

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

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 63](#)]

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the House to join me in welcoming a group of students from City School who are visiting with us today accompanied by two parents, Mrs. Teavan and Mr. Eskin, and two teachers, Mr. Alan Crawford and Mr. Mike Day.

Introduction of bills.

**AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL FINANCE
AUTHORITY ACT**

Mr. Curtis moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 14 intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Finance Authority of British Columbia Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 14 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

**AN ACT TO AMEND THE
LABOUR RELATIONS ACT**

Mr. Chabot moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 15 intituled *An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 15 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next

sitting after today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain.

MS. P.F. YOUNG (Vancouver-Little Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of privilege. I wish to make a statement. In reading yesterday's *Hansard* I note that the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) stated, "It shouldn't be surprising. If you read through *Hansard* the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain did describe the NDP policy in the last session when she said, 'We are going to teach people to work for the love of working. We think people ought to learn that to give through work is better than to receive' and on and on."

Mr. Speaker, I have examined the two times I spoke during the last session of the Legislature and at no point did I make those statements or anything remotely resembling them.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Member.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

(continued)

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

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we debated yesterday an amendment and I will try and restrict my remarks to the Speech from the Throne excluding consideration of the material covered yesterday. But perhaps before I get on to that directly, I would like to outline, as we see it in this party on this side of House, precisely the type of role that we fulfil in this area. I mention this because among some of the comments made, there has been some difficulty in some Members at least in understanding what precisely the role of the Opposition parties is.

We feel that the best description of this perhaps is by a former well-known national Leader of the Opposition, John Diefenbaker. He was speaking almost 25 years ago and he said this — I would like to quote it for the record and also I think for the benefit of all Members, He said in Toronto on October 27, 1949:

"If parliament is to be preserved as a living institution, His Majesty's Loyal Opposition must fearlessly perform its functions. When it properly discharges them, the preservation of our freedom is assured. The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends. It upholds and maintains the rights of minorities against majorities. It must be vigilant against oppression and unjust invasions by the cabinet of the rights of the people.

It should supervise expenditures and prevent over-expenditure by exposing to the light of public opinion wasteful expenditures or worse. It finds fault. It suggests amendments. It asks questions and elicits information. It arouses, educates and moulds public opinion by voice and vote. It must scrutinize every act of the Government and in doing so, prevents the short-cuts through democratic procedures that governments like to make. The absence of a strong Opposition means a one-party state and a one-party state means an all-powerful cabinet."

I feel those are wise words and I preface our major

[[Page 64](#)]

intervention in this debate of the first real session of this Legislature by quoting my former colleague in the 28th federal parliament and a man whom I am pleased to know personally and describe as a friend, the former Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker.

I feel that the debates that we have had in this House over the last few days and of course in the fall session

have indicated that despite the change in the province over the past few months, there is a difficult period of adjustment for both the Government and the official Opposition. Now I think that, Mr. Speaker, it is right to say that this transition, although difficult, is perhaps more pleasurable than painful for the NDP and perhaps more painful than pleasurable for Social Credit Members. But it appears from our vantage point — our unchanged Liberal vantage point of five Members — to be equally difficult for both.

Mr. Speaker, I quoted a moment ago John Diefenbaker and what he said almost 25 years ago. But talking of Mr. Diefenbaker, I think there is a curious similarity between his performance in office and that of the Premier of this province. At least the Premier's performance so far. Now both these men are interesting and likeable people. Both were elected with large majorities, more or less to the surprise of their opponents and of the public. But both men...

AN HON. MEMBER: And themselves.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: "And themselves" my colleague from Point Grey adds, which I think is perhaps not true because I think the present Premier of the province, as I did, expected the shift in the Government last time and he expected it to go his way, as did I in the final days of the campaign. Nevertheless it was a surprise I think to many of his backbenchers who find themselves here today.

Now John Diefenbaker had great gifts but he, I think, had great difficulty in adjusting from the role of an Opposition leader to that of first Minister. I might add that John Diefenbaker still has great gifts. He's not a man that we speak of in the past. He is still active in Canadian politics and, I trust, will long remain so.

Nevertheless, the ability to shoulder executive responsibility was not one of his gifts. He was never able to distinguish between his skill as a debater and the skill required to manage public affairs and to govern this nation. At least this is my opinion, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday we saw an interesting example of the same skills and the same lack of skills being displayed by our Premier.

Now at this time obviously, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prevent reconsidering the subject matter of yesterday's debate but I would like to use that debate as an example of the debating technique which Mr. Diefenbaker is such a master of, and at which our present Premier is no slouch. And his predecessor in this province is no slouch either.

Now we have in this province a total unemployment figure of something like 80,000 in December. It's up 16,000 from November and my figures, Mr. Speaker, are from page 6 of the Statistics Canada publication No. 71 - 001 December 1972 — "Selected Seasonally Adjusted Figures Month to Month." By contrast the same tables show employment in the Atlantic Region as down by 7,000, in Quebec down by 1,000, in Ontario down by 7,000, and in the Prairies where of course there are two out of three governments that are NDP governments, it is up by 5,000. As I said before, in B.C. it is up by 16,000 — a substantial increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those figures are of concern and my friends on my right rightly put forward an amendment to the motion on this yesterday but I have no intention of going into yesterday's debate on that amendment. What I am interested in and I think all Members of this House and indeed the province should be interested in is the style of the Government's response and in particular the Premier's response.

Well, shades of John Diefenbaker again. Yesterday we had our Premier ignore the specific responsibility of his Government. He launched into a speech on the federal government's shipbuilding programme and on a Canadian merchant marine. Well, whether or not a Canadian merchant marine is a good idea or whether or not further subsidies to shipbuilding industries are a good idea, I am quite willing to discuss.

I was one of two B.C. MP's in Ottawa who had shipbuilding interests in their ridings. For the past 4 years I have studied the matter. Well, there is plenty of information on this, and I would be delighted to discuss it with him but of course the information given was strictly the contents of a telegram unanswered unfortunately between the Prime Minister and the Premier, Now I am, as I said, quite willing to discuss later on in this House or outside it the virtues or otherwise of subsidizing a Canadian merchant marine. As a merchant fleet becomes more capital-intensive, as the amount of investment needed for each job created as a merchant seaman approaches \$1 million

apiece, perhaps a capially developed country might well find they can compete with some of the less developed nations of the world.

Nevertheless, that is something which we can discuss elsewhere, but what I find distressing is the Premier's performance in that he pays so little attention to his own sphere of responsibility and his own sphere of influence. Like John Diefenbaker years ago, our Premier seems to believe that a speech irrelevant to his own responsibility would somehow make the problem go away. Now certainly, Mr. Speaker, our Premier has managed to divert attention

[[Page 65](#)]

from the problem. What he says is news, and what he ignores is presumably not news. Certainly he can count on a relatively servile group of backbenchers whose support for the Premier's political and debating performance apparently outweighs their concern for the large numbers of unemployed in this province.

Mr. Speaker, diverting attention from the problem may get headlines and may impress the backbench, but it does nothing, let me repeat, nothing to improve the unemployment situation in the province. Now I trust that the Premier and his supporters realize this. And I trust that they are not so intrigued with the political and debating aspects that they have forgotten that the figures we were discussing — the numbers — represent people, real people, flesh and blood people, people with skills and ability who cannot find work to support themselves and their families, as they would like to. Now I don't think they are impressed by debating and political skills displayed in this chamber.

I don't think they are impressed by a failure to deal realistically and sensibly with their problems. I don't think that their respect for this Legislature and for our ability to deal with their problems is in any way enhanced by yesterday's performance. In fact, not only the unemployed, Mr. Speaker, but is anybody's respect increased by yesterday's performance of our Premier and indeed of this Legislature?

Perhaps the few professionals involved — ourselves, the professional politicians of this province, perhaps the Press which again in the gallery there can be considered to be professionals in the sense that they observe and mark us according to our performance in the House — well, they are impressed by debating and political skills but I think that is about as far as it goes.

A Premier should have I think executive skills, administrative skills, as well as a concern for politics, and a Premier should have concern for people. Yesterday was an opportunity for us in this House in particular...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, you know the rules. You do not touch upon the vote in detail. It has already been canvassed by the House and voted upon in this session according to our rules. Therefore I would urge the Members in future discussing this question to deal with it not in detail because that could have been done yesterday, should have been done yesterday, and indeed was done yesterday.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: True, Mr. Speaker, I agree with your proposal. My point in making this intervention was to describe the style of the Government, not to rehash debate. I'm describing a style and approach to a problem, a real human problem and in this way I feel it is germane to a speech in this debate on the address replying to the opening speech.

However in view of your comments I trust that perhaps a reading of *Hansard* will point out that I am trying to stick specifically to the style of government rather than discussing for example the areas where unemployment can be improved or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest the Hon. Member read *Hansard* tomorrow and then I'll make a ruling.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I will move on then as you have suggested. I have no wish to argue the point like this but I feel, if I can just finish one sentence, it was an opportunity to correct a mistake that occurred in the throne speech. It was an opportunity to correct a mistake not taken. We represent many people in this province, and I trust it will be corrected in short order.

Well, returning to the document itself, Mr. Speaker — the opening speech by Colonel the Hon. John R. Nicholson — it's a puzzling document. Now prior to its release we were informed at some length that it was going to be a contrast to the verbose, fulsome opening speeches of the previous administration. And there is no doubt that those people on the Government benches who made this point are quite right.

There was a suggestion made that it is a return to British parliamentary practice but here I have a great deal more difficulty with those who made that point. I have consulted May, the recognized British authority, I consulted Beauchesne, the recognized Canadian authority, neither of them particularly helpful. I then turned to the previous throne speeches of our federal parliament, some of which I was present at the reading of, I turned then to the British *Hansard* to see what Harold Wilson had to say in replying to the throne speeches given by her Majesty the Queen in the British House.

I am afraid that my research has failed to support the Premier's contention that the type of opening speech His Honour read last Thursday is a traditional opening speech. I don't feel, Mr. Speaker, that the thinness and lack of content in this unimpressive document can be supported by quoting imaginary precedents. Let me go over it in more detail. It's eminently unambitious, forgettable and no doubt the 5 days since it was first read, Mr. Speaker, has been quite enough time to wipe it from your memory.

The first page contains little of note. We are told that the special session of last October is an indication of the carefully designed programmes to meet the priorities and expectations of the people of this province. Well, I find that this remark astounds me. During that special session we heard excuse after excuse as to why one subject or another had not been taken up in that session.

The favourite refrain was "give us time." The Ministers would say this and then add that we will

[[Page 66](#)]

deal with it in due course, and there was the other popular excuse and I am thinking particularly of the *Minimum Wage Act* and guaranteed monthly income for senior citizens. The other excuse was that there was inadequate information or research material at hand and once again we in Opposition were charitable enough to the new Government to accept these excuses.

But it is a different matter now. Apparently the Government believes that we were faced by carefully designed policies and programmes. Well, I have mentioned already we had a debate on unemployment. With those figures I wonder whether the Government policies were carefully designed to deal with the problem. According to the throne speech they were. According to the throne speech the Government had carefully taken into account its policies and programmes and I quote "it was carefully designed to meet both the priorities and expectations of our people in the most appropriate way."

Well I wonder whether we can describe the lack of legislation in this area in the fall session in that way. My own view is that we cannot and that is a bit of boasting which might well have been left out. The speech follows, Mr. Speaker, with a paragraph of the satisfaction that we all feel at the ceasefire in Vietnam. Now all of us in Opposition and I know I am speaking for every one of us here, fully agree with the point made by His Honour in this regard and fully support the Government statements along that line. I might mention that I have more than a dispassionate interest in that I spent a year in Indochina mostly in Vietnam as a legal adviser to the Canadian Commissioners in the Indochina international control and supervisor commission.

Well, for 19 years we Canadians have been serving in Indochina trying to have the 1954 agreement that ended the war between the French and the Viets respected. And we and our colleagues were unsuccessful. And if you'll forgive me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I think that Canadians and people of other nationalities too, should understand fully that there is no way for a control commission to guarantee a peace settlement. All it can do is observe and report its findings on violations, if any. Peace depends not on the commission; it depends on the willingness of the former combatants to respect the agreement. I think our two decades of experience in Indochina, and certainly my own experience, show that its value is slight unless the parties concerned have a genuine desire for peace.

Mr. Speaker, the next paragraph of the speech is again curious. We have references to meetings between Ministers of the Government and their counterparts in other provinces and the cabinet Ministers of the federal government. And it goes on to say, "Sincere appreciation for our contributions has been expressed by many in these important discussions, and expressions of optimism..." et cetera. Well, no doubt there have been such meetings. They continue between all provincial governments and the federal government, and between provinces themselves on a regular basis.

We even had, Mr. Speaker, a conference of welfare Ministers in this province. But, perhaps again, instead of unsupported statements and self congratulations, the Government should be making a serious effort to co-ordinate the conflicting Ministerial statements. For example, the impression was given during the social welfare Ministers meeting that British Columbia supports and indeed would be willing to extend the Quebec concept of provincial control over social services. I have with me clippings on that point.

The next problem of course was that the Minister of Finance went off to meet with other financial Ministers and the apparent tack taken by him was different from that of his welfare Minister. I trust that the lack of communication, or the lack of co-ordination, will be dealt with because I see the Premier shaking his head. In my view there is contradiction here, or at least a lack of clarity, and I trust that this will be cleared up in due course and there will be a consistent British Columbia position put forward.

We also have the confusion that surrounded the meeting of our Premier with the Prime Minister of the country. It was confusion on the federal government's willingness to change its position regarding the provisions of the guaranteed income supplement scheme. It was news to me when the Premier made this announcement, because I had spoken with the Prime Minister three days before, and failed to get any suggestion from him that this would take place. But of course, later on it happened that the Prime Minister himself had to issue a press release clarifying the Premier's statement and pointing out that in this area the federal position had not been changed. I think perhaps we were in an area where a lack of preparation had gone on beforehand. And perhaps the Premier, had he prepared himself a little better, might well have realized that there was flexibility in the federal scheme before, which he apparently was unaware of.

