural land in the interior of the province.

No, I didn't hear anything when the Minister of Agriculture was talking about the agricultural land reserve and the Land Commission, about the Department of Recreation and Conservation going out and buying up land. I didn't hear anything about the Department of Public Works going out and buying up land, or the B.C. Development Corp. going out and buying up land.

There are many other departments in this government: B.C. Hydro, the Land Commission, the Department of Agriculture, Dunhill Development, the Department of Highways, the B.C. Petroleum Corp. and the Environment and Land Use Committee, all buying up land. They've gone on one of the biggest land-gobbling sprees in the history of British Columbia.

Closure is upon me so I'll take my seat, but there is really not too much for the future of British

[[Page 592](#)]

Columbia in this budget.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): The House is in a jolly mood this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It's very nice for me to be able to get up and talk about "DBBD," which is Dave Barrett's Big Deal.

We find \$3.25 billion of overtaxing, under servicing and maladministration. I'd say, indeed, what a recession and what a regression — from Dandy Dave to Dangerous Dave in under three short years.

The Premier is running around saying that he's wondering about an election. I'd say the sooner the better. That, indeed, is what the public says, and over 70 per cent of them are expressing that attitude today. That will soon be 75 per cent.

HON. MR. LEA: You won't get that big a vote.

MR. GARDOM: All one has to do is check the most recent and the most reliable poll. Check the stationery stores, Mr. Minister; the stationery stores in this province have enjoyed the biggest run in farewell cards in the history of B.C. (Laughter.) You should see the inscription: "It's been good to know you, but we'll be glad when you're gone, you rascal you." That's what they're saying in all those cards. (Laughter.) Three out of every four voters in B.C. are lining up to buy just those things.

Is there going to be an election this year? Don't accept my word, Mr. Speaker, just let the estimates speak for themselves. We take a look at the advertising expenses that we find in these estimates — and the estimates, of course, do not cover the enormous budgets for advertising in the Crown corporations and the state-controlled companies in this province.

Agriculture: we find that is up \$9,000.

The Attorney-General increases from zero to \$4,700.

The Rentalsman: just a very unassuming, modest, little increase of \$200,000, that all.

Consumer Services: it's down a little. Economic Development has an increase of \$122,000 for advertising.

MR. GIBSON: But no money for economic development.

MR. GARDOM: The best thing to do with that portfolio is just cut it out and plough that amount of money

into the community with low-cost incentives, and everyone would be much further ahead.

Education, up about \$160,000

Highways, remaining static.

Housing, an increase from zero to \$150,000. Mr. Speaker, that's what it's going to cost to create an image in the portfolio of Housing.

Human Resources — he must have got the message — a \$298 increase.

Labour, up \$10,000.

Lands, Forests and Water Resources, an increase of \$38,000.

Mines and Petroleum Resources, an increase of \$105,000 — another \$105,000 to be spent in the Province of British Columbia to tell people why they can't mine.

Municipal Affairs. The searching question here must be: will a \$180,000 increase turn a tabby cat into a tiger? It's up from \$20,000 to \$200,000.

The Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) — little wonder, Mr. Speaker, he's called "Big Ernie." Big Ernie is up \$750,000.

Recreation and Conservation — a lot of clay pigeons there, too — up \$111,000.

Transport and Communications, up \$4,000.

Community Recreation Branch up \$10,000; Travel, advertising and publicity, up \$387,700.

The Minister Without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Nunweiler) — they're going to place \$5,000 in advertising to enshrine the name "Alf" in the north.

Monsieur le President, bouclez votre ceinture — all of this totals a \$2,201,778 increase in an advertising budget! That's up from \$4 million last year to \$6.2 million this year, and all apart from the most extravagant advertising campaigns that this province has ever experienced through the Crown corporations. That's a pretty big increase, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like you to put that into your sweet bippy and think about it a little bit.

But I don't want the Hon. Premier to worry about one thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is that he's going to be forgotten, because he is not going to be forgotten, make no mistake of that. Neither is the general public going to forget Manny Dunsky. They're not going to forget the political appointees. They're not going to forget the fact that we have the largest burgeoning bureaucracy of any province in Canada. They're not going to forget all the pork barrettites — barrellites. That's a Freudian slip, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter.)

They're not going to forget the credibility gaps with the Premier and the egg war, the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) and the ferries, the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) and its Columbia River documents and the costs.

The public are not going to forget the \$100 million overruns in welfare. They're not going to let slip by ICBC and its inefficiencies and the Adams debacle. They are going to remember about desks, Mr. Minister, the size of volleyball courts.

They're not going to forget, Mr. Speaker, about the Department of Education that is rife with dissension and verging upon mutiny, if not mutinous today. They're going to remember Bremer and Knight.

They're not going to forget that beached mackerel, Casa Loma, or the shabby treatment of the

municipalities, the lack of chronic care...and RIP to mineral exploration in B.C.

They are going to remember, Mr. Speaker, the continuing and growing secrecy and stealth of the Crown corporations and the state-owned companies, most of which are beyond the law, beyond any bounds of decent accountability. They are going to remember the phony ads and the ventures and misleading the public with their own money.

They're going to remember the fact that the Trade Practices Act hasn't moved against ICBC in its advertising, or against the Premier in his advertising of the budget, or in the advertising dealing with tax deferment to senior citizens.

They're going to remember that there have been very silly and unnecessary tax increases that should have been tax decreases. They're not going to forget the woeful cabinet performance in three areas, Hon. Members, that are so obvious it is barely necessary, perhaps unkind, to mention them, but the initials of the portfolios are "H" for...?

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Housing?

MR. GARDOM: Housing. Very good. Top of the class.

"E" for...?

MR. McCLELLAND: Education?

MR. GARDOM: Marvellous! "E" for Education, and "C" for...?

AN HON. MEMBER: Consumer Services?

MR. GARDOM: No, You're wrong. Communications.

There are just 17 points there, Mr. Speaker, that not the opposition but this government have put before the general public since 1972, and the general public are not going to forget that.