Now, we have another area in which I think I might — as he's not in the House — praise the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams). I think he has been a bit of a slow starter in this area, but he has shown in what he's done that he's willing to end the war which existed between the provincial forest service, and the federal fisheries branch. Now, I think it's high time that this took place. For far too long our fisheries resources have been severely damaged by the refusal of our forest service to pay attention to this valuable resource.

I don't think our fisheries in British Columbia can be protected by the federal department alone unless

[[Page 67](#)]

there is proper green strip legislation, unless it improves logging practices, and unless these are instituted by the provincial Government, there is no way that the federal department can alone protect the salmon streams. And if that's the case the fisheries resources will continue to decline as in previous years. Now, there's nothing in the throne speech about legislation in this area being forthcoming.

But I do appreciate the fact that the Minister of Forests has taken the first step in pointing out to his department that they must co-operate with the federal authorities, and that use of one resource must not result in the destruction of another. I think he's taken the first step in a relatively long journey. I think that he's stepping, however, in the right direction and I'm looking forward to hearing of more and closer co-operation between his department and the federal fisheries authorities because there is a great deal to be done. As I'm throwing out congratulations, I think perhaps the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) also deserves congratulations for the way he has handled some of the federal-provincial negotiations that he's been involved in. I think that his attitude again has been constructive. It's very difficult to throw roses at the Provincial Secretary.

Anyway, perhaps the most important area of federal-provincial co-operation between Ministers is the co-operation between the Premier of this province and the senior federal cabinet Minister, the Hon. Jack Davis, the

Minister of the Environment. Now, the only area that we unfortunately read about of their discussions has been a somewhat acrimonious exchange. I regret this sincerely, because I don't honestly believe that you can have a successful federal-provincial relationship, as indeed we must have for the benefit of our citizens, if you have feuding on the part of the Premier and the senior federal cabinet Minister responsible for B.C.

Now, the issue of course is the question of Howe Sound and the question of Squamish. We are aware, all of us, of the desire over the years of B.C. Rail to build up the port of Squamish as an industrial port. And I am pleased that the Premier, following the recommendations of the two environmental reports in the area, has seen fit to suggest that Squamish not be pushed by B.C. Rail as such a port. However, the suggestion is that the port simply move 6 or 7 miles down the Sound, to the port Britannia.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The Member from the area says 10, Anyway, whatever the distance between the two communities, the problem is fairly straightforward. It's whether or not we are to have Howe Sound protected environmentally. I think that we should have it — well, the Premier says, "one ship a week." The same arguments used, I've heard so often from oil companies trying to tell me that there is no problem in oil shipments. Perhaps it's a thin edge of the wedge. I'm sure that when the port of Vancouver was opened there was less than one ship a week.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, Mr. Premier, I'm merely saying that if we are to establish a major port it may well not be one ship a week.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Should we close the Vancouver port?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, the statement is made by the Premier, that Britannia will not be a major port. I'm sure that gives pleasure.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Yes, and I've just been told that the Irish Stardust was heading for Squamish when it went aground, and managed to spill oil over Alert Bay, and other areas of the north end of Vancouver Island. Whatever it is, it's decisions...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The echoes of Premier Bennett, I thought he was in the high seas, Mr. Speaker, but I see that he's sitting third over in the government benches living inside the suit of our good friend from Coquitlam. The same echoes, of the same old Premier, the same story, the same argument...

MR. L. NICOLSON (Nelson-Creston): Point of order. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member for Oak Bay that he has referred to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by name, and then has again...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. NICOLSON: Victoria, I'm sorry, Victoria. Apologies to Oak Bay, but this is the second time this has happened in this speech, and I as a new Member I would certainly if I'm wrong like to know the ruling on this.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Very good, I'll tell him why he's wrong, Mr. Speaker. First thing was, that I was quoting from a document presented to us by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. It says, "opening speech of Colonel the Hon. John R. Nicholson." That's the quote that I made. I find it difficult to quote a document if you're not allowed to read the words.

The second thing — I believe my reference was to His Honour. Now if I made another reference and

mentioned His Honour the Colonel by any other name, well I apologize to him and to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Well the rule, as I think we all know, is that you speak only in the kindest terms of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. You speak only in the kindest terms of any foreign Minister, and of the Speaker, that's the rule. (Laughter).

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, I don't know, perhaps when the Hon. Member gets more experience I'll be happy to discuss this after. But you do have difficulty quoting documents if you're not permitted to read the words. In any event, where was I, back to Squamish, or was it Britannia? Anyway, we are on Howe Sound.

HON. MR. BARRETT: We're on the high seas, I think.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Yes, right, Mr. Premier, on the high seas. Well, in any event, the comments made by the Premier are regrettable because this is the type of thing that should be looked at carefully. It is not simply a question of one or the other, and I will go into that later in my speech, I think that there is a need here, first of all, for decent cooperation and decent lines of communication between the Premier and the senior B.C. federal cabinet Ministers. How else can we get the provincial government's views well heard in Ottawa? How else can we have cooperation for the benefit of both parties and both Governments?

So, this is an objective which I trust the Premier will bear in mind. I would like to suggest, in order not only to facilitate things in this area but also to avoid the difficulty that he has, that he drop the presidency of B.C. Rail. There is an obvious conflict of interest between the presidency of a railroad — which is determined to justify its previous decisions on investment in terms of machinery, or in terms of laying track, or its previous decisions in terms of exploitation of resources — and the role of the Premier, which I think should be a great deal more dispassionate. The Premier rolled his eyes and thought that was horrible. I don't think he can visualize the distinction between the presidency of a railroad and that of Premier. Only, I think, because he remembers so well our former Premier who, as I said, is never far away despite his physical absence.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I'm not criticizing, my dear lady. I'm just suggesting that the man is...

MR. SPEAKER: Would you all address the Chair when you have a comment.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The lady Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) seems to think that I am criticizing the former Premier. All I'm suggesting is that his influence remains despite his physical absence. If that is criticism, I'm surprised. I would have thought that it would be almost a minor bit of congratulation — the pointing out that his influence is pervasive, wherever he may be in the world.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Somebody says "permeates the chamber" — well, maybe that's true. In any event, I do feel that it is necessary for the Premier to divert himself of the presidency of B.C. Rail. The experience of other provinces with their northern railroad and the experience of the federal government with respect to the CNR, do not indicate there is any need whatsoever to have these two jobs combined in the same person.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, he's referring, of course, to the other Social Credit province of Alberta, which perhaps had a change in government because they followed this procedure too.

Nevertheless, there is no real reason for the two jobs to be combined in one person and indeed, when you add in the Minister of Finance, I think the work-load of our Premier is too great. When I can point out that there are many areas where he has failed to brief himself properly for our discussions — and I will be giving another example

very shortly — I think there is clear need for a division of powers within this province.

Now that we have a Government, I trust, more interested in the environment than the previous Government — now that we have a Government which may well have a different point of view, as a Government, than the B.C. Railroad — perhaps the time has come to consider another person for this job. This would allow the Premier to take a dispassionate look at things and to judge things on their merits instead of as the president of the railroad worried as to whether he will be able to match the profit or loss statements of the former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett), the Member for South Okanagan.

In any event, I would strongly suggest that steps be taken by the Premier to divest himself of that responsibility.

We come now, Mr. Speaker, to what I may call the most unfortunate references to the death of two distinguished Canadians, Lester Pearson and Herbert Anscomb. We again concur completely with what the Government has said in the Speech from the Throne and what His Honour read to us the other day. Both were dedicated public servants. Both served this

[[Page 69](#)]

country and this province well and we share the regret expressed by His Honour.

There is, following that, the travel section of the speech. Here again we find our new Premier following in the footsteps of the old. Up to now his travels have not proved as expensive. I personally can well remember the involved planning and work that went into the visit of the former Premier to Hong Kong — in 1966 I think, or 1967 — when I was an assistant Canadian trade commissioner there. But the present Premier is off to a pretty good start.

We don't begrudge him his efforts in this regard. But I do object somewhat strongly to the fact that he has discussed matters of critical importance to British Columbians, namely the potential oil pollution on our coast from the Alaska-to-Cherry Point route, without taking the time to adequately prepare himself for these discussions. As a result, the net effect of his efforts has in all probability been negative from the British Columbia point of view.

Now, oil and energy questions are extremely complex, as no doubt the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) in his two-day journey to Washington, discovered. They require a tremendous amount of time and preparation and a great deal of expertise. The Canadian government, for example, as the Hon. Provincial Secretary knows well, keeps two men full time in Washington doing nothing else but considering energy questions. In my two years of visiting Washington, approximately every three months, on energy matters I have only realized the fact that I know very little about it. It is not something for the quick or flip remarks.

In any event, I trust that the Premier now realizes how important it is to brief himself properly before such meetings and discussions. It is not enough that intentions are good — and nobody questions his intentions. But good intentions are simply no match for a skilled and well-informed opponent such as we find in Governor Dan Evans of Washington State. We must face the fact that Washington State and Dan Evans — and for that matter Governor William Egan and the State of Alaska — want an Alaska-to-Washington State tanker route. We must face the fact that we do not, because it is not in the interests of our province. If anything would underline this, it is, of course, the spill of a few days ago at Alert Bay.

So I think that the skill demonstrated by Governor Egan in putting words into the mouth of our Premier — words that damaged the efforts that many of us — British Columbians, Canadians from other provinces, as well as the even greater number of Americans who are opposing this pipeline — I don't think that that was very helpful to us. More than a year ago on an earlier visit to Olympia — the reference of the news cutting on this I think would be January 14, 1972, in the *Victoria Daily Colonist* — Mr. Barrett made the same mistake of discounting the success of those of us who are opposing the Alaska pipeline and the west coast tanker route.

Now surely the more than 12 months that have elapsed must have shown our Premier that what Governor Egan told him then was wrong, and is just as wrong now. This pipeline has been delayed for three years and it has

been delayed not by defeatism but by confidence. We feel — I know I speak for all those many thousands of Canadians who have helped me financially and in other ways — we feel that our cause is right and we intend to fight. If the Premier does not wish to help us, as we think he could, that is his privilege. But certainly we do not like the idea of him being used by our opponents, who of course have a very different interest indeed.

The speech, Mr. Speaker, then goes on to a list of bills — and it is a meagre list — which are meant to come forward at this session. Now there is nothing very new or startling in any of them. We in this party heartily approve of the concept of a Bill of Rights and we congratulate the Attorney General for having this brought forward at this time — and it is put at the top of the list. Indeed, had it not been put forward, we probably would have been putting forward a private Member's bill of our own. We trust that the bill that we have in mind and the bill the Government brings forward will be similar, because we think it is a very important step. I think that the House knows this.

We discussed at some length, during the fall session of the Legislature, the need to curb ministerial powers — the need to prevent abuse by Ministers and their agents, abuse which would result in a diminution of rights of the citizen. We feel there is an important place for a Bill of Rights. We trust that it will permit suing the Government. We trust that it will permit suing B.C. Hydro and other Crown corporations. We think it is important that a Bill of Rights be brought forward.

But a Bill of Rights is not everything. I quoted earlier from Mr. Diefenbaker. I quoted earlier his views of what a Legislature should do — scrutinize, examine, make sure that Ministers justify the powers that they demand. I am willing to excuse backbenchers on the Government side for what we think and said at the time was far too hasty acceptance of ministerial requests for powers which they did not justify but stated that they needed. I said that we will forgive them because of inexperience in the fall session. But we trust that in future we will not have the same type of legislation brought forward without some sign of recognition of the need for individual liberty protected in legislation, recognition by people other than those in the Opposition.

The Minister of Labour is not here at the moment but we are going to be interested to see whether this bill, this Bill of Rights, contains, for example, a conscience clause dealing with union membership. It

[[Page 70](#)]

is a matter up to now that he has rejected. It is a matter which, perhaps as we are dealing with the Bill of Rights, should be seriously considered.

Anyway, we look forward to that bill. We trust the Attorney General will bring forward a bill which we can accept not only in principle but in virtually all of its measures and its paragraphs. We await with anticipation what he brings forward.

Now the next bill on the list is a government automobile insurance bill and it's ironic that in this Speech from the Throne this comes immediately following a Bill of Rights. Will the public's right to deal with whichever insurance carrier he wishes, government or private company, be preserved?

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): No.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: We have a statement from the backbench of the Government side that this right will be denied. Well I find that curious, in view of the fact that the very first suggestion is that we have a Bill of Rights.

AN. HON. MEMBER: That's the reserve Attorney General talking.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, I think, certainly the would-be Attorney General.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Even your own backbench wouldn't laugh at that one.

Will the average motorist, we wonder, have the right to choose for himself the government supplier or any private supplier? We feel that's a point which should be brought forward. It's a point we raised — obviously unsuccessfully — during the election campaign. But the views of our party members at our convention last year and the points that we put forward in the campaign we feel are valid and we intend to check that bill very closely.

The next item is amendments to improve the pension plans administered by the government. We welcome amendments to the pension plan. Heaven knows we argued long and loud, Mr. Speaker — or the best we could in any event — in the fall session of the Legislature, pointing out irregularities and errors in the scheme that was at that time proposed by the Government. And we found that the replies given at that time were not adequate. The replies indicated the Ministers were not sure what they were dealing with. We expect and I presume that this bill, among other things, perhaps will clean up some of those mistakes, some of those errors that were made at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's amendments to the *Constitution Act* and a revision of some departmental Acts to reflect the new thrusts and priorities of the Government — ironically, thrusts and priorities which have not been set out in this speech. We, therefore, cannot know what these new thrusts and priorities might be but we will be looking at it with interest.

We understand from statements already made that four new cabinet posts will be established. If it can be justified we will certainly support that. I can see an eager look come into the eyes of some of the backbenchers over there who I can see absolutely support the idea of more cabinet posts, But if they're justified, we accept it and we will be interested in the views put forward.

It's quite likely, I think, that many of these changes could well be justified. We just don't know and cannot tell from this Speech from the Throne because the words "amendments to the *Constitution Act* and revision of some departmental Acts," et cetera hardly tells us a thing about what the Government intends to do.

We feel that we obviously will be opposing an increase in bureaucracy for bureaucracy's sake, but we cannot tell until the Acts actually come forward.

Amendments to the *Park Act and Litter Act* are the next mentioned. Once again there's no indication of what the thrust or direction of the Government will be.

Perhaps I can point out that under the previous administration the acreage of parks in this province actually declined although the number doubled. It declined almost by half and some will say it declined by more than half. I welcome the Government's proposal if this does mean that there is going to be an increase in the number of our parks. I welcome it. They'll find Members on this side who have often spoken — I am thinking in particular of my Hon. friend from Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) who has often spoken in favour of increasing parkland who often opposed in this House as well as elsewhere the reduction of parkland of a previous administration. You will find us definitely on your favour there. Again though, we just cannot tell from this document what precisely you have in mind.

The next line is amendments to the *Land Act* and the *University Endowment Lands Act*. I am not too sure again what's in mind. When dealing with the general subject of land perhaps we can assume that these amendments have got something to do with the land freeze on agricultural lands. If this isn't the correct assumption, forgive me. But there's no way I can really tell and we have been told that amendments or legislation will be coming forward dealing with farmlands.

Our position on this, Mr. Speaker, is clear. We do not oppose, in principle, legislation to control urban sprawl and preserve farmland. It's been said time after time by Members in this party. It's been said on the hustings, it's been said in the House. We do feel,

however, that there should be proper provision made for compensation — compensation to the farmer who is affected should be full and fair and that is, in our view, in full for the development rights lost. And he should have

this value established not by government inspectors but by independent assessors, and further, that the farmer should have the right of appeal. We feel these are very minimum rights, especially when we're talking about a Bill of Rights in the Speech from the Throne.

What we are suggesting in fact is that fair market value be established, that the value of agricultural land be deducted from that, and the difference — the development rights of that land — should be paid by society to the people who have been adversely affected.

I'll give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Say the farmland is worth, for farm purposes, \$2,000. But say it's worth \$5,000 for subdivision purposes. Well, the difference is \$3,000 and we feel that if you are going to cut a man's land, if you are going to take away a right from him to do what he wishes with it, you should compensate him for it and it should be to the tune of \$3,000 development rights lost.

We feel that's just and we feel that's fair and we feel it's going to be expensive. We know that. And we'll be sympathetic to requests for funds for this. But we feel under the present circumstances, when we're affecting the livelihood of many men and women — men and women who have for years and years been willing to work at a relatively low return — it's only fair to compensate them for this loss in value of their property.

Fifty per cent of the British Columbia farmers are over the age of 50. They are looking forward to retirement which means they're looking forward to selling their land. Many of them have worked for many decades knowing that they were not getting the same return as they would get if they were working in the forest industry, if they were working as professionals, or if they were working as MLA's. But they continued to work on it because they thought that their own land was appreciating and they would at least get the value of their land out and they could then retire on the proceeds.

And it is important to remember — quite apart from any demonstrations that might have brought it to our attention dramatically — that we're dealing with the rights of a large number of people, a number of people who are very, very concerned about what is going to happen to them.

The figures given by the B.C. Federation of Agriculture are that 82 per cent of farmers would do better off if they didn't work at all, But they continue farming because the value of their land has been increasing and because they love the occupation of farming and wish to do that as their life's work. I only feel it's fair that we treat these farmers fairly. Greenbelt legislation designed to go around the city is basically for the benefit of the city dweller. The farmer is already farming; the city dweller is the one who wants to preserve the farm land for him to drive through.

If society as a whole thinks it's valuable and important that farmland be preserved — and society as a whole, let's face it, is represented in this House by the Government party — society as a whole should pay. Farmers contribute taxes. They in turn will be paying part of it, too. But I don't think they should be singled out for any extra cost as a result.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday we welcome administrative and legislative changes to the Department of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce. The first one we suggest, of course, is an individual Minister. The present Minister is a competent Attorney General and no doubt would be a competent Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce had he the time to devote to it. But presumably this is one of the areas where there is to be a new portfolio created and I think that probably the Attorney General would be grateful if that burden is taken off his shoulders.

If we get that perhaps we will get something approaching an industrial strategy or a strategy of industrial development for unemployment about which we talked yesterday. But in any event we look forward to this because it's high time we had it and we only regret that in his Speech from the Throne there is no opportunity for us to discuss the thrusts and intentions of the Government. There is no opportunity here because everything about the Department of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce is simply tied up in "some administrative and legislative changes." We think it's important that this department be strengthened.

We regret, as I and as my Hon. friend from Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) said yesterday, the closing of an office

in California which might have been of assistance before a decent opportunity had been given for its value to be assessed. We trust that there will be a decent, reasonable industrial strategy designed to curb the enormous increase in the jobless which we have experienced over the last few months.

Legislative Procedures and Practices Act. We again have been working on this, members of our party. We welcome them, Mr. Speaker. We look forward to hearing your views on this. Perhaps as a result of your comments to me yesterday, you might wipe out that provision which allows a seconder of an amendment motion to speak at length on any subject. You might restrict that seconder to the amendment that she's seconding — or he or she is seconding — that is the proposal I put forward to you now as a result of my experience yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: You're proposing to restrict

[[Page 72](#)]

debate by the Opposition?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am proposing that the seconder of an amendment be treated in the same way as other speakers in that debate. We come to the final page of the speech. And there is in the first paragraph a curious, and a curiously attractive, sentence — namely, the Government's determination to depart from, "acquisitive North American values that have seen profligacy and waste on all sides."

Well I'm sure no party in this House wants to see profligacy and waste. I wonder whether the Government would not at some time clarify the ambiguity of this sentence. For example, is it the Government's intention to curb the acquisitiveness which leads workers to put forward wage demands above those of previous years? Is the I.W.A. to be told that its "acquisitive North American values" are no longer to motivate it during contract negotiations?

This sentence is an interesting bit of rhetoric. But when it's brought down to the here and now of our everyday lives, it has even more interesting ramifications. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's all very well for us to talk in this building about society and society in general. But what is society? Society, Mr. Speaker, is me, it's you, it's that person over there, and that person down here. If society is every one of us — and we cannot make a statement about society in general and then ignore it at the individual level — otherwise, of course, this statement has no meaning at all.

So we ask the Government to clarify this statement. There will be Government speakers coming up. What, precisely do they mean by this? What wage negotiations will have Government interference designed to cut down on this acquisitiveness?

AN HON. MEMBER: Would MLA's strike?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Yes, indeed, the suggestion comes to mean that there will be no more increases in pay for MLA's. That's one excellent start perhaps, based on this statement. We would like to know what it means. Are we to accept in this chamber reduction in the emoluments for what we do? Perhaps we should.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I'm not altogether sure that the Government itself knows. But I'm disappointed the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) has left the room because obviously it means that he can't get his jet aircraft, which was wheeled into the hangar a couple of days ago, — the Government hangar at Pat Bay — with much secrecy.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: There is an evaluation of jet aircraft apparently taking place. No information is available to the public.

Interjections by Some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'll explain this then in more detail as there is obviously interest in it. What has happened is that a government aircraft was put outside. Somewhat late in the evening an American jet aircraft was brought in — a Cessna Citation, serial number, got it all, N542CC. Here's the *Wall Street Journal* ad. The Government has evidently taken up the *Wall Street Journal*.

HON. MR. BARRETT : Is it a leftover from Ottawa?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, there's no Cessna Citations. The Ottawa jets were purchased by the Hon. George Hees. They're pretty ancient at this stage. They're Lockheed Jet Stars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does that mean that they're executive jets?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: But in any event, we're talking about acquisitive North American values. I wonder whether or not — this aircraft may well have been put in there for simply hangaring purposes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. But I find it strange that a government aircraft should be moved out of a government hangar and this aircraft should be put in there, if it has not got some connection with the Government. Perhaps if it was simply a commercial deal, it would go to a commercial hangar.

AN HON. MEMBER: The former Minister of Highways would want to make a come-back. (Laughter).

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: My friend says that the former Minister of Highways may well make a come-back. Anyway, we wonder, is that aircraft to be one of those things which are part of the North American way of life which we're to do without? I don't personally think it's a very good idea. Governor Reagan of California, who has a state as populous as all of Canada and a G.N.P. almost half again as much as Canada, has only just acquired an executive jet — on the grounds that hijacking makes it unsafe for him to travel on commercial aircraft. (Laughter).

I don't know whether I'm giving the Premier an idea and a reason for buying an aircraft. But we would like to know what precisely they have in mind. We have, of course, when discussing acquisitive North American society, redecoration of Government offices — and perhaps they were somewhat thread-

[[Page 73](#)]

bare. The redecoration has been done in excellent taste. We congratulate the Government on doing a good job of redecorating.

All we can say is perhaps it should now stop, if we are to get away from some of our acquisitive North American values. The Premier, having had his own office redecorated, shakes his head in agreement with me. So the other Ministers will presumably have short shrift. Nevertheless, we would like to know precisely what this sentence means — how it can be done.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible to have growth — to have opportunity for the economy to expand and still preserve the environment. I genuinely believe that there has been much discussion on this in recent months and years, much of which I have read as a very interested layman. It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, for us to forego jobs and forego any increase in the standard of living, simply because of the fear that we have of environmental degradation. I've spoken probably, Mr. Speaker, for too long. I'm sure people will applaud that statement. I'm glad to see that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) responds like Pavlov's dog to my suggestions.

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants more.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: He wants more, does he? Oh, very good. Anyway I will just quote them from the *Monthly Labour Review* of the United States Department of Labour, an excellent publication, where they are discussing the ideas of Barry Commoner, who is one of those who believe that the world should not stop, it should simply take a new direction. I'm quite sure that the Government will agree with this. And I'm quite sure when they tackle some of the problems that we have in this province, they will realize the correctness of Commoner's approach.

A couple of quotes, Mr. Speaker. He says: "Production activities with intense environmental impacts have displaced activities with less serious environmental impacts. The growth pattern has been counter-ecological." Now he goes on to say, "This foregoing conclusion," which I agree with, "could be easily misconstrued to mean that technology is per se ecologically harmful."

The remainder of this article in the November, 1971 issue goes on to deal with the fact that, if you can channel growth into ecologically less harmful or ecologically beneficial areas, there is no need to worry about such things as unemployment or loss of jobs or reduction in the standard of living. One final quote on this, on page 12: "It would appear possible to reduce the environmental impact of human activities by developing alternatives to ecologically faulty activities. This can be accomplished not by abandoning technology and the economic goods it can yield, but by developing new technologies which incorporate not only the knowledge of the physical science but ecological wisdom as well." I'm sure that's a statement that no party in this House would disagree with. I'm sure that this is a fruitful area for this Government and this Legislature to look at.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in summary I feel that the Speech from the Throne, as given to us, is a disappointing document. The Government had an opportunity to discuss at some length, in philosophical terms, its priorities, its thrusts, its intentions, its desires, its hopes. It's the first throne speech of a new Government, the first new Government we've had in 20 years. It was my hope that we would have a philosophical document dealing with what the Government hoped to achieve in the next four years or, if they wished to be ambitious, in the next eight. I think that this opportunity has been missed, and it's disappointing to me.

I would like to have had more of a statement of where the province is going, what the Premier has in mind, what his Ministers are thinking about. We've missed that chance. I trust that we will try and rectify it in future debates of this House in this session.

Alternately, I had expected that if there was not a wide ranging philosophical discussion of how and where we are going, there might be a bread and butter, meat and potatoes type of throne speech dealing with some of our day to day problems — and some of the things that should be done on a day to day basis.

Again I was disappointed in this. But equalling my disappointment in that respect, was my disappointment yesterday. I do feel that it is important for us to face up to some of the real problems. It's all too easy for those of us who are skilled in debating — and there are many here more skilled than I am — to divert attention into areas which are irrelevant.

It's all too easy to avoid the real problem that has happened yesterday my friends to my right, but forward. But that really doesn't handle the problems of British Columbia. That really doesn't deal with the guts of what we are talking about. I think that we are all of us probably to blame. I think certainly the Premier is to blame for this tone that was set yesterday.

I think that if I can go back to my original quote from John Diefenbaker — if I can go back to my original reference to him — this province will not see good government, and will see the quick erosion of a big Government majority, unless the Premier grasps the concept that he must administer, he must act as executive, as well as acting as a debater and a politician. I suggest that five months is plenty of time for him to change gears from Leader of the Opposition to being Premier. And I trust that it will happen fairly soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

[[Page 74](#)]

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel very pleased and gratified to take my place in the throne speech debate in the first regular session of the 30th Parliament. When I resigned from the Social Credit Party — or perhaps, as my former friends would have it, when I defected; it just depends which direction you are looking from — the leader of that party not only predicted my political demise but he said that no Conservatives would be elected at all to this House.

Now I'm not mentioning the point to castigate a man who has given the province very worthy service. In fairness one should not castigate a public figure whose role in public life is now clearly at an end — as witnessed by his own choice of at least semi-retirement when he should be fulfilling his duty as the MLA for South Okanagan. I merely raise the point to demonstrate the reappearance of elected Progressive Conservatives in this Legislature.

It will be the role of the two Conservative Members — after a long absence of Conservatives — at least to outline the philosophy and the policies we believe in. Of course, democracy is a clash of philosophies; it allows people to put forward ideas. We don't expect that side of the House to agree with us and, because of the philosophical differences, we don't agree with them. But the heart and soul of democracy is that the people of this province should have a clear understanding of what the two sides do believe — and whether, in fact, they behave as they say they believe. So the next time around they have a clear choice between the present socialist Government and the alternative.

Someone'll say that's the kiss of death, but... (Laughter).

But one of our eminent columnists has written — and I'm sorry that he isn't in the House — he has written that the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) has been delegated by the Premier to keep me politically alive; to "keep the Tory rump functioning and breathing so that the faint hope of the Tory resurgence is kept burning." End of quote.

Now at least, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of anatomical accuracy, I don't think the rump has anything to do with breathing. (Laughter.)

And while I have the greatest respect for the Hon. Minister of Highways, I really feel that he and I have some basic philosophical differences. So I think I can get along fine without his fatherly attention.

It's also interesting to see the Premier pick up new titles as he progresses. When he left the special session, Mr. Speaker, he had the title of "Dangerous Dave." But I see that after a visit to Olympia we have to address him as "Your Excellency." (Laughter).

But joking apart, this party appreciates the effort the Premier has made in establishing good relationships with our neighbours, particularly those who share our coastline. We feel that nothing but good can come from better understanding between British Columbia and the State of Washington.