They are also not going to forget them for their lack of imaginative and innovative capacities and programmes. Marketing boards are a flop. Nothing has been done to improve or resuscitate or eliminate them. Educational direction in B.C. is spinning in neutral. The Indian community is treated with nothing but palaver. Pollution control has been sloughed aside. Housing is a flop — for the sake of *Hansard*, spelled P-H-L-O-P — and socialistic state insurance is in red ink up to its armpits.

You know, it is concerning itself with fenders and chrome strips. Surely, Hon. Members, if there is any argument for state insurance, it should be only for insuring flesh and blood and bones, and not for taking care of a bunch of Detroit-produced tires and burnpers.

The industrial policy, what does it do? It scares business. The very best thing to do with this little Minister is to put him out of his misery and make him assistant Attorney-General, for he's not happy with what he's doing, nor is anyone else.

Rapid transit: it isn't. That's the sum total of rapid transit.

War on crime. A bubble-gum exercise. The legal rights of citizens have been eroded and chiseled and are disappearing day by day. The historic concepts that we have of the individual liberty of the subject are being constantly disregarded by this government.

Social reforms. They talk about this; they talk about their Mincome and the Pharmacare, aid to the handicapped and the retarded, and *Hansard*, sure — and the question period. These were all obviously needed; the money was there and it was done. But there is nothing innovative about those programmes. They were just responsive to an obvious and clear-cut need. After that they plunged right into just a straight Waffle direction all over again.

But I would very much like to congratulate the Premier for his charm, and I do wish that he was here. I really admire him for his optimism and his cheery outlook — egg boards and lady reporters notwithstanding. Just look at his picture here; it's absolutely radiant. It really is, you know. It looks like an "after" ad for Crest. And with that great halo, as you mentioned, Hon. Member, shining from behind. I thought that was your bag, you know — the halos. But, by golly, there it is shining away. This must have been taken right after the election, Mr. Speaker, because the public sure doesn't see that halo anymore.

Then on page 2 he comes out with a very prophetic statement — he starts off: "This is the third year now that I've had the privilege and pleasure of presenting our government's budget to this Legislature." Well, in three years, what have we seen happen in B.C.? We've seen it move from Disneyland right through to wasteland in three short years.

But this government and the Premier have produced some very dandy pictures in this budget, and I specifically like the front page. These two children are very vibrant — and they're laughing and they're joking. But I want you to look, Mr. Speaker, at the way they are running. They are running away from the trees in just the same way that the voters are going to run away from the NDP for the various reasons that I've mentioned.

This is another reason, and a very important one too, because the person who is lurking in these NDP woods is the fellow whose portfolio it is. That's right. He's not in view, but he's in the woods that we find the bulk of socialistic support and caucus support right behind him.

The Attorney-General a few days ago tried to set a blind trail; he wanted to make the public believe that it was he who was sitting back there. And it didn't fool

[[Page 594](#)]

these kids, and it won't fool the public, because it's the Minister of Lands, Forests, Water, Hydro, Housing, Environment; overall Waffle planning — not to mention different types of typewriters — who is lurking back in those woods, and the public know that fact too.

There are a couple of other prophetic shots here. At page 4 we find a maypole exercise which is no doubt symbolic of the economic planning policies of this government, which is to run in circles, entwine, lose breath and fall down and claim accomplishment. (Laughter.)

Lastly, on page 8, the best sign of all. We see a Seaforth kiltie in full regalia, and chained to his sporran is a St. Bernard dog facing the parliament buildings. I'll tell you what that dog is doing, Mr. Speaker. He's on obvious alert for a necessary rescue operation. That's what the public wants, and little wonder when considering what Members of this government spent last year, alone in global travel. You know, in fares alone they could almost single-handedly have attempted to restore favourable Canadian trade balance.

International finance is a very interesting thing, and it's really wondrous exactly how it works. The Premier of B.C. had to go to China to find out from New York how to borrow money in Arabia. Now that's amazing, you know. We're using Arabic money to turn the lights on in B.C. so Hong Kongers won't have to buy in the dark. Yet yesterday this House experienced a power failure. One certainly must be curious and ask as to whether or not the Premier is a little late in the loan, or was it an act of appeasement on his part, or retribution on theirs.

There are many, many unanswered questions, Mr. Speaker, and far be it from the opposition to answer them. But the public is questioning, and the more they question the shorter the days of this government. And that will be a very attractive day indeed.

The schools are becoming closed because someone isn't getting paid enough for cutting the grass. Transcontinental air traffic is becoming grounded because somebody won't provide the necessary services to clear runways. Grain shipments are stagnating; ships are not sailing. Hungry mouths are not being fed because someone has got all riled up about containerization. B.C. Rail chugged to a stop earlier on. What did that do? Blocked off an artery of supply because some specific branch of its organization felt it was not getting a square deal.

These are primarily all public sector vocations. They are certainly all situations where the distemper, valid though it may be, of one segment can shut down the operation of the whole.

One has to ask: Is that right? Can this be called progress? Because someone will not cut the grass, does the whole system have to grind to a stop?

I say it should not. I say that that is not progress; that is not right. It is very wrong. I do feel strongly that the public subscribe to that point of view.

We do live in a democracy, fettered with bureaucracy though it be. People are not being dragooned into being employed in one industry over another. They do have a choice. There are very different standards and rewards, financial and otherwise, and different responsibilities attached to each, depending upon the skills and the duties and the risks and the consequences of non-performance upon others. But can it be said to be unfair or improper that, upon having made a vocational choice, one has to accept the particular responsibilities or duties attached to that vocational choice? I say not.

Here there has been little doubt that a distinction can be drawn between the public service and the private sector. The technological revolution and the communications explosion have all happened. Like it or not, society is more interdependent and more reliant upon its group efforts for individual success than probably ever before.

HON. MR. COCKE: We can't all be lawyers, Garde.

MR. GARDOM: Now perhaps this was not by design. Perhaps it was more by way of accident. But the result is the same. Society has got to learn to live effectively with that result. But is that happening? Are we, as a society, effectively living with the results of the technological revolution and the communications explosion? I say, no way! We find at regular and anticipated intervals serious disruption, if not almost open revolt, between employer and employee with consequential upset being thrust down the throat of the third party, the general public. The general public has not asked for it. It doesn't want it. It is completely fed up with it.

A proper and successful society is a functioning society. A functioning society has its public services operating, and operating without question, in those areas which are essential for the well-being, the health, the safety and the commercial life of all the people.

Once again, we must return to consider the differences between right and privilege, a consideration which is flexible. It should be flexible. It is one that mankind has never ever accepted as being static.

Is there an unqualified right to strike or lock out? I say no. I say the complexity of society has turned that right now into a privilege, just as driving a car is not a right now but a privilege. It is dependent upon the training of an individual, his acceptance of the rules of the road, all based upon the need and the care that society has imposed upon him, both for the concern of his own well-being and that of his fellow

[[Page 595](#)]

man. Those are the conditions of driving.

Should it not be a condition of service in the public sector essential services that the personnel affected would forgo their privilege to strike and the state similarly forgo its privilege to lock out? That would have to become a condition of service. Surely that would be the first step, with the protection of agreed binding arbitration again as a condition of service for the reconciliation of disputes.

One thing is clear. These mechanisms, apart from being almighty unpopular — particularly in the eyes of the taxpayer, the fellow who has to pay the full shot — are just not working. The essential service people are constantly sabre-rattling and, worse still, creating shutdowns. The non-essentials are taking the course of not only going out themselves but dragging the essentials along with them. John Q. Public once again is having to take every kick in his shin. That is purely and simply and categorically not right at all.

The public, as I said, are fed up. They are losing their respect for those in the public service. They are losing their faith in the powers of their governments. They are abandoning the hope for leadership from their politicians. The public are tired of living from crisis to crisis. They want solutions or, if not solutions, at least some better attempts to provide solutions. If you put those kinds of questions to public plebiscite, there would be a resounding "yes."

I say that it is about time the public's wishes were better heeded and better responded to. The government for, by, and of the people — that is what it all is supposed to be, rather than constantly a placatory and propagative process for certain special interest groups. The public service is supposed to perform a service for society. They are not supposed to tie it up. The public wants the privilege to strike or the privilege to lock out to come to an end, probably in the whole of the public service, but, without question, in the essential public services, and to supplant that with binding arbitration.

What is or what isn't an essential public service would, once again, needfully be determined by current and contemporaneous debate and flexible decision according to the dependence of the general public upon its operative continuance. But that is what has to become a condition of service. The children have to go to school, by law. The parents have to pay school taxes, by law. Both of those things are mandatory. Is it too unreasonable to suggest, in the interests of the public, that the schools should remain open by law? Is that too unreasonable to suggest?

What the public are being forced to live through at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is leap-frog to leap-frog, interruption upon interruption, cessation upon cessation of service, uncertainty upon uncertainty, and inflation upon inflation. If one will agree that the effective fabric of the society can be judged on how it is functioning, a breakdown of that fabric happens when it is not functioning.

I've before used the analogy of a doctor. If he walks out on a patient in the middle of an operation, he's got to run the gauntlet of five avenues of censure: he wouldn't get paid for his job; he could face charges of criminal negligence under the Criminal Code of Canada; he could face a claim for money damages for negligence or for breach of contract from the patient or his next of kin if the patient didn't make it; the doctor could face the loss of his licence to ever again practise medicine; and he could find the doors of the hospital in question forever closed to him. Now, those are restrictions that society has imposed upon him — and rightfully so.

Is it too much to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who have elected to take as their vocation essential public service, of their own free will and choice — and they do have an assurance of payment of income, and in by far the majority of cases an assurance of continuance of vocation — is it too much to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they accept as a condition of that employment that they abandon, in the public interest, the privilege to strike? I say not. And I say the public agree; loud and clear they do indeed agree.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the picking up of nettles can be unpleasant, but if there's a need to do that it's got to be done. What I've been talking about is a nettle. There is a need, and it has to be picked up.

Here's another one: I'm going to talk about gun control. I'm not talking of elimination of firearms, nor of unreasonable restrictions, but of some common sense, needful rules and regulations concerning the possession and the use of firearms. Crime is running rampant. It's worse than it has ever been before in the history of this province. The number of armed offences is increasing daily. You just have to listen to the radio; you just have to read the paper, We all know the argument that it isn't the gun but the gunner who causes the problem, but surely any reasonable measure that can be enacted which would aid in the prevention of crime and assist with the apprehension of the criminal would be a step in the right direction. Society doesn't have any qualms in establishing licensing or registration requirements concerning pharmaceutical prescriptions, motor cars, mortgages, bicycles and boats — so why not guns?

I think this government's safety programme for hunters was a very good start, and I compliment them for it. In the words of Dr. Jim Hatter of the fish and wildlife branch, it has made a significant contribution to a better record, and I agree with him. Under this programme, first-time applicants for hunting licences have to meet certain standards.

But that is a response, and this is the point I wish to emphasize, from those who are conscientious and responsible to those who are conscientious and

[[Page 596](#)]

responsible. The nettle that's got to be picked up is to make things more difficult for those who do not fit into such admirable categories. How anybody can construe my suggestion as being an unwarranted restriction on the capable and the conscientious and the responsible, I just don't know. In response to the needs and wishes of the public, legislators have concerned themselves about the registration of various wherewithals, Mr. Speaker, and with the training of people for a variety of reasons: for good order, for safety of the citizen, for the continuity and improvement of a skill and service, and for the general betterment of society.

As I said earlier, we have registration systems dealing with the use and keeping of certain things according to the licence or permit of society: land and chattel registration systems, pedigrees are maintained, dogs are tagged, cars and bicycles are licensed.

Standards are prescribed: food, drink, energy supplies, elevators, ski lifts. All have to meet certain standards imposed upon them by society.