I would also like to thank the Premier for his awareness and consideration in improving the office space allocated to the Conservative Members. We are moving from our present single room to two rooms high in the building on the next floor up. And I hope that that reflects the fact that the party is on the up and up.

Actually the stairs are quite steep, Mr. Speaker, I think that I might have to repeat my plea to the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) that outpatient oxygen be provided free. The second room is really in the attic and, as I peered out the window with the sloping roof and memories of Edinburgh and so on, a sudden silly thought went through my mind. I recalled how when I used to go to Sacred conventions we always used to sing a symbolic hymn, "Oh God, our Help in Ages Past." I just suddenly had the silly thought that if the Conservatives should now adopt a symbolic hymn it would most aptly be "Nearer my God to Thee." (Laughter).

But we do appreciate the efforts made to give us better space and I would just make one further request, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier. I don't like to sound like Oliver Twist, but I would hope that when he comes to enlarge the civil service by 1,000, he might hire 999 civil servants and one research assistant for the Conservatives.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP administration has made serious efforts to fulfil many of the promises they made in the election campaign. I think their aim to have an open style of government is commendable. And certainly anything which keeps government open will be supported by this party.

I am also delighted to realize early in the administration that the Premier answers his letters. In fact, the department of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) has gone one step further. For

the first time in the few years that I have been in politics I was invited to take part in a seminar, in an advisory capacity to Government, on drug abuse. I think it's this co-operative effort on drug abuse where our solutions and our debates should certainly rise above party politics.

Now I've said so much in favour of the Government that I'm sure people are becoming confused. One sad, misguided Oak Bay resident went on a radio interview the other day and said that, because I had congratulated the Government on some of the things they had done, it was obvious I'm even now in the process of moving over to the NDP party. (Laughter.)

I'm glad you're laughing, Mr. Speaker, because I thought it was the funniest thing I had heard in a long time, too. Actually it's a little sad also, because it reflects the concept of so many people — that politicians in opposition parties must oppose simply

[[Page 75](#)]

for the sake of opposing and should never acknowledge or give credit for the positive accomplishments of Government. This, I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, is not my personal feeling and it's not the philosophy of the Conservative Party. In this session and in future sessions I would hope that we could come forward with keen debate, constructive criticism and always a sincere attempt, on our part at least, to let the people of the province know what we think. And if you on the other side of the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, tell them your philosophy, then we hope that democracy will really flourish.

A comment that I heard someone make to me was: "You know the first week or so around the House is just great. Everybody's shaking hands. And from then onwards they're shaking fists." I hope that we can change that previous practice.

Now that was the good news for the Government. However, I feel, as I said yesterday in the throne speech debate, that it has to be classified as disappointing. And I'd like to quote what the present Premier said just a year ago, He said, "after this throne speech in the first year of our second century, when we expected Government and its responsibility to announce the directions it was going." I think that was a very valid observation.

And later on he said: "It must be said for the record that one of the greatest opportunities of outlining new directions for the people of this province was dramatically missed by the Government in the throne speech." With respect, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that we in this party feel that that quotation aptly applies now to the now Premier.

We feel that it is devoid of substance — and his own quotation, describing the last throne speech as a "hollow document," is still applicable to the present.

It cannot be ignored either, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, in many ways, seems to be following the habits and customs of the man he criticized so roundly. And "Dangerous Dave," Mr. Speaker, needn't shake his head, because there is the fact on record that he was very strongly opposed to the idea of the Premier also being Minister of Finance. I can well remember hearing him say that it "placed too much power in the hands of one man."

Now we have the tables turned and he is doing exactly what the former Premier was criticized for doing. Time alone will tell whether this feeling he has about holding power will engulf him as it did the former Premier with the same devastating consequences for his party.

I personally feel this will not happen, Mr. Speaker. But I think that the danger note has to be sounded. The feeling in this party is that it would be much better, as with the other dual portfolios, to have a Minister deal with each department.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the Opposition parties that are a little concerned. From an interview, or at least a news report, on television last night it was reported that many of the Premier's backbenchers are not prepared to accept the empty words of the throne speech. One unidentified backbencher is quoted as complaining about the fact that the backbenchers are not consulted or even made party to cabinet announcements, such as the

decision to move the coal port from Squamish. This report went on to claim that 10 backbenchers attended the Premier's press conference to learn about this decision at the same time as the Press learned about it.

I would have to say that this, indeed, is shades of the Social Credit regime. Furthermore, the speaker claimed that a caucus meeting was held at which cabinet Ministers dropped in — and that indeed is reminiscent of the Socred administration. Yet I can remember the Premier saying how shocked he was, time and time again, to hear of the fact that the then Premier Bennett never went to caucus. As was said in this House at the special session, we begin to wonder just how well the present Premier has learned his lesson of political infighting and intrigue from the splendid example set by his predecessor — at least "splendid" if that is the way you feel politics should be played, and I certainly don't.

But if the backbenchers are restless, Mr. Speaker, and ripe for revolution, this seems surprising this early in the life of the present Government. If this is true — but I think time should be left to prove whether it is or it isn't — I'm reporting what was said on the media...

AN HON. MEMBER: You don't believe that.

MR. WALLACE: I've got an open mind. Maybe it's too open sometimes. I like to be shown but I'm always eager to hear just in case it turns out to be true. (Laughter). So I preface my next comment with the fact that, if this is true, I certainly couldn't criticize the backbenchers. The election campaign of the socialist Government was a vigorous one, promising many ideas which appealed obviously to the voter — and it's very disappointing after all this promise of progressive legislation that we should be presented with such a dull throne speech.

Perhaps if I have accused the present Premier, Mr. Speaker, of being too reminiscent of the former Premier, there is one difference. I think that after his long apprenticeship in the Opposition, he is probably making the mistakes much sooner and won't last as long.

To digress for a moment, we feel that some statement on our party's behalf should be made on the matter of the Squamish decision announced yesterday. It is...

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. WALLACE: "Why?" Aren't you interested in the environment of your own riding?

[[Page 76](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes. Why are you talking about it?

MR. WALLACE: Well, you're the Member. Am I not entitled to talk about your affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: Would you address the Chair, please?

MR. WALLACE: That's democracy! That's democracy! Why shouldn't I talk about your affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair, Hon. Member.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: I would have thought the reason, Mr. Speaker, was quite obvious that with only two Members in the House, it becomes rather difficult for our party to be adequately represented and to present the views of people who wish to have this point of view presented from other ridings. I would seek your correction if this is not a reasonable...

MR. SPEAKER: There is no restriction on free speech in here providing it follows the rules.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: The point to be made, in our view, is that to look at the controversy which has been raised simply in terms of coal is a rather narrow vision. There should be a total environmental study for the whole of the Howe Sound area. It serves, as we all know, as a very large recreational outlet for greater Vancouver. It would certainly be the view and the hope and policy of the Conservative Party that the study would be carried out through the agency of the new Department of the Environment which, it has been announced, will be set up.

There are enough problems, I understand, with respect to the pulp mills at Woodfibre and Port Mellon and, despite what has been said earlier, there is an increasing amount of freighter traffic in the Sound. There is potential danger to fish and marine life, and indeed to water purity, from the increased amount of sewage which is being discharged from the recreational cottages and other homes in the area — and, of course, from the environmental dangers which result from increased port development anywhere.

It is also a fact that in the election the NDP candidate in West Vancouver–Howe Sound stated that it would never be the policy of the NDP to export coal out of Howe Sound. I'll be very frank with the House — this is not my personal knowledge that this was said in the campaign. I am acting on the information which was given to me from that riding.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: The other point which I had meant to mention — and I would tread warily because it deals somewhat with jobs — is that if we are setting up a Department of the Environment, I would hope that, of the 1,000 new jobs, a large number in the civil service would be allocated to that particular new department. The simple reason being that when we have travelled to other parts of the Island, in particular, and inquired of people who are very interested in preserving our streams and rivers, they feel that too much is done after the event — when possibly some environmental studies prior to logging and other practices would have prevented the event.

Mr. Speaker, based on the statement that I made earlier that we should let people know what we stand for, I propose to just mention a few of the bills which our party will be introducing. One reason we are not introducing them right away is that we recognize the rule of anticipation. And I feel that it is unfortunate when we still have the throne speech and budget speech to carry on for the next three weeks — that it is unfortunate if one tables bills which prevents Members choosing to talk on these subjects during the debates.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, with our intention to change the rules of the House that, contrary to what has happened in the past, the House will be given an opportunity to debate bills in the hands of private Members.

We would, as stated in our election campaign, introduce a Bill of Rights. I am sorry that so many comments have been made to suggest or imply that a Bill of Rights, because it is often difficult to implement, is hardly worth writing simply for the reasons that have been stated — that people have to have the wish and the intent to adhere to the Bill of Rights. But surely, by documenting it and putting it in a formal document which is passed by this Legislature, surely at least that demonstrates the good will and intent of the Members and their hopes for a better society. I think that the bill that we will table will give some of the equality and justice for women which was so eagerly sought by the Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown).

The Conservative Party is very concerned about the individual — his privacy, his protection and the dangers of the individual being engulfed by the heavy hand of the state. We will introduce a bill called the *Public Document Confidentiality Act* which would ensure that any document or paper which has come into being by a department or Crown agency of the Government, which relates to the personal history and record of a child or adult, cannot be disclosed to any person without the written consent of that person. And when private information has been disclosed, the aggrieved person will have recourse in a

[[Page 77](#)]

court of law.

We intend to introduce a bill entitled *The Government Computer Privacy Act*. This bill would safeguard the

privacy of individual citizens by preventing indiscriminate access to government computers and data banks which contain personal information. It would regulate and control the dissemination of data from government computers and prevent the pooling by unauthorized persons of personal information maintained by government departments. It would also establish a computer register, which would provide in readily available form the nature of the data, the purpose for which it is stored and the class of civil servant authorized to extract data from it.

We will also introduce a bill called the *Consumer Credit Disclosure Protection Act*, which would give the individual wide powers to have access to any files containing information in the hands of a consumer reporting agency. The bill in general would give much needed protection to the individual where consumer credit, employment and insurance information are nowadays so vital to his personal affairs.

We would bring in a bill to control one of the problems we have had recently in Victoria. We would call it the *Instructional Institution Bonding Act*, whereby dance studios cannot take large sums of money from citizens and then skip town, as happened in Victoria.

We would also introduce as a result of another individual incident in this area, the *Abandoned Refrigerator Act*, which would be intended to prevent the abandoning of refrigerators in such a way that children can become trapped and die. Very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that for as long as refrigerators have been around there is only one province in the whole of Canada, namely Saskatchewan, that has any definitive legislation to try and prevent such disasters.

We also talked, and I think we always will be talking in the House in debate about the style of government. We would certainly create an ombudsman and the post of Auditor General. We will introduce a bill also in this session called the *Conflict of Interests Act*. This bill will apply to any person holding public office by virtue of a public vote and will require that every elected official on taking office, will file a statement of personal assets and liabilities and sources of personal income. It will also prohibit elected officials from purchasing land in British Columbia except for a family home, farm, or cottage. We hope that we will have the opportunity to discuss further details of this bill. The theme of which is very close to many people's hearts when they feel and see the records or the disclosures in other jurisdictions and in the past in this province.

We will introduce an *Administrative Appeals Act*, which will provide for a review of all decisions made by an administrative official — which affect the rights and interests of an individual whose groups are associations. We feel that the law is presently antiquated in its provision for remedies. And in our opinion with a growing bureaucratic involvement of government in the affairs of the individual, this kind of appeal is more necessary than ever.

We will introduce a *B.C. Crown Corporation Accountability Act* which will require Crown corporations to present their financial affairs for full and detailed review by elected officials, either a committee of the Legislature or the Whole House.

We also sought election on a platform which we called the "quality of life." As I have stated in this House before, on more than one occasion, we fully support the concept of a Department of the Environment to co-ordinate and integrate existing arms of government dealing with the environment — under separate departments at the present time.

In terms of the quality of life we would certainly amend the *Hospital Insurance Act* to bring coverage to patients in private hospitals and nursing homes under B.C.H.I.S. to give them exactly the same coverage which presently exists for other levels of illness.

And I'd like to comment a minute or two later on the news released by the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) today, Mr. Speaker, regarding Richmond Heights Hospital.

We would introduce a bill called the *Senior Citizens Council Act* which would create a provincial council concerned with the problems and aspirations of senior citizens throughout the province. The council would seek to promote public understanding and education in assisting the senior citizens with their basic problems of pensions

and housing.

Again, with the same subject we would introduce a bill called the *Forensic Clinic Act* which would enable judges and magistrates to refer a person who is charged or convicted of an offence to attend a forensic clinic for examination, diagnosis, or treatment. With the tremendous drug abuse problem in British Columbia there is need for investigation and research in what is more a medical and social problem than a criminal problem. This bill would allow investigation to be arranged by the judge and he would have flexibility in handling cases.

On this point I would like to say that the party fully supports the action of the Attorney General in setting up a task force — because he has become so intimately aware of the fact that more than half of the jail residents have a drug problem or a drug involvement.

We would introduce an Act to reduce the municipal share of social assistance from 15 per cent to not more than 10 per cent. In terms of economic development, again it is nothing new — we talked about it a year ago — setting up of a provincial development fund to provide low interest loans, or provincial guarantee of loans for business and

[[Page 78](#)]

industry to expand.

We have also campaigned on encouraging the independent and private sector to be active in social problems. And we would be introducing a bill called the *Day Care Centres Act* which would encourage private organizations to participate in the provision of day care centres.

These are the kind of subjects that we think are important at the present time in the province. And these are the kind of bills which I hope will be given an opportunity to be debated. I won't say too much, Mr. Speaker, about agriculture because the particular topic has been mentioned yesterday, and today. It's safe to say that certainly we are opposed not to the concept of trying to preserve land or to make the best use of land. That is not in question, or in debate. We realize that land to coin the old phrase — I forget which comedian said it — but he said, "They're not making any more of it, so you better get it while it's there." I can't remember the comedian, but one of the old timers. I think we all recognize that this is the fact of the matter.