We also find training programmes. You can't pilot a plane, or drive a bus, or fix teeth, or operate steam boilers without some acquired expertise.

Again, society has imposed certain standards. Once again, we're back to considering rights and privileges. Many activities that were formerly considered as rights, that used to proceed freely unfettered without check or balance, have again by the virtue of the proliferation of society become privileges, only to be lawfully carried on according to at least the minimum standards prescribed. This is the decision that society has made.

That's why, for example, we favour pollution control, and have rules of the road and mandatory requirements concerning the registration of pistols and revolvers. But we have done mighty little as a society to cut down on the illegal and wanton use of firearms. I'm not talking about illegalizing guns, but is it too much to ask that a person should know how to use a gun and that those weapons should be registered? I'm glad to see that I'm getting support from one or two Members here.

I'm calling for a central registry of all firearms where all sales and transfers would be recorded. Any gun not so registered would be an illegal method of dealing with a firearm. All dealers would have to be licensed. For violations: there would be hefty fines and there would be confiscation.

Any gun, rifle, sidearm, revolver or shotgun should not be sold to anyone under a prescribed age. Dealers should have to make declarations as to the age of the purchaser. It should be completely illegal to sell guns of any kind to mental defectives or people with past convictions involving the criminal use of firearms.

I would also say that in order to use a gun its owner must be qualified — be aware of the laws concerning its use and be familiar with the weapon and with the normal and accepted duties and responsibilities which one would expect to follow from its use.

No one is going to suggest that gun control is going to stop crime. It won't end violence. We all know that laws can be circumvented. But, surely to goodness, if registration, proficiency tests, sales and transfer requirements, with ammunition only going to those who are adequately credentialed, would aid in the detection and the prevention of crime and save lives, it would be worth it. Anything less is an abdication of public responsibility.

If I have a little time left, I thought I might just stand in silence and bow my head for the mining industry. I don't know how long I've got left, but since I've come to the termination of my remarks, I'd like to thank the Hon. Members for their attention and wish them a very pleasant Wednesday afternoon.

MR. C.S. GABELMANN (North Vancouver–Seymour): With this new job of mine, I never did think I would get to actually speak myself in this debate. But I managed to slot myself into the most favoured time position, and here I am.

A number of things I wanted to talk about this afternoon relate particularly to concerns that I have been pursuing as an MLA, both in my riding and provincially. But I wanted to start out with a little twist on what has traditionally been a game we socialists enjoy playing, and that's kicking the press. I want to do it in a slightly different way this afternoon, if I may, I think one of the things that we have been accused of saying all the time is that we as New Democrats do get a pretty unfair shake from the press. I have never really subscribed to that view.

MR. FRASER: You get more than you deserve.

MR. GABELMANN: Yes, I think you get what you deserve in the press.

MR. FRASER: You get more than you deserve.

MR. GABELMANN: Well, that's open to debate. I'm trying to be charitable, Mr. Member.

I really do believe that the working press, particularly, treat us quite fairly, and occasionally the editorial pages do not. But that's fair enough, as far as I'm concerned. The people who own the editorial pages can print the stuff they want to print, and I don't have any quarrel with that. I don't expect to be supported on the editorial page and I'm not going to gripe about it when we're not.

But what I wanted to do this afternoon was to make another point that I think is more important. I may just start by saying that when I picked up the

[[Page 597](#)]

Province this morning — I'm not meaning to pick particularly on *The Province*, Barbara, but....

HON. MR. LEA: It just always happens that way. (Laughter.)

MR. GABELMANN: It's the neatest and the smallest paper, and it's easier to pick up. There's no indication whatsoever on page 1 that the Legislature is even in session — no stories whatsoever of any kind, none of the briefs indicate that the Legislature might be in session. You have to go to page 9, if you get that far, before you have any understanding that the Legislature was in session yesterday.

My quarrel here isn't with who got covered better, we or the opposition, but with the fact that the newspapers — and it's not the fault of the working press — in this province do not seem to understand that this Legislature is in session or, in fact, that the House of Commons is in session. How long has it been since either of the papers in Vancouver, or any other of the media in this province, have covered the House of Commons activity in Ottawa? I think that's important to this country.

I think it's important that newspapers, if only to attempt to inform the population, do let them know that we're here. When they do, in fact, on page 9 indicate that we do exist, what are the stories? If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, we had five speakers in this Legislature yesterday plus question period. I accept the fact that question period is going to lead to the more lively stories and thus the bigger coverage and the bigger headline. That's fair enough. Today's *Province* indicates the main story was that of question period.

But there were five speeches made in this debate yesterday afternoon. One of them was covered and that, incidentally, inadequately. One dealt with the power outage; another dealt with the handicapped, from the Hon. Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi). Another story dealt with another aspect of the Human Resources

Minister's speech. That's it. What happened to those four other Members who spoke, two of whom were opposition Members? Occasionally opposition Members and government backbenchers are covered in the media. But the problem is, Mr. Speaker, not with the judgment of the particular reporter in picking up or in not picking up what's being said. The problem is with the attitude of the media in this country generally — with the possible exception of the *Globe and Mail* the attitude that the legislatures or the parliaments are not all that important.

I think it should be a normal practice on the part of all of the newspapers to automatically have some coverage on the front page, some extensive coverage, and some indication that at least Joe Blow spoke. Even if the reporter thinks nothing in that speech was worth printing, there should be at least an indication that he or she spoke.

That's all I want to say. I think it is a different complaint, and I appeal to the people in the gallery particularly not to misunderstand the complaint I am making. It's not a complaint against who got covered better; it's a complaint against the system which seems to downplay the importance of parliament. I wish that could change. That is an aside, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk today about issues that concern me in particular. I have four, five or six that I want to try to deal with this afternoon. I want to say, just in passing, that our government backbenchers have several options when they get up to speak. The traditional one, I guess, for us is to get up and do a very nice number on why everything is so good with our government. That's sort of a traditional role, and that's a speech I would be quite glad to make. It's been made on quite a number of occasions by government backbenchers.

I think there is another role for government backbenchers that I hope we can pursue further in the days to come. It is to act as a prod to government to think about programmes that have to come in the years ahead, as a vehicle to help to create or expand public interest on issues that need to be talked about in the community. Also, it is an opportunity for us to let our constituents know what it is we think so they have some opportunity to know what it is their Members say for them and on what kind of philosophical basis it is made. I think that's important.

Unfortunately, the only way we can get that message out is through *Hansard*, and only a limited number of people do read *Hansard*. We can't possibly expect the media to cover the full range of the speech. I would never ask for that. But at least, if it is in *Hansard*, we do then have the opportunity to forward that to our constituents so that they know what it is we stand for when we stand up in this Legislature, so they can make a more honest judgment about whether or not we should be returned.

MR, GIBSON: There should be more copies.

MR. GABELMANN: Absolutely. I would like it if we could adopt the House of Commons practice in Ottawa where we can get reprints of *Hansard* on a very easy and available basis, and so that we can distribute it in our ridings on an available basis.

Mr. Speaker, if my constituents don't agree with what I say, I want them to know what I say so that they can intelligently vote me out at the next election. I want them to have that opportunity on the basis of what I say, not what I am alleged to have said. I really think that that kind of information transfer is important. That's one of the reasons I

[[Page 598](#)]

stand up in this Legislature and make the kind of speeches I do. I'm not going to stand up today and say the budget is great, because that's not the kind of person I am. I think the budget is great, but I'm not going to make a speech about it. It's been made and it doesn't need to be made again.

The things I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, include the housing situation as it relates to North Vancouver. I sound like a broken record in this House talking about the fact that we have 6,000 acres of land waiting to go. We also have, in the area where we have those 6,000 acres of land waiting to go, about 13,000 people who have kids going to school four days a week. The senior secondary school in that area isn't big enough because the school board didn't have enough foresight years ago to plan for an additional high school in that area. They are planning now, and

their expectation is that it will be ready to go in the fall of 1976, a year and a half from now. I doubt that very much, because one never meets those kinds of construction deadlines. It's at least a couple of years away before we get that second high school in that area. But at the same time, our Crown corporation, Dunhill Development, has been trying for two years to develop a plot of land, about 34 acres, that could provide approximately 130 homes.

The residents turned out in greater numbers to that public meeting about that Dunhill development than voted in the last election. More people than actually voted turned out to the public meeting to oppose Dunhill's plans to develop that area. That tells you something about the community interest.

They oppose what we are doing for good reason. They say their kids are already on a four-day week. If more families are put into this area, what does that mean? Does that mean that the kids are guaranteed a four-day week for the next two years? If you put 130 family homes into that area, that's a problem. They say: "Do we have to continue with these mile-and-a-half and two-mile long lineups every morning to get onto the Second Narrows Bridge because the road accesses are inadequate?" Those are problems that concern the community.

Before we can begin to intelligently provide housing in those areas, we have to solve the problems of the infrastructure. That's a problem that can't be solved by this government, nor by the municipalities, nor by any government acting in isolation. We've got to be able to act together.

What do we have when we come to the transportation problem? The problem isn't with this government. The Department of Highways has had for years, even before we were elected, plans for the proper development of an interchange and road links for the area. Most of the cost would be shared 50-50 because it's an arterial road leading to the Mt. Seymour park. Much of the cost would be 100 per cent provincial in terms of interchanges on Highway 1, but the District of North Vancouver, which is in the process of selling lots for between \$36,000 and \$46,000 apiece, tell us that they don't have enough money to pay their 50 per cent share of a part of this road system.

So what do we do? They say they can't do it, so we don't do anything, so the road situation stays the way it is. We have attempted, through the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer), to upgrade the bus system which has helped magnificently, but it's only a partial solution.

So how do we solve the problem of putting housing into that area unless we can get full municipal cooperation on a matter like this?

On the matter of schools, when we have indicated to the school board that we are prepared as a government to provide the money that's required to put those schools in, how do we solve the problem if they delay their planning years later than it should have happened?

Then, when we say we have an urgent housing crisis and we have to put housing into this area (and I agree with that) the residents say: "Hold on a moment. We don't want our kids staying on a four-day week for the rest of their school life. We don't want those transportation problems to be magnified." And you know, that's a concern that I agree with. I guess what I'm saying is that there needs to be a much higher degree of cooperation between the various levels of government — the school board, the district municipality and the provincial government.

I'm probably one who has spoken more critically of the District of North Vancouver than anyone else. I'm trying desperately to keep my comments about them just as cool as I can because I really feel that, to solve the problems we all face, the most important thing we can do is to have some cooperation between that district municipality and this government. I'm quite hopeful that can come about because I really believe it has to come about.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'm trying to keep it cool too.

MR. GABELMANN: Now I do want to say one or two good words about the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I think I mentioned the first time I spoke in this House that we desperately needed bus service in North Vancouver — some areas didn't have any and it needed to be upgraded in other areas. I suggested at the time that I

didn't think buses would run full for quite a while, for more than a year or so, but that we should put them in anyway in order to get people accustomed to the idea of using buses.

All that's happened in the area that never had bus service before is that the buses are running full and

[[Page 599](#)]

we've had to add to the system, It has been a phenomenal success. I think it's something that MLAs from all sides of the House should look at in terms of the prejudices we have had that people won't ride public transit.

They want the public transit; they will ride it. The better you make it, the more efficient you make it, the faster you make it, the more they'll use it. I really commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs for having the courage to plough ahead on a programme like that. It has been just tremendously successful in my constituency.

I also want to commend him for moving as quickly as he has on the question of developing a ferry link between the North Shore and Vancouver to attempt to take some of the burden of traffic off Lion's Gate particularly but, in general, off both bridges. That programme is being very well received in the community. I'm continually being asked when the ferry is going to start; they want to use it. It's going to be, I know, a tremendous success as well.