But we feel in our party that it is very unfair and discriminatory to choose the method that has been chosen by the Government, namely put a complete freeze on the subdivision of the farmer's land. The government has met with the representatives of the industry, as we have, and I must say that if I were a farmer I would feel exactly as they do. They put up with a minimal standard of living, which certainly in terms of their annual net income and the hours they work, is less than \$2 an hour for very many of them. But, they do this in the hope that their land is appreciating and at least when it comes their time to retire they can have assets which accrue from the appreciation of the land.

If indeed government wishes to continue to have low food prices — and that is a good aim in itself — but if the government wishes to have low food prices at the sacrifice of the farmer who works long hours for low income — they can't have that on the one hand, and also take away his right to appreciation of his assets. I think that our policy would certainly be that either the order-in-council should be rescinded and some better form of legislation developed, that the farmer be given fair compensation for what he has lost in terms of cash by the order in council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've talked a great deal about party and philosophy and policies. But I think one of the responsibilities in this debate regardless of politics, is to bring forward some of our crying social problems. And certainly one of these above all others has to be the drug abuse problem in our society. Particularly the abuse of heroin. But in highlighting heroin, let me make it very, very plain that this is not meant in any way to diminish the dangers of other drugs, the so called soft drugs. Because if you're involved in the consequences of drug abuse and you see the people involved — there really is no such thing as a harmless drug. As far as that goes there is no such thing as a harmless medical drug. The simplest drug used for good medical reasons usually has some dangers. And certainly the non-medical use of the vast array of illegal drugs has to be one of the most frightening influences in society today. I certainly reject the thought and the point of view that is often put forward that because this drug, or

that drug, is no worse than alcohol then it should be legalized. That has to be the most twisted kind of thinking that I've ever heard — that if you compare something not by its value but by how little harm it does. I think for that reason alone, and certainly as far as I am concerned, and as far as the Conservative Party is concerned, we certainly are opposed to the legalization of marijuana. Or any drug, for that matter.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, just very quickly a few words about the heroin problem — because this particular drug renders the victim so totally a slave to the drug. If you sit and talk to an addict who tells you that he has lied and cheated, and stolen money from his own children to support his habit, and I've met more than one addict who tells me this, then I think society must wake up to the fact of the absolutely total enslavement and degradation which happens to a person who becomes a heroin addict.

I think really this is the central theme or should be the central point when we are looking at the problem of heroin addiction. It's not quite like any other force on a person. When a person is enslaved by heroin he is no longer a criminal problem in my opinion, he is a serious and probably incurable — I say that advisedly — probably an incurable medical problem.

Now I know it is difficult for society — it's certainly difficult for me to accept the fact that it is probably incurable. But unfortunately if you look at the facts and the figures and you look at experience, there are very few "cured" — and word is a little dangerous to use in the drug scene — but there are very few "cured" heroin addicts.

One thing is equally certain. There are many of them causing all kinds of social mayhem and disaster by breaking the law in order to support their habit. While it sounds rather negative and the kind of decision one would rather not take, I really would appeal, Mr. Speaker, to Government to look seriously at the positive values to society of providing heroin to registered addicts under medical supervision in conjunction with rehabilitation facilities and every other kind of health or counseling facility to give those who do wish to break the habit that chance.

At the present time these addicts are simply on a heroin-crime-jail roundabout with tremendous upheaval not only to society but certainly to the innocent members of their family. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, whole families are thrown into total disorganization and disruption. They get into debt to

[[Page 79](#)]

many thousands of dollars. They are under threat of physical harm because they are behind with payments and the children sense the disruption in the household. A totally innocent family can be brought to complete ruin.

So that while my suggestion that we should really consider making heroin available to registered addicts under strict supervision may sound the reverse of what I just said about marijuana, let me emphasize I'm talking about the established, proven addict whose problem would appear to be helped by no other method than keeping him out of jail and at the same time attempting to rehabilitate him.

I know that this requires federal legislation and I would hope that when the task force has completed its work... One of the hearings I attended in the task force was attended by a new association that has been set up called the Concerned Citizens' Association and some of the tales told to that task force are rather harrowing and almost unbelievable but they are true. I hope that the Attorney General will take this kind of information and seek federal cooperation and at least attempt some new approach to the heroin problem.

It is certain that even if the suggestions that I am making are not found to be useful, I would certainly plead very urgently that at least we try some new approach because the present situation is totally and utterly futile.

I would like to speak for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of strikes which is another major problem in our society. We had a headline the other day which read, "1972 B.C.'s Worst Labour Year". Over 2 million days were lost and we all know that strikes not only affect our vital export markets on which our economy depends but they certainly cause real harm very often to innocent parties.

It is also interesting that many people have spoken publicly that the strike weapon has now been recognized

as a cruel and often a senseless way for individuals to seek justice in the marketplace. It may be that strikes served a purpose in days gone by when the odds were stacked so heavily in the favour of the employer. But I think today that the opposing forces of management and labour are certainly more evenly balanced. It is also an obvious fact that in some strikes there are no winners, only losers. Even the veteran labour leader, George Meany, has described it as archaic and suggested that society move towards accepting the concept of compulsory arbitration more readily.

The Conservative Party certainly acknowledges the importance and supports the concept of free collective bargaining. Let there be no doubt about that. In fact as an historical note, it is interesting to read and the House would be interested to know that in Britain in 1874, the Conservative Government under the famous Prime Minister Disraeli first gave workers full collective bargaining. In 1875 — the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is smiling and I think he'll like this, too — that in 1875, the Trades Union Congress recorded an official vote of thanks to the Conservative Government for its attitude to collective bargaining.

But anyway, I think it probably points out that despite our differences across this floor and in other Houses there is no party that has any kind of monopoly on its interest in the betterment of society, better conditions of work and improving the lot of the working man. Perhaps we are slower than you are. This is the common criticism.

Just to make the point — we feel that there has to be a more eager acceptance of the concept of compulsory arbitration because of the damage done to people and to the economy by frequent and lengthy strikes.

I would have to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, we would like to make our stand very plain in regard to government employees. When it seems that industrialized nations all over the world are recognizing the senselessness and the damage frequently done by strikes, we feel that it just makes no sense at all to give the right to strike to government employees. Again I would say that we believe completely in giving them full bargaining rights and at all times encouraging every aspect of negotiation which is likely to speed up a settlement. But we certainly feel that the strike of government employees would create a serious breakdown in the whole administrative structure and affairs of this province. We would perhaps go further and say that we consider it irresponsible of the NDP Government in the light of strike experience at this time to widen the segment of society who have the right to strike in what is a particularly vital function in our province.

In a recent essay, Arnold Toynbee, who is the famous British historian — it is interesting to quote what he says. He says that some of the tactics of strike mechanisms show that civilization is manifestly beating a retreat. In so called peace time, he says, the parties who quarrel are trying to use pressure on their opponents by tormenting third parties against whom they have no grievance. Foreign diplomats are kidnapped, planes are hijacked, supplies of coal, gas, electricity, transport and other necessities of life are cut off by workers with the object of coercing the public into begging private employers and governments to concede contentious wage claims.

I have no wish to belabour that point any further except to finish talking about strikes with the local situation in our schools. Let me preface this, Mr. Speaker, by saying that in no way am I taking sides in the strike. The workers believe that they have a point and the school board believes that they are protecting the taxpayers, as indeed it is their duty, against an unreasonable wage demand. That is the dispute. I'm

[[Page 80](#)]

not arguing for or against who is right in the dispute. Mr. Speaker, one point I want to make very, very clear — and it was interesting that the Premier the other day made the comment that opinions are never expressed from empty chairs. Put another way, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that two sides to a dispute will never agree until they sit down and talk. As far as the school dispute is concerned, I, as a parent of four children in school, think it is very irresponsible of all parties concerned — I'm not laying the blame at anybody's door, I'm laying the blame at everybody's door in the dispute.

I think it is just unbelievable that 10 days could go by and the parties didn't even sit down and talk. I don't want excuses that somebody is too busy or cannot be there, or Tuesday doesn't suit or Saturday doesn't suit. I'm just saying that all the children practically — certainly in the junior and senior secondary schools in this greater Victoria area — are now into their third week when they are, to all intents and purposes, getting no education.

Now, I don't think that any of us really want this situation. I'm sure we don't, not even the people who are striking. All I'm saying is that surely there has to be mechanisms whether it be compulsory arbitration or otherwise, whereby this kind of situation which just makes no sense at all should be brought to a halt. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that too often we allow strikes to go on until some really serious point is reached and until the third innocent party in the dispute really does scream out and suffer and shout, and then something is done. And I think that if we have any sense of our public duty, whether we are MLA's or board officials or workers, that surely this should not be acceptable in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, I think I was misunderstood in the telegram that I sent to the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly). It was interpreted as a direct request that she or the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King), who also received a telegram, intervene with some form of compulsion. And I'd like the House to understand very clearly that what I said in the telegram was that I would urge the sides to be brought together.

Now I was not asking either Minister to come forward with chapter and verse and the full power of law to force them back. I was simply hoping that the Ministers concerned would at least make a public statement informally and in a friendly way, say to the two parties, "Look, we're not taking sides on the dispute. We're not forcing you back to work. But for the love of Peter, get down and talk. Because if you don't talk you'll never reach an agreement."

But the fact is that 10 days went by and the children were out of school and the two sides never even met to talk over the problem. I think this is shocking and as far as I am concerned as a parent I am very angry about it — and that's rather obvious, I guess.

I would like to comment on the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance's (Hon. Mr. Cocke) statement this morning that negotiations are underway to attempt to take over Richmond Heights Hospital. I have spoken in this House before — the Minister nods his head, so maybe that is not correct reporting. Let me put it this way, to get to the subject, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times that I feel that patients in nursing homes are getting a very raw deal from society. I think we're agreed on that.

I would like to put forward our point of view that it would not seem unreasonable to either acquire modern facilities which exist or build new facilities under exactly the same structure which we now have for acute hospitals and extended care hospitals. I am talking about the 40/60 split between the local municipalities and the provincial government for the capital construction of facilities to accommodate people requiring what we call "intermediate care." And I know these terms are confusing to many people.

But very simply, Mr. Speaker, we sort of have two levels of illness at the moment — you might say two ends of the scale. The very acutely ill and the very chronically ill are covered under B.C.H.I.S., but in the middle we have a large segment — several thousands of patients — who require a level of care between these two and they presently receive no help. And I may say, no help from the federal government or the provincial government.

I was certainly encouraged to read in the Press today that there was a move afoot to bring these facilities under the care of government. I would just like to say, while applauding the general idea, that I hope somehow the mechanism will provide for strong local involvement in the management and running of these institutions. I think again that history shows that government-run hospitals are not... The Premier has often talked about Riverview and the past history of the care in mental hospitals in this province and elsewhere. I am not just saying it happened in B.C., but the fact is that governments generally do not run hospitals well, whereas people at the local level — somewhat in the same idea that I think it's very important to have local school boards for local interest. I would hope and I think it's the policy of our party — indeed it was in our election platform — that these facilities would be provided and that patients would be given coverage. But I would hope it is not meant to centralize these hospitals, or the control and administration of these hospitals, but to give the management to local citizens, dedicated and interested as they have shown themselves to be in the past in our general hospitals.

The throne speech mentions "profligacy and waste on all sides," and again I would not want, Mr. Speaker, to tread on the subject of yesterday's amendment debate — but I think we must put it on record that our party agrees

that growth for the sake of growth and planned obsolescence just don't make sense.

But we have to go on record also as making it clear that we find it irreconcilable to create jobs on the one hand and limit industrial and economic expansion on the other. To tread on the matter very lightly, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we believe that a balance can be reached between these two objectives without damage to our environment and without ever-increasing unemployment.

In finishing, Mr. Speaker — and I have talked longer than I had intended — the choice between the socialist and non-socialist government would be a good note to finish with, I think. We believe that the initiative of the individual is the prime mover of economic and social progress, and that the heavy hand of the state can only retard progress.

We feel that the word "freedom" is fundamental to a Conservative: the freedom to choose your residence, your job, your religion, your family, your education, your wage, your politics, your movements and so on are very basic to the average man. And we feel that the one agent in society which is giving less and less of that freedom in these various areas is government.

The Conservative feels that you cannot have total freedom and total security. We feel that you want to be free rather than be secure and we don't feel that government can give you both.

A Conservative feels that freedom is foremost and that a free people will prosper. And that can best be ensured within society by preventing power from being concentrated in the hands of too few people.

Somebody said to me the other day, "It's not very easy being a Conservative, because you're often accused of being reactionary or of protecting wealth and privilege." And maybe some Conservatives are doing that. But I assure the House this is not my intent or my concept of being a Conservative.

I would say further that in my experience the vast majority of Conservatives are ordinary, dedicated Canadians, trying to preserve a balanced society in which there is a place for all socio-economic groups. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon Minister of Highways.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): May I have a podium, please.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Oh, I won't be too long. On occasion in this House I have gone 3 1/4 hours, but by that time it would be the 6 o'clock hour and I promise I will not keep you till 6 o'clock this evening. How much before 6 o'clock depends on how the afternoon goes.

Now I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate so far. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to be back in the House once again participating in the formal, full-blown throne debate. We had a brief flurry in the fall session, and this is the first normal session — or usual session — since the last election.

There was a period during that election when I wasn't sure whether or not I was going to be back for this throne speech because the day before the election one of the Vancouver papers, in examining the province constituency by constituency, said that "the Socreds could pull an upset and take Cowichan-Malahat away from the former NDP leader."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, no. That was in the newspapers of August 29, 1972. I am happy to say they didn't quite make it.

I have listened to the speeches this afternoon. I listened to the speech by the Hon. leader of the Liberal party describing the role of the Opposition in the words of John Diefenbaker. Many famous politicians, both in Britain and

in this country have described the role of the Opposition — it's a situation with which I am fairly familiar having had some few years in that particular role.

MR. McGEER: You're still playing Opposition.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I always give a Government speech — even when I was in Opposition I gave a Government speech. But however...

AN HON. MEMBER: Always confused.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, no. Never confused. But sometimes, because other people didn't understand, they were confused, they were operating from the wrong base. Like my good friend who just sat down, the House leader of the Conservative party, (Mr. Wallace) whom as everyone knows I admire very much and I think he's an outstanding individual and a first-rate Member for Oak Bay, and sincere and forthright and I appreciate his remarks all the time...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: ...and he has no highway problems — that's right — he has no highway problem. But you know when he wound up I think

[[Page 82](#)]

he made clear the difference between those who sit in this House as Members of the New Democratic Party and those who belong not just to the Conservative Party but to the Liberal Party and the Social Credit Party.