I want to say one more thing about moving people from the North Shore to Vancouver, and vice versa. The ferry service will help tremendously; the increased number of buses going across the two bridges will help tremendously. But it's not going to be enough. We're not very far away from the time -particularly if we develop those 6,000 acres at Seymour — when the public is going to be clamouring for some alternative additional service. My fear is that they will clamour for additional highway or automobile-type crossings. That's my fear because I think that when you have a transportation problem people are conditioned to building more highways and more bridges.

It's desperately important that we begin the planning now for a tunnel under the inlet, which will be able to carry rapid-transit passengers. That is essential if we are going to be able to head off what we see as a potential public clamour, which will become irresistible before too many years have passed, to some kind of automobile crossing of that inlet.

I retain my opposition to any further automobile transport across that inlet because I have had an opportunity to visit a lot of other cities in North America and in Europe, and I just know what happens to a city when you use that kind of alternative. It is imperative that we begin thinking about a tunnel.

Mr. Speaker, an issue that I want to raise relates to amalgamation of the City of North Vancouver and district of North Vancouver. I sense in the North Shore a growing concern and a growing understanding of the need to amalgamate the municipalities. I sense at the same time, an abject refusal to do so under terms existing in our current legislation. To remind the Members, the terms in effect are 50 per cent vote in the combined area.

The feeling in the City and District of North Vancouver is that there are two established municipalities. It is not the same question as in an area like Kamloops, which is dealing with an expanding urban area. They are not two existing, strong municipalities that have been there for very many years. The feeling is virtually unanimous among all political stripes on the North Shore that 50 per cent plus one vote should be allowed in each municipality, I am aware that that is a statement which puts me at odds on that particular issue.

MR. WALLACE: Right on. Never mind. Carry on.

MR. GABELMANN: I say that in some peculiar situations when you are talking about amalgamating two municipalities that have existed side-by-side and are relatively equally well established but where one of the municipalities has a substantially larger population, then I think the argument is fair and just and proper. In fact, a 50 per cent vote should be held in each of those municipalities. I want to emphasize, however, that I do not think that that is the case in an area like Nanaimo or in an area like Prince George. I think the current method in those areas is the proper one.

I am hopeful that we will be able to find some kind of way to deal with that very real feeling in the community. I think that without making those kinds of changes, we are not going to get amalgamation in the North Shore. My first interest in this process is to get amalgamation in the North Shore. I just make those comments for what they are worth.

MR. WALLACE: It's a democratic method — 50 per cent plus one.

MR. GABELMANN: I made it clear I am not making a blanket statement about every amalgamation. This is a particular circumstance and idea. I want to move on to another topic.

MR. WALLACE: What about Oak Bay?

MR. GABELMANN: I don't know enough about Oak Bay.

I want to move on to areas of recreation. One of the things that has been brought to my attention as an MLA more than any other is the lack of marina facilities in the lower mainland. It is an urgent matter, in my view. There is a myth existing in the g community — particularly in the NDP community, I think — that people with boats are upper middle class and not working class.

MRS. JORDAN: Speak to your own Minister about that.

[[Page 600](#)]

MR. GABELMANN: It is my view, just on the informal kind of survey I have done in my own constituency, that the majority of boat owners who are desperately searching for marina space are, in fact, quite working class. They have considerable difficulty. That is usually their major form of recreation — to have a boat for one purpose or another.

I really think we have to make a concerted effort to increase the number of marina sites and, at the same time, boat launching sites (which are woefully inadequate in the lower mainland) so that people can enjoy the kind of recreation potential that does exist in the lower mainland area.

I want to spend a moment on the Community Recreational Facilities Fund, Mr. Speaker. I have been very impressed with that programme. I have been impressed with the number and diversity of grants that have been made by the department. But I have a nagging fear that we don't properly check out whether or not that is an adequate use or an adequate plan that the community is developing, whether or not it is the right thing to do, and whether or not, for a few more dollars, a much better facility could be built, or whether, in fact, it should just not be built. We have difficulties.

I am more informed in the skiing area, I think, than I am in any other. I know that community groups want desperately to develop a ski hill for their particular area. Quite often that is the wrong site. I went through this experience as a kid growing up where we, in fact, had ski hills built on three different mountains before we finally picked the best one. If, in those days, there had been community facilities recreation funds available, a lot of money would have gone into the wrong mountain at that time because there isn't the adequate kind of checking about whether or not that was a good use of money. I am concerned that before we get too far locked into this programme, additional money be made available so that we can be sure the grants are going for the right purposes. One particular thing we could do, I think, in relation to ski recreation, is to make sure that we hire a ski recreation co-ordinator or a ski co-ordinator — whatever we might want to call the person — so that he or she can make sure that every ski facility being developed in the province is in the right place and that the chairlifts are put in the right place.

So often the chairlifts are put in the wrong place in the first instance because the local people think: "Well, we're only going to be able to get one chair in for a long time so we'll put it in the place which best serves us for the next three or four years." But when you put the second life in, it often means that the first one is no long as effective as it could be if they were both put in the right places. You get into some very complicated areas in this, but I really think that that kind of advice should be made available to communities. I think, in the area of ski recreation, that the

hiring of a ski co-ordinator would be a very high priority.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about the Whistler Mountain area. I know that the Municipal Affairs department, among other departments, has spent a lot of time developing programmes and policies and plans for the area because, unfortunately, until this date, the planning was totally non-existent and sewage facilities don't exist. There was no planning, no idea where schools are going to go, no idea where villages are going to go, no idea where hotels might go if they're put it. All of those questions are being studied at the moment, and the Municipal Affairs department is now circulating a community development study that, in my view, is quite excellent.

There are a number of minor flaws with it, as there are with any report, but I want to pick up on what I see as one major flaw in the report. I suspect that on this issue I may initially encounter some disagreement from my colleagues on this side of the House, but I want to try on an argument that I think is valid. I've tried it on a number of people and I just want to try it on the House. The thesis behind the community development study for Whistler is that Whistler Mountain should be reserved for British Columbians for their own recreation, that the area shouldn't be developed into another St. Moritz or Aspen or Sun Valley. It should not become a focus for the international jet set — the Boeing 757s full from Japan — but in fact should become a facility for British Columbians.