The Member for Oak Bay said that the Conservative Party is trying to preserve the balance in our society. Now that is the point from which his thinking and the thinking of all those people in the private enterprise parties start. They assume that there is a balance in today's society. We say there has been no balance. We say there has been an imbalance and we are going to bring balance to it. We don't want to preserve this imbalance that has existed in our society. That's why we're here because we recognize there was an imbalance and we are going to set out to correct that imbalance.

Now the leader of the Liberal Party made some reference to a private plane for the Minister of Highways.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which leader?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Well, I don't know which one it is, whether it's that one now sitting in the leader's chair, the former leader, the ex-leader, the new leader, the once was leader or which one it was, but anyway...

AN HON. MEMBER: The leader of a new party.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, that's the one on the other side, the leader of the new party. But anyway he made some reference to "a secrecy of a Cessna Citation." I can't remember the names of all these planes — that was locked up in a Government hangar outside, out in Victoria. Certainly there was a plane out there — I think it was a Cessna Citation. I didn't see it.

But it is true that we've looked at a number of planes. I remember in the last session of this Legislative Assembly, Members on both sides of the House urged the Government of that day to do something to replace the present planes that were owned by the Government. Members on both sides of the House. I allowed the TV cameras out there and I announced publicly that I was setting up a committee to examine the plane requirements of this province and its civil servants, and to make recommendations to me as to what should be done.

And in the course of doing that job there have been a number of planes examined and that's how you arrived at a decision to make your recommendations. But I can assure you that what happened under the aegis of a previous Minister of Highways with jet planes or any other planes — it won't happen as long as I am Minister of Highways.

And he talks about secrecy? There was a TV camera out there this morning! Where's the secrecy? Take your camera out. Take pictures. I don't care.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The Investigators? I don't know who the investigator is, but anyway — oh, it's a morning show is it? Well I'm usually working in the mornings. (Laughter). Even when I was in Opposition I used to work in the morning. I didn't have time to watch TV or radio or wherever this programme is.

MR. D.M. BROUSSON: In one car — out the other.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: During the election, Mr. Speaker, I spoke about this House, how it operated, how it had operated in the past and how I wanted to see it operate in the future. I was concerned about the way in which the House was operated and the attitudes displayed in the House. And I was determined that there should be some change in the climate of politics both in and out of this House. I felt that this was very necessary. It would restore the faith of the people in politics and politicians, and during the life of this Government, in the comparatively few days that we have sat in session during the short session last fall and the session so far this year, there has been an honest sincere attempt on the part of the Members of this Government to change the climate and temper of politics in this House.

I'm disappointed that, in the actions and attitudes of the official Opposition especially, we see this determination on their part to retain in this House the old politics, the old rancour, the old anger that was so much a part of politics during the last 20 years. I simply want to express my regret that they seem determined to maintain that atmosphere in this House, and I hope that as time progresses they will realize the error of their ways.

I want to commend the mover and the seconder of the motion we are now discussing. I think the speeches they both gave were thoughtful, thought provoking and constructive. I appreciate the speech made by the lady Member regarding the Human Rights Act. For many years in this House we pointed out that ever since the Conservative federal Government passed the Canadian Bill of Rights the complementary provincial bill was absolutely necessary if we were to get a full bill of rights in legislation applicable to the Province of British Columbia.

The lead-off man for the Opposition said that legislation of human rights won't change human thinking and that's probably true. But I want to tell him that human thinking won't change until those who think otherwise are exposed to working and associating with people of another colour, another

[[Page 83](#)]

sex or another religion who can hack it on the job and in society equally well. Now that's what is required.

That's why legislation is a necessary first part towards changing human thinking. Because too many people have been brainwashed into thinking that because a person is of another colour or another sex or another religion or another ethnic group, they are not as good as they are, and incapable of hacking it. And when you have legislation that forces society to take certain measures, to take certain steps to allow certain things to happen, then people are exposed to the possibility that perhaps the original attitudes were wrong.

This is what is happening in many places in the United States through the Presidential Affirmative Action Programme where any company who wants to get the benefit of the government contract must demonstrate very clearly that their employees right through the whole organization are a fair reflection of the society of that community, whether they be Mexican, Negro, Italians — you name it. That is actually working in the United States, and people are recognizing through this government attitude, this government demand, that people of a different colour and a different nation can do the job.

I talked with a senator in the Washington State Legislature when I was down there who is in charge of an Affirmative Action programme for the telephone company down there. The stories he told me about the sort of

feedback you get to this certainly was a revelation to me, and it indicated to me very clearly that you can change human thinking once they are exposed to the kind of things they have avoided in the past.

As the Minister of Highways of this province we have a few problems here. I have initiated talks with the federal Department of Indian Affairs to give the Indians of this province the same treatment as non-Indians insofar as highways are concerned.

The Member from Atlin — the Minister without Portfolio — and I sat down with some representatives of the Indian group and the Indian representative with my officials and I am optimistic we're on the way to getting that situation resolved. With the Indians accepting their responsibilities as far as highways are concerned and the provincial government treating the Indians exactly the same way as they treat non-Indians.

You know the Opposition quoted the Premier that if the resources of this province stay in the ground for 50 years then let them stay there, but they forgot to say that he added to that. He said, "let them stay there till a generation comes along that can do a better job." Can do a better job.

If we can't find ways of utilizing the resources of this province in a proper and adequate fashion then we are better to leave them there so that someone with perhaps more brains than our generation has are able to do a better job of it. It is our intention to try and do a better job and that's why there will be some changes made, but I think we can agree that the tally is now in and the mad rush to get rid of our resources at fire sale prices in this province in the rawest possible state is economic suicide.

You know, some time ago a man by the name of Nelson, in reviewing our present society, said that "technology began as an extension of tools and as such brought uncounted blessings with it. Now, swollen beyond any conceivable human scale, it rolls along — a blind Moloch, overriding all needs of the human spirit, all traditions, customs, races, ideologies. There is no one in the driver's seat."

That is basically what has been happening to our society. There has been no one in the driver's seat. Technology has been making the decisions and pushing us further and further toward the precipice. Well, as long as we are the Government there is going to be someone in the driver's seat as far as the developments in this province are concerned. Moloch was the chief god of the Phoenicians, whose worship consisted chiefly of human sacrifices, ordeals by fire and mutilation. That is what has been happening to our society, too. Mutilation, human sacrifice, without consideration of where we were going.

I think it is obvious that all the cry from the other side about an "economic climate" is because they don't want any change. They are all conservatives. They are trying to preserve what is now rather than trying to correct what is wrong now. We have to adapt and change according to the needs of the times. The dinosaur, I think, is a prime example of something that couldn't adapt to change and disappeared. Someone said the same thing happened to Social Credit — they couldn't adapt to change — and they are about to disappear too. Well, certainly they are fragmented,

AN HON. MEMBER: Won't you miss us?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Oh, no. I wouldn't miss you a bit. (Laughter). Wouldn't miss you a bit.

MRS. JORDAN: You won't have to put it to the test because we aren't disappearing.

AN. HON. MEMBER: That's obvious. (Laughter).

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The throne speech mentions the automobile insurance plan. You know, the other day I was going through some papers and I came across a speech that I made the first time the Premier ran for office in 1960. There is the page of notes I had when I gave that speech the first time the present Premier ran for office in 1960 in the days of the CCF. One of the items I have listed to talk about

is automobile insurance, among other things. So here it's up in a throne speech introduced by that same Premier.

I listened to the remarks from across the way from the first spokesman for the Opposition about automobile insurance. You know, I don't think he really knows what he is talking about. He said the only people who will benefit from a government automobile insurance plan will be those on the assigned risk plan or perhaps the younger drivers at the expense of others.

I have only made one statement about what my objectives are in the matter of this government automobile insurance plan and I will repeat it now. Those with the bad driving records will pay more than those with good driving records. That is the only statement I have made and it is the only statement I am going to make at this time about what is in the proposed legislation.

But I have been asked a number of times by people: "What should we do? Our insurance policy is up for renewal. Should we renew it or wait until after the legislation is in?" Well I cannot tell you what is in the legislation but I am going to tell you that I have an automobile insurance policy that expires in February and I am going to renew it for 12 months. I expect to have a few more words to say about automobile insurance before this session is over.

But I really want to talk about this afternoon is my own department — the Department of Highways. One of the first actions I took as Minister of Highways was to have the B.C. No. 1 signs taken down and the Trans-Canada Highway signs reinstalled. The question is on the order paper as to how much this is going to cost and that question will be answered as soon as I can get the figures. I think it is very clear why I had those signs replaced. I felt it was a demonstration to the people of this province and to the people of Canada that B.C. was a part of Canada and intended to remain a part of Canada. That B.C. would not indulge in the cheap political tricks that epitomized the former administration in their relationship with Ottawa. I knew when I gave the order to change them that it would cost money but there are times you have to spend money to correct something that was done wrong. I want to tell you I have had letters from all over British Columbia and all over Canada commending British Columbia and this Government for taking that action.

I want to tell you also that, as far as I am concerned, the statement that was made in the *Journal of Commerce* of January 22 by Olaf Naas, the president of the B.C. Road Builders' Association, will not happen as long as I am Minister of Highways. What did Olaf Naas say — the president of the B.C. Road Builders' Association? He said that in the past, much of the Government highway construction programme was based on political expediency. Now there is a man with a lot of experience in highly ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No. That's what he said. Check the *Journal of Commerce*, January 22 of this year. He said that in the past, much of the Government highway construction programme was based on political expediency. Well there is going to be an end to that as long as I am Minister of Highways. I don't promise to make this province one whole stretch of blacktop or concrete. I promise not to make this province one whole stretch of blacktop or concrete.

Mind you, when I look at the requests that have come to my department from the chambers of commerce, the municipalities, the ratepayers' associations, the regional district and MLA's, I get a mental picture of B.C. as one whole field of blacktop. When I look at the programme that was presented to me by one group, I estimated the cost of that one programme, scattered all over the province, at about \$5 billion. I think I might have a little trouble in getting that amount of money from the Minister of Finance. He didn't react at all.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: However, it is obvious that we do have many highway problems in the province. They will be settled and decided on a priority basis of the greatest need. It is also obvious that especially within the urban and city areas there has to be some new thinking on the development of highway systems in the Province of British Columbia. The density of our urban areas is decreasing and rural sprawl and ribbon development is

increasing. The causes are complex but the chief factors are the attractiveness of rural environment, the high cost of urban services, lower rural taxes, increasing personal income and the ability of the automobile to conquer distance.

But the true costs of the automobile are hidden. Direct costs are well known when we build a highway. But the indirect costs arising out of the impact of the automobile are not always appreciated. For example, the automobile produces lower density population, which increases utilities costs because of longer sewer lines and power lines to serve the same number of customers. The impact is felt in the full range of services — police, roads, water, sewer, schools, power, phone, ambulance, welfare and almost every aspect of the social community.

In general, drivers wish to travel at high speed on internal highways in urban areas. The only facility that can move high volumes at high speed in an urban area is a freeway. To accommodate this demand in the built-up areas would require a network of freeways in the urban areas about three miles apart.

[[Page 85](#)]

British Columbia can't afford this solution, (1) because of undesirable social impact, and (2) because of the excessive dollar costs.

Under these circumstances, it is not possible to provide high-speed facilities in urban areas for the small through movements in the trunk highways. High-speed trunk highways considered necessary to connect together the regions of the province should therefore be provided only in the rural areas. In urban areas, the trunks should be integrated into the urban street system. Only the grid network of major streets can provide the capacity to meet the high total vehicle miles of travel within urban areas. In general, municipalities are not at the present time providing for those networks.

What we have to do is (1) encourage urban areas to infill and expand in a progressive manner. That is one of the reasons the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) took the action he did with regard to two of the municipalities in this Province as we saw the developments leapfrogging one over another out into the rural areas.

2. We must discourage commercial and residential development in rural areas.
3. We must ensure urban areas produce a grid of major streets.

Current legislation falls far short of achieving this policy. For example, most of the area of the province is not zoned and small lot subdivisions can be proceeded with freely and undesirable developments that do not need direct access can spring up lawfully in these areas. We must examine what is happening and discuss the possibilities of a number of things, and I hope that in the course of this session you will apply yourselves to these items for discussion, debate and help to the Government.

1. The provincial subdivision regulations should be examined as to the size of the parcel of land required in unzoned rural areas.
2. The provincial subdivision regulations should be strengthened to require installation of services in subdivisions.
3. The *Local Services Act* must be used to enact regulations to provide low-intensity zoning in unzoned, critical, rural areas. Local participation and local action must be taken in the upgrading of existing municipal and regional district bylaws that fall short of the objectives of maintaining British Columbia as a reasonable place and a comfortable place and a happy place in which to live.

Now I'd like to talk about the ferries for a few minutes. I want to explain to you the problems I had after I became Minister of Highways with the ferry system. It's obvious that there's great difficulty in providing a ferry system in this province capable of meeting the peak loads of July and August. I have examined the load records of the two main ferry runs between Vancouver and the island, month after month. And we find that in the months of July and especially in August, and especially in the Horseshoe Bay–Departure Bay run, on occasion as many as 300 cars were being left behind as a ferry pulled out.

How do we provide a service and ships that can obviate that when we have to operate a ferry service 12 months of the year? Our advertising programme of the ferries is designed to try and build up what are called the "shoulder" months — months other than July and August — to try and spread out the peak period.

An examination of the load factors indicates very often that people who have waited two or three hours for a ferry could have avoided that wait if, instead of going to the ferry terminal at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, they had gone to the ferry terminal at 6 o'clock at night. Because by 6 o'clock, 7 o'clock, the backlog is all gone and the ferries sometimes are running without a full load because they had caught up to the backlog of cars that had been waiting.

I want you to examine the full accounting of the ferries that for the first time is in the annual report which I tabled in the House on opening day. I had these figures inserted in the report prepared by the previous Minister — they are on page 396. There you will find the report of the cars and passengers carried by the individual ferries, the cost of operating these ferries and the income that comes from these ferries.