The problem in ski development with that, Mr. Speaker, is that most of us ski on weekends. We ski on Saturdays and we ski on Sundays. Very few of us ski Monday to Friday. In order for a ski area to be economically viable, it has got to have maximum trade seven days a week. So in my view, in order to make the cost much cheaper to British Columbians — both taxpayers and lift users who are paying the lift fees — it's essential and important that we have maximum seven-day use on these lifts.

The only way that you can get maximum seven-day use in an area as large and diverse as the Whistler area is by having international or outside skiers coming to the area. There are all kinds of fringe benefits to that in terms of the tourist industry, the number of dollars that are put into the province. But the essential element in my view is not the fringe benefits but the fact that we can provide more facilities for our people to ski on weekends at a cheaper cost if we use the facilities full-bore all week long. That doesn't mean we bring in non-residents on weekends. We devise our policies very carefully so that in fact it's the weekdays that we have the visitors. That's my major disagreement, Mr. Speaker,

[[Page 601](#)]

with the report as it's been developing, and I would like to have a debate about that issue as we go along and as we do debate the future of the Whistler area. But I am absolutely convinced on that point. I'm not just throwing it out for discussion at this point other than to say that I think the House should discuss it. I have really become persuaded of that view.

The next issue I want to move on to is the question of labour legislation, which has long been my particular interest in politics — the question of labour, the labour movement and what we do with labour legislation. I want to say that in my view the Labour Code has worked very well indeed. I think the record that has been talked about in this House of the reduction in the number of days lost because of strikes or lockouts is a good indication of the successful application of the Labour Code and of the successful strategy of the Minister and his staff.

In saying that, I don't pretend that there aren't some problems with the legislation. I really feel that it could be improved, and I want to talk about a couple of those areas after I make a renewed appeal for a comprehensive labour standards statute instead of the wide variety of labour standards statutes we now have, I'm truly hopeful that we can end up before long having the most progressive labour standards statute in the country, hopefully using all of the United Nations declarations.

In terms of the Labour Code, one concern that I'm beginning to have about how we deal with labour legislation relates to the question of professional and management employees. It's my understanding, for example, that at B.C. Hydro fully 10 per cent of the employees would be denied representation under the Labour Code because they are classified either as professionals or as management. That's a growing group of workers who, in my view, should be provided access to collective bargaining and provided access to all of the protection of labour

legislation. Whether we do it in a straightforward way in the Labour Code by removing that list of exemptions or whether we do it by creating a new statute that deals with professional and management employees, I'm not particularly concerned about whether it's one way or the other. My major concern is that we begin to understand that this is a growing group of people; it's not a small number. They're not really management in the full sense of the word, even though they have many management, supervisory functions. I think that they should be provided with the same rights as the guy who pulls lumber off the green chain, in terms of labour law.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Works Fair Employment Practices Act, to put it baldly, should either be made to work or scrapped. In my view, there are too many exemptions to this legislation. Many people in the community are not aware of whether it covers them or not when they're dealing with the government of the province, and I really think that we should make up our minds, as a government, either to make that law work across the board, or to forget about it altogether.

The picketing sections, Mr. Speaker, of the Labour Code, in my view — just to go back to the Labour Code for a moment — are a bit inequitable in that they do favour the employer. I think the thesis that the Labour Code should be neutral and create a balance between labour and management is a fair thesis. I think that in order to achieve that with regard to picketing sections, they need to be amended to a certain extent, and I will continue to push for that.

The final thing in labour law, Mr. Speaker, is the open season. As you know, the current legislation allows for raiding once every year. It's my view, simply, that raiding should be allowed once in the lifetime of every contract.

I want to move on — time flies faster than I realized — to the question of legal services, Mr. Speaker. I've been participating with the group in the Justice Development Commission that is working on the question of legal services, and I was quite amused and alarmed both, when the other day there was a headline in the *Vancouver Province* saying: "Lawyers resist government legal aid. The provincial government should keep its hands off legal aid programmes, except to pay private lawyers' bills, says the B.C. branch of the Canadian Bar Association." Mr. Speaker, that in my view is an outdated attitude.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Right!

MR. GABELMANN: I know, Mr. Speaker, that many members of the Liberal Party agree with that, and I know that some members.... As a matter of fact, I think the campaign manager for the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound has also agreed with that in his participation in the JDC. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the participation of legal aid and VCLAS — has been truly wonderful in the things that they've been able to do in the community, but their services are particularly limited and we must expand it through a proper legal aid system. There must be two premises, in my view — and I'm going to cut this shorter than I intended to. The first is that the law must be available to every citizen, and it's not now available to every citizen.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Hear, hear!

MR. GABELMANN: The second thing I think that we must understand is the concept that provision of legal services is a social service. It's similar, in many ways, to the public health nurse, the social worker, or

[[Page 602](#)]

the community planner. It's a social service, and I think if we understand that we will move a long way into devising a proper legal aid system. Currently, there is not equal access to the law for a number of reasons, in my view. Obviously, there's a financial limitation in many areas. Equally importantly, in the case of poor people particularly, the under-privileged, there's ignorance of the role of lawyers. People just aren't aware of what lawyers can do for them. How do people who work for a living go to a lawyer? They have to take time off work. Law offices aren't open on weekends or evenings. Why not?

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Neither is the bank.

MR. GABELMANN: The other major problem in my view is that very few lawyers are trained in areas that are of concern to the poor or the underprivileged. We have no shortage, Mr. Speaker, of corporation lawyers in this province, but we have a desperate shortage of poverty lawyers. I'm hopeful that a legal services system will be able to begin to change that problem.

MR. WALLACE: Did you ever get a plumber on a Saturday, Colin?

MR. GABELMANN: As a matter of fact, yes. My plumber will come on Sunday. Like I have a doctor, I have a plumber, believe it or not.