Some discussion has taken place — and I for one was optimistic that we would be able to put on a night run, on at least one of the areas between Vancouver Island and the mainland. Once we advertised for the staff available we discovered that there were a number of areas we simply couldn't recruit the staff. This was especially in the officer category and, just as important, in the manning of lifeboat crews demanded by the Department of Transport.

I also looked at the regular sailings and the number of cars and passengers that travelled on the ferries that now run the last two runs at night and I discovered that they are not utilized as fully as they should be. And because of all of the problems no night run has been put on. And I want to indicate to you that at this time I have no intention of recommending that a night run be put on until we have solved some of the other problems related to the ferry service.

I am asking my colleague, the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly), to consult with the B.C. Institute of Technology with regard to providing a course there in the form of a marine college. Such a college would provide the training for the personnel that the ferry service requires. I recommend the B.C. Institute of Technology, because it, as nearly as I can determine, is one of the best-organized institutions for the operation of such a college and so that we can train the personnel required for the staffing of the officer and engineer crews of the ferry system.

[[Page 86](#)]

In recent weeks we have been hearing and reading in the Press a great deal about the operation of the ferry system between Horseshoe Bay and Departure Bay, especially from my good friends the Liberal Members from the north shore.

I want to tell the House what I found when I came into office. They say, "Get out of Horseshoe Bay." I have one question for them before I start: Where am I going to move the ferries to if people in other areas of the province adopt the same attitude that the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) adopts about a port anywhere in his constituency? Where am I going to move the ferries to, if every MLA says, "Take 'em away but don't bring 'em here"?

I suggest that when they talked yesterday about the need for jobs and the need for development and need for this, and then today they say, "We don't want any coal port or anything else. Take it away." Now what sort of nonsense is that? But I'm still asking the question: Where am I going to move the ferries to, if every other MLA in every other constituency and in every other area says, "We don't want 'em"?

However, I want to read to you a letter that was sent by the Treasury Board to the then Minister of Highways on April 12, 1972. It's addressed to the Hon. W.D. Black, Minister of Highways in the buildings, and it's re Horseshoe Bay to Departure Bay:

"The Treasury board wishes to advise you that it is firm policy to operate the ferry service on its present route from Departure Bay to Horseshoe Bay. The Board also wishes to repeat its instructions to you that it is in order to stretch two more ferries on this route for the summer of 1973."

That's April 12, 1972. "You are also authorized to spend up to \$5.5 million on improving facilities at Departure Bay and up to \$3 million to improve the facilities at Horseshoe Bay in order to handle the stretched ships."

Well, by the time I came into office I discovered that the commitment for Horseshoe Bay was not \$3 million but \$8 or \$9 million for Horseshoe Bay, This was to put in enlarged parking facilities, enlarged moving facilities, enlarged docking facilities and, in Departure Bay, a 3-tier concrete parking block, and, in Horseshoe Bay, a 4-tier concrete parking block.

I also discovered that for many years proposals have come forward to the previous administration urging them to remove the Nanaimo-Horseshoe Bay run from both of those terminals to a different situation. A different location. The relocations have been under consideration since 1964 and investigations extended until 1967. I have here a report which was prepared in 1967 and it says here and it is addressed to the Hon. P.A. Gaglardi, signed by special project engineer and it says:

"Dear Sir: In late 1964 the management of the British Columbia ferry authority requested an investigation into the possibility of establishing a new ferry connection between Vancouver Island and the mainland which would permit the removal of the Departure Bay-Horseshoe Bay trans Georgia Strait routes from its Horseshoe Bay terminus. Management was of the opinion that the ever increasing traffic volumes on the present route, the increased use of Horseshoe Bay as a recreation facility and the restricted availability of upland and foreshore property preclude expansion of the Horseshoe terminal to accommodate the anticipated growth of service demand."

That's from 1964 to 1967. 1966, in this report —

"Possible future planning. Since the conclusions indicate that the redeveloped Horseshoe Bay terminal could handle the three services..."

That's the Horseshoe Bay...et cetera.

"... for a maximum life of 15 years. Planning should begin within a very short time for the anticipated removal of route 2 from Horseshoe Bay."

In other words they knew then that by 1980 we would have to get out of Horseshoe Bay. They knew it. 1980 is only seven years from now. And yet on April 12 of this year the Treasury Board of the previous administration was saying, "It's going to stay there and you are going to spend a lot of money to keep it there."

"The economic studies indicate that the most efficient system would be a route located between Gabriola Island, an extension seaward in the Steveston-Iona area. Such a route would reduce travel distance between Vancouver Island to 16 knots and reduce travel time on water to approximately 1 hour. In 15 years the demand of the two services remaining at Horseshoe Bay is expected to utilize..."

And it goes on to talk about the utilization and asks for consideration to be given to the requisition of properties in the areas that would be involved and any switch of route.

MR. CURTIS: Worst kept secret in the province!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Then we come to 1969. A memo from the then Minister to the Deputy Minister.

"With reference to your memorandum of February 26, "

this is the short Nanaimo-Horseshoe Bay ferry service,

"This matter has been discussed with Treasury Board and by Executive Council and I have to advise that Government is not prepared at this time to consider shortening any ferry route."

[[Page 87](#)]

Then it goes onto discuss it even further. Come up to 1971. Again they're begging for a consideration and one word

"no" Signed by the then Minister of Highways (Hon, Mr. Black). Come to 1972 and here is a memo to the then Minister from the general manager and he says:

"I realize that a number of pleas have been made in the past in an endeavour to relocate the ferry bases at Departure Bay terminal so as to shorten this route and thus provide much more adequate service. Despite previous rejections..."

and this must be about the fourteenth rejection,

"...I feel I must make one more submission in this regard which I will keep as brief as possible."

Now I want you to listen to this.

"If we remain at Departure Bay we will not only continue to have excessive overtime, fuel and maintenance costs but will require very major expenditures on Departure Bay terminal in order to handle stretched ships which will be required in the near future. I believe your engineers will confirm that not only will it be necessary to purchase private property in order to provide an adequate terminal with sufficient holding capacity to fully utilize the stretched ships but also considerable purchases of private property will be necessary in order to provide adequate access and egress road facilities to clear the terminal, If these steps were taken with their great costs, we would simply be providing a stop-gap since with stretching in the foreseeable future additional ships will be necessary on this run. When this happens we have inadequate docking area to add additional berths at that time. It would therefore be necessary to abandon Departure Bay and move to another location.

In addition to the construction costs involved and the high operating costs with stretched ships we will of necessity be operating a minimum 10 hour shift."

Where was this business administration? Where were these people who knew how to run a business efficiently? "Efficiency with economy," we heard. Excessive overtime, excessive fuel costs, excessive maintenance costs — we're going to destroy Departure Bay... They were going to fill in one bay across here, they were going to fill in something out here. They were going to build this mammoth concrete structure in that restricted bay. They were going to cut up the highway on both sides, destroy the view and have to get out of there by 1980 anyway. There it is. You heard the original of it — "It is the firm intention of this Government to maintain that ferry route in that area."

When I came to office... Oh no!

The other day there was an editorial in the *Vancouver Province*, January 29, about an interminable ferry terminal. It says: "In 1968 Opposition leader, Robert Strachan said a new Vancouver Island mainland link should be built probably between the Steveston Jetty and Gabriola Island. The idea was a bridge a tunnel that would remove the tariff wall around the island. Last weekend Highways Minister Strachan said the Nanaimo-Horseshoe Bay ferry route would remain in the link with central Vancouver Island for a long time to come. In effect he was telling Northshore politicians to forget their campaign to get the Nanaimo run taken out of Horseshoe Bay. What has happened in those intervening years to Mr. Strachan's thinking?"

Well, first of all, at no time have I said that the Nanaimo-Horseshoe Bay route would remain the link with central Vancouver Island.

What did happen was that a reporter phoned my office, commented on the fact that the Northshore MLAs were demanding I get the ferries and the ferry terminal out of Horseshoe Bay.

I made a very exact statement. I said no consideration is being given to moving the ferry terminal from Horseshoe Bay at this time. They didn't ask me about the Horseshoe Bay-Nanaimo run. They asked me about your demand that I get the ferry terminal out of Horseshoe Bay.

You asked me a question, I answer the question you asked. If you can't ask the right question, that's not my fault.

MRS. JORDAN: Well then, don't cry.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'm not crying. Oh, I'm not crying. I just want to indicate to you the question that was asked and the answer I gave.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, stop complaining,

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'm not complaining about anything, except about the irresponsibilities of the previous administration and the utter waste that they were trying to commit this province to.

Well, O.K., what happened? On October 23, five weeks after I became the Minister of Highways I had the ferry management and my deputies into the office to discuss these proposals for Departure Bay and for Horseshoe Bay. I asked them the question; have you ever looked at the shorter route? The deputy left the office and he came back with this map which was prepared in 1966 which shows that they examined a multiplicity of routes including the one from the south end of Gabriola Island to somewhere in the Steveston-Iona Island area. Mr. P.A. Gaglardi was the Minister then. I looked at the map and I discussed it with them further and I told them — this was on October 23, 1972 — I told them to get busy and take a look at the possibility of moving these terminals.

I told them to get busy on an engineering study of

[[Page 88](#)]

moving the Nanaimo run from Departure Bay and Horseshoe Bay, here is a letter dated November 14, after previous phone calls, which was sent by my chief engineer to the Swan Wooster Engineering Company, and as I said, the date is November 14:

"Regarding a proposed new mainland terminal for Vancouver-Nanaimo Ferry, B.C. Ferries Route 2. The Minister has approved an assignment for you to undertake a feasibility study of locating the above terminal. It is possible that this study will lead to later design and supervision of construction by you of the facility, except for certain marine works where Department standard practice may be used. Compensation for this study" and so on — "Urgency for this study is indicated by the Department's desire to establish at an early date a policy on the future of the mainland terminal. Please arrange to discuss at an early date with Mr. Bone."

Then there's a reply, dated November 20 from Swan Wooster:

"We wish to acknowledge and thank you for the letter, we confirm — "so and so," we also note the urgency and need to keep the matter confidential."

A third letter indicating they would consult:

"We have noted the requirements to discuss the implications of various alternate locations with federal, regional and municipal agencies at the appropriate time"

And that feasibility study is going ahead at this time.

But more — more. I described to you the proposals that I found on my table when I came into office. After this initial discussion with the ferry management and my deputy and the others, I realized that I could not allow the construction in the Departure Bay area to go ahead. So I cancelled the construction in the Departure Bay Area. We will have to do some work there because the contract has already been called for the expansion, the jumbo-sizing of some of the ferries. So we will probably have to spend about \$1 million for the extending of the berthing facilities in the Departure Bay area.

Then I started to sweat it out with the Horseshoe Bay situation, And I want to tell you my whole being was revolted at the prospect of putting in the developments in Horseshoe Bay that the previous government had forced upon the ferry system. But everywhere I turned in discussion of the problem I faced, I was trapped by figures and problems. I was trapped by figures of parking requirements, accommodations, berths — the problems just went on and on no matter which way I turned. Finally I realized that even if this would only last till 1980, if we built this operation in Departure Bay, we'd locked in. And eventually the ferry system would have to take over all of

Horseshoe Bay. That is what we were faced with if we allowed the construction in Horseshoe Bay to go ahead.

Now I could have left some other Minister sometime in the future that legacy. But I didn't. I cancelled the construction the Horseshoe Bay Ferry Terminal area too.

Now we await the report and the recommendations of the committee. But it's certainly my intention to move the Nanaimo runs out of Departure Bay and out of Horseshoe Bay. It's part of our promise to do everything possible to correct, the mistakes of the past and to preserve our recreational areas. It is part of our promise, My friend from West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) is back in his beat, and I'm glad he's back, because I indicated to him earlier that the moving of out ferry terminals will create problems — finding other places for them to go. If every MLA and every other community adopts the attitude that you are taking toward a coal port at Britannia, then we'll have no place to go to with the ferry system. You said, "No way." No way do you want one ship a week. This proposal will take from 10 to 20 ferries a day out of Horseshoe Bay. And if you want us to do that, then you must be prepared to support us in other areas, even if it affects your constituency — because we have to share the load of protecting and preserving this province, as well as developing the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You can't expect to sit in West Vancouver-Howe Sound and build a fence around it. You're part of British Columbia too.

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll agree with that.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: All right, just keep that in mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: All that construction in Horseshoe Bay ...

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Cancel it, yes, the whole thing. The whole thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including the marine structure?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, because of the stretched ferries that we were committed to by the previous administration — we must put in the marine structures in order to berth the enlarged ferries.

MR. BROUSSON: All the parking surfaces?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: All that. That's cancelled until we get this feasibility report. Now, this is not going to be easy. You realize that in this three or four year interim period, once we see the reports in and I get the approval from my colleagues, we will go ahead

[[Page 89](#)]

as rapidly as possible — providing we can get the accommodation and support of the people of this province to the realization that this has to happen in order to preserve two areas, two important areas, in a small tight bay.

There will be problems in this transition period. There will be problems of waiting in line, there will be problems of accommodation, there will be problems of parking. I expect the support of those people in and out of this House who have been talking about the need for changing these ferry terminals. I expect their support unflinchingly and right down the line in this transition period. Because otherwise we are in for difficult times.

I want to say also, that if the recommendation is Gabriola Island, we already have the bylaw No. 39 protecting Gabriola Island. The planning commission on Gabriola Island will be part of determining the protection that will be given to that island. But I'm determined Gabriola Island will not be destroyed.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): You'll destroy it.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, no! — No, no! Have you read Bylaw 39 on Gabriola Island? You have, what does it say? What does it say? Come on, what does it say? Yes, yes — all right.

MR. CURTIS: It's not in my riding. (Laughter.)

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: There it is, clause after clause — and the planning commission, they're a part of it. Now, this will not all be an outlay of money, because the \$12 million that was going to be spent to lock us into these two areas will be part of the money available for any new construction. If Gabriola Island becomes a part of it, it then means that the one ferry that now operates there at considerable cost — and incidentally it would have to be two ferries in the next few years — will not be a cost factor. And the economics of any move are certainly in there.