MR. WALLACE: Well, you're pretty lucky.

MR. GABELMANN: I have a hunch that all the heckling is going to take my time and I'm not going to have enough time to finish. I'm convinced that early legal advice — if you can get legal advice into a situation at an early period in the problem — I'm convinced that you can reduce the costs of administering a legal system, because early legal advice can, by the uses of conciliation at an early stage, I think reduce the number of court appearances. I'm convinced that if people who have what they perceive as a legal problem don't get good advice early, the problem can fester, and when finally they do get advice the problem is such that it has to go on through the court system. If at the very beginning they could get the right advice, often a social worker in the community could solve the particular problem that arises. I really don't have time to go into the details of...

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Early advice would solve the problem altogether.

MR. GABELMANN: That's right. Early advice could involve the problem totally, and my point there, Mr. Speaker, is that saves society a lot of money. I think he community resource boards should be a vehicle which includes legal services or legal advice. It should not just be looked on as a social service agency.

Of the other two things I want to talk about this afternoon, one is electoral reform. I've had a particular interest in amending the existing Elections Act, and in the whole question of electoral reform, particularly because prior to becoming an MLA, I had a lot of experience as a campaign manager and as a campaign organizer. I've worked with elections Acts in other province, and obviously, of course, with the federal Act. In my view, the existing B.C. Act is probably the worst of all.

In terms of what we want to do I think it's important that we encourage people to vote. Currently it's very difficult for some people to get on the voters list or even to be aware of the processes for getting on the voters list. I think a full enumeration is a far better process than a permanent voters list. I would ask that when we change that legislation that we do go to a full enumeration.

I think the voters list has to be organized geographically, and if I remember correctly, I think my colleague from North Vancouver (Mr. Gibson) made the same point in his speech. Currently voters lists are organized alphabetically. That's absolutely insane for the people working in election campaigns, and that applies to all political parties.

I think the eligibility to vote should be lowered to 18. I think there should be financial limitations to election campaigns, but I think that the financial limitations should be pretty generous. I think that a constituency like mine, although I wouldn't want to spend that kind of money, should be allowed to spend somewhere between 75 cents and \$1 per voter, if we want to. In my riding, at \$1, the maximum would be about \$40,000.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): Too much.

MR. GABELMANN: When you consider in-kind contributions.... If you include in-kind contributions, my campaign last time cost well in excess of \$20,000. I think we've got to be very realistic about the levels....

MR. WALLACE: Index it to the cost of living.

MR. GABELMANN: I'm not too keen about indexing in any area.

Redistribution. Two points I want to make about it: one is that I would like to see us get as close as we can to the old principle of representation by population. I understand the arguments of having huge ridings up in the north, that it's impossible to service. For that reason I agree that you can't entirely

[[Page 603](#)]

achieve representation by population, but I do hope that we can come at least as close to it as the federal legislation enables the federal House to come.

MR. WALLACE: What about corporate donations?

MR. GABELMANN: I'm not sure if I want to get into that at this time. Maybe we'll get into that during the Provincial Secretary's (Hon. Mr. Hall's) estimates.

I think, too, that there should be financial disclosure so that people who contribute to political parties, in whatever form, should be forced to tell us.

MR. WALLACE: Right on!

MR. GABELMANN: One of the problems with the federal legislation is that if you give less than \$100, you don't have to disclose that. What you can do, of course, is give \$100 to 282 candidates, and you don't have to disclose that. That is a lot of money. That's my understanding of the federal legislation. If you give \$99 to per riding.... I may be wrong, but that's a loophole we have to be sure to avoid. My understanding of the federal Act is that that is the case.

The other point about redistribution is that I sincerely hope we do get back to single-Member constituencies. I think it's confusing to voters in seven constituencies right now. It's confusing to them to have two Members representing them. I really think it would be far easier for MLAs if they had a defined area that was theirs exclusively.

The final subject I want to talk about this afternoon is a particular project of mine in which I have a great deal of emotional involvement. It is the question of mass-screening for the detection of breast cancer. It's my understanding that one out of 15 women will develop breast cancer in their lifetime. The technology now exists to detect the possibility of breast cancer long before there's any danger of the need to operate or any additional danger of the cancer spreading — techniques such as mammography, which is essentially an X-ray type of technique, and thermography, which is essentially a heat detection technique. Those two techniques combined with, in many cases, physical examination can, I am convinced, lead to the virtual elimination of the threat of breast cancer in the one out of every 15 women. That is a threat that every woman in this society faces.

I haven't said very much publicly about this issue....

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): You sure haven't. You're just getting on the bandwagon,

MR. GABELMANN: That's an interesting comment. Last fall, Mr. Speaker, I issued one....

MRS. JORDAN: Where were you at Christmas when your Minister was shot down?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GABELMANN: Mr. Speaker, that's the most astounding thing I've heard. Last fall I issued a single-page press release on this issue. I circulated that press release to every women's group whose address I could find in the province. No newspaper in the province, with the exception of the North Shore papers, bothered to print excerpts from the release.

I have had a flood of mail — now well over 100 letters — from groups and individuals in the province asking that this government implement a mass-screening programme for the detection of breast cancer.

The issue is an emotional issue, an important issue, and it's an issue that women throughout the province are deeply, deeply concerned about.

I'm fully aware of the cost of setting up a mass screening that, in effect — if you don't understand what I'm saying — means you would no longer have to go to your doctor to get a referral for a cancer test. It is like going and getting a TB test. That is an expensive process.

The Minister of Health has moved, I think, dramatically in cancer detection and has made a number of excellent steps forward. But I think that over a phased period of time we need to get into the business of providing for every woman in this province the ability to walk into a clinic, whether it is affixed to a hospital or whether it is a mobile clinic, and receive a checkup to determine whether or not she has breast cancer.

That's all the time I have, obviously, Mr. Speaker. I thank the House very much.

Hon. Mr. Nimsick moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Cocke presents the 1974 annual report of the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

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