We had to make a tough decision. I have to make tough decisions, but I think this Government will never be afraid to make the tough decisions that are necessary to keep this province improving. Mr. Speaker, this is not going to a committee. This is a responsibility that I accepted as the Minister. I couldn't wait. The decisions had to be made immediately because of the mess you had left the whole thing in. And perhaps I should re-read that last word from the Treasury Board, just in case you missed it. It's dated April 12, 1972 from the Treasury Board:

"To the Hon. W.D. Black, Re: Horseshoe Bay, Departure Bay: The Treasury Board wishes to advise you that this firm policy to operate the ferry service on its present route from Departure Bay to Horseshoe Bay."

Firm policy! When seven years from now you are going to have to get out of both places because of the growth of service and the growth of the traffic in those areas. It's just fortunate that they were thrown out of office when they were. A couple of more months and the whole thing would have been in the works. We'd have been committed to the tenders that had been let and then we would have been locked in.

Mr. Speaker, there are many challenges facing British Columbia in the future. Our growth and its problems. In the years ahead, this Government will not hesitate to make the tough decisions to ensure that B.C. remains beautiful — that its people have a life with quality — that this Province of British Columbia does, in all reality, become a green and pleasant land and part of a better Canada.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Chilliwack.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion I trust that you'll allow me to insert this preamble. This will be my first address to this assembly and I feel a little bit like I do when I address the other kind of assemblies in that I usually address a church group where some of the seats are empty. However, I notice that some came back in just in time for the sermon. I'm delighted.

May I say how pleased I am to be here and even though I may be a rookie legislator, I feel that I am among friends. Last evening at the Schmockey game it was very obvious that all were rookies, Mr. Speaker, and the ground was level. As a matter of fact, some of the players were level as well.

But I trust that as the ground was level there, it shall always be the same in this assembly.

I bring greetings from my people, both to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the entire House. The people of Chilliwack perhaps are among the finest in the province and they represent perhaps every philosophy of life. They are urban. They are rural. They are cultured. They are studious. They are informed. They are far enough away from the big city to be insulated from those parts from which they wish to be insulated and yet close enough to take in any of the parts that they wish to take in.

They are agricultural. They are representative of perhaps almost every ethnic group. If you stood and looked at them from a distance they would almost form an ethnic college. They are a religious people; hence a stable people. There's about 40 churches in a little city that only has just a few more than 12,000 people. They have a deep interest in the affairs of this province.

But I think that the most important thing about the people of my constituency is that they are

[[Page 90](#)]

together. They always have been, in years gone by, ably represented in this House, and I trust that in the days that lie ahead they will be no less ably represented.

They are a people of goodwill and they extend that goodwill to you today. The Big Book has taught them to have a deep respect for those who are in authority over them and they offer that respect today, both to you, Sir, and to the First Minister and to the cabinet and indeed to every Member of the House. They're not about to vote for you but they'll respect you, There's goodwill out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack.

I want to talk today briefly about what I think they would ask me to say if they were all here in the House. And I would think that they would say this: "Tell them we're disappointed, Harv. We're not disappointed about the length or the brevity of the throne speech but about the emptiness of the throne speech."

Now certainly we could ascribe enough of strategy and maybe enough of craftiness to the First Minister to assume that the speech was empty by design. However, after five months of rule by order-in-council and the chaos that it has created, we can't assume anything. The speech could have been empty by default.

What are the areas of disappointment that I see? It's customary for the area of revenue to be left to the budget speech. But if the budget speech is as bereft of clear-cut definition as the Speech from the Throne was, then maybe we should sound the alarm now.

It is very clear to the people of Chilliwack that when an order-in-council is passed authorizing expenditures in excess of budget to the tune of several millions of dollars and nothing is said about revenue, we're in trouble. Could it be that the people of this administration, with their meagre financial background, are so expenditure-oriented that they do not understand revenue? Could it be that they have been involved so long in the dispatch of welfare where someone else provided the sources that they are unaware that sources must be found?

We want to know if they have ever heard of the rule of the reservoir, which simply stated says this: "Somebody's got to put something in there, Jack"?

Or are we going to follow the precedent that's established by other socialist provinces where, at this moment, a population of approximately one million can be submerged in a provincial debt of something like \$660 million and all this in an area that's purported to be the world's richest wheat growing land.

I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, there's apprehension out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack.

We talked a little about land use. We would have welcomed any definition of the *Environment and Land Use Act* that would have been a benefit to the people if indeed was a benefit to all the people. But there's no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne.

If the intention of the Government is the continuation of this non-consultative, imposed sort of legislation of which we have recently seen a sample — namely the land deepfreeze — then not only must I decry this action but I must also support any counteraction which is engendered in the agricultural community.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that the recent land freeze which, although it may have some benefit in the minds of the administration, is having such adverse and far-reaching reaction that men in high-ranking positions — cultured men, peace-loving men, law-abiding men — have stated in my hearing that they are willing to resort to any recourse, including committing such acts of civil disobedience as they deem necessary, to protect their rights. and their interests.

Legislation at the best of times finds unpopular resting places. But the manner in which that legislation has been implemented can only serve to inflame an already volatile situation.

This new administration, Mr. Speaker, has become a champion of this sort of imposition in just five months. The outcry of an innocent observer in yesterday's House proceedings should give some indication of what I am trying to say. I think there is some wisdom in saying, "Let's get back to the public hearings. Let's learn all the facts before we turn on the refrigerator."

Another example, Mr. Speaker, of this disoriented, unco-ordinated type of regulation comes from my constituency. We have what they call broiler-hatching egg producers — it's a specialty type of farmer. And one regulation tells him he can't accept less than 96 cents a dozen for his product because this is considered to be the break-even point. While yet another regulation forces this hatchery — the hatchery who buys his eggs — to pay no more than 85 cents a dozen. Or maybe he gets a 7 cent bonus, bringing it to 92 cents if all the eggs hatch.

Again, the farmer is caught in the middle and my producers say that they are subsidizing their operations to the tune of something like \$100 a day because the chickens have got to eat even though you can't sell the eggs. It's a clear indication of leap before you look for which this government is fast becoming famous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which came first?

MR. SCHROEDER: Which came first!

The sad part about all this, Mr. Speaker, of the

[[Page 91](#)]

land freeze and all, is that whenever you take a premature action such as this landfreeze Act, irreparable damage is done. So that even if the order were to be rescinded, you'd call back the order and every agricultural landowner would do this: he'd want to capitalize and flee.

The result on land prices would be something close to devastating. The economy would plummet.

Perhaps this is all a part of the well-screened plan of this Government in their land acquisition scheme. I certainly could think of no better way to do it. But what a price to pay for power.

Approximately 95 per cent of the land in British Columbia is already Crown-owned. Is this an attempt to put the remaining 5 per cent, which is privately owned, under the domain of the Crown?

I wish that the land freeze were the only wrecking bar that this administration has used in my constituency. But no, here comes another one. Have you ever heard about the flood plain tactics? In one stroke of the pen — or one slip of the tongue, whichever you prefer — the Executive Council corroded land values in my constituency by saying no development should take place on a flood plain.

My question is: where are the flood plains? The answer is: who knows? Certainly there is no relationship between the designation of flood plain and the likelihood of flood. Parts of land that have never known flood waters in the history of British Columbia have been designated as flood plain and hence they have been depreciated forever. It's a bad deal, Mr. Speaker.

And there is disbelief out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack.

May I commend you, Mr. Speaker, in your efforts to bring some reform to the procedures of this House, I trust that one of the continued benefits that will accrue to the Opposition benches will be that of true impartiality from you, Mr. Speaker, God bless you. I wouldn't want your job for all the tea in China.

As a rookie in this House I am sure you might be interested in some of my observations on things that perhaps you, in your long tenure, tend to take for granted. I was initially, upon my introduction to the House, surprised at the apparent lack of dignity. And of course I have come to know, after a few days here, that's all meant in good fun. Or is it?

I was somewhat alarmed at the prolific use of absolutes. The words "never", "always", "nothing", and "all". After a couple of days here I was led to believe that the previous administration was nothing but bad, or that the present administration suddenly had all the answers. Mr. Speaker, absolutes scare me just a little. But never as much as when they are used by those who seem to be possessed by some sort of political schizophrenia.

I was amused at the apparent misconception that the length of a speech had something to do with wisdom. And I was amazed to think that some others would think the loudness of a speech, or the noise that you make, or the arms that you flail had something to do with importance. I was chagrined at the devices of grammar that were used to sort of skirt the rules of the House, and I'm sure you've been chagrined about it.

Let me give you an example. Rather than to say "He is a pig," I heard them say something like "It appears as though he might be a pig." (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, I had trouble with exaggerations when I first arrived — I mean listening to them. But most of all I was appalled when a Minister of the Crown yesterday sought to mislead the Members of this House by an illegitimate comparison of figures in a matter as grave as unemployment in British Columbia. And this is despicable.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, I realize it's your maiden speech. But you're not allowed in the House to attribute to any other Member that he deliberately misled the House. He may have accidentally, in your opinion, but you must not say he did it deliberately. (Laughter).

MR. SCHROEDER: Perhaps may I say, Mr. Speaker, that it appeared to me as though he were trying to mislead.

MR. SPEAKER: You've learned some grammar too, I see. (Laughter).

MR. SCHROEDER: Your new Act of procedure and practice must provide, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, some kind of a scourge for such misleading action. And may I ask the Government of the province — if that Minister were to be allowed to use such a false argument in this instance, what makes any of us believe that we could trust him in the next instance? He really blew it. There's apprehension out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack.

Now on to unemployment. After listening to all the cancellations of work programmes that we have just listened to from the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), I am sure that those who are seeking to lower the rate of unemployment are a little chagrined, Mr. Speaker.

But I would like to couple unemployment and welfare together. I would like to suggest that the two are synonymous and that they should fall perhaps under one Ministry. The Department of Labour is concerned with the employed. And the two, unemployment and the employed, are poles apart.

There is no greater unconcern than the unconcern that the employed have for the unemployed. That's why we have unemployment. And in the debate on the amendment I listened with interest to the fact of unemployment, I listened to the fault for unemploy-

[[Page 92](#)]

ment and I listened to the figures that were pertaining to unemployment, but I didn't hear a whole lot that would lead to freedom from unemployment.

I said to myself as I listened, "Surely, not among these people. Certainly these who have been selected from among the best. There's no way that these who are deeply involved in the political direction of British Columbia would not know this." But the longer I listened the more obvious it became — the reason we find unemployment such an insoluble dilemma is because we don't understand the basic fact of employment. It's so simple everyone must know it. And yet, the way we act, we certainly deny any knowledge of it and I am almost embarrassed to talk about it, but here it goes.

Jobs are not created. What would you create them out of? A job is a vacuum, it's a need. It's a need that some enterpriser has for a service that he cannot render or that he does not have the time to render. A job is not something you deserve. A job is not an obligation that someone has to give to you. If this were true then you would have an obligation to give a job to someone else.

A job is not a right. A job is not something you demand. There is no magic formula that you can just, presto, create a job. A job is something that is given to you, Jack. You become a beneficiary. If there are no jobs available, it simply means that there's not enough enterprisers out there.

Everyone has the right to become an enterpriser and have the satisfaction of giving a job to someone else. What's an enterpriser? He is someone — don't miss it — he is someone who is willing to risk what he has in the production of something that he hopes to sell in order to create enough profit to pay the wages of production and to create a job for himself. An enterpriser is one who must have enough confidence in the economy to make himself believe that all of this is possible. And when a government does anything to destroy or betray that confidence, the enterpriser evaporates and leaves the bitter sediment of unemployment.

I call on this Government to restore that confidence. At least, if they are unable because of their socialist philosophy to actively restore it, then at least to desist from making damaging orders-in-council and statements to the Press that would indicate that the age of boomism is over in B.C. Or that the incentives are not to be offered. Or that growth would not be sought for growth's sake. These statements supply the heat for the evaporation of the very enterprisers that we so direly need.

I say let's get on with it. As a great proponent of conversion, I say let's convert the welfare rolls which are swollen with employables and indeed which list even the vast numbers of the same persons who are listed in the 78,000 unemployed. Let's convert them to holders of productive jobs. When we do this we will restore the economy of British Columbia and the dignity of the individual.

After all, I hear those people of Chilliwack out there on the flood plains say, "When you give a man his bread you make out of him a debtor, a beggar even, with a sense of guilt. But when you give a man the opportunity to earn his bread, you make out of him a citizen with a sense of accomplishment."

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Big Book says, "Therefore in the sweat of his brow let a man eat bread."?

Mr. Speaker, there is wisdom out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver South.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to be able to address this House.

First of all let me compliment you and your staff in the Speaker's office on the very fine way in which you arrange for students to come into the galleries from day to day and for people from various groups in the constituencies so that they can see what's going on in this House. I think it's greatly appreciated by all the Members, and particularly the students.

One reason is that most of these students are in their teens, and ever since the age limit for voting has been lowered it means that by the time they are just about finishing their high school they are ready to vote. And these young people have to know what they're voting for and who they're voting for. They have to know the difference between the responsibilities of the federal government, the federal institutions, the provincial government and the provincial institutions. And through your office this is a great duty that you're performing to the students and to the schools of British Columbia. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to see the progress the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) has made toward the amalgamation of Kamloops and its adjacent townships and also in the case

of Kelowna and its neighbouring municipalities. Throughout the world today, with the development of a highly technological society and the development of the large, multi-national corporations, it seems that modern man is quickly becoming an urban creature.

I represent a Vancouver constituency, Mr. Speaker, and in that capacity I am very concerned about the rapid growth of our city, and the direction in which that city is being developed.

Vancouver has a mild, pleasurable climate with many natural physical attractions, not only for the tourists but for the new residents. To accommodate this present movement of people toward the lower mainland, much thought has to be exerted by all

[[Page 93](#)]

levels of government to make it a livable area for people, both for those already established there and for the newcomers.

It's widely realized that urban development everywhere is in a real state of crisis. A recent set of statistics showed that 75 per cent of our population in Canada now lives in urban centres.

But Dr. David Suzuki, who is an highly esteemed geneticist at the University of British Columbia, places that figure even higher. He says that only 12 per cent of the population live in rural areas.

Regardless of what the figure may be, it is too high to be taken lightly. It is a well known fact that approximately one half of British Columbia's population lives in the greater Vancouver or lower mainland area of this province. It must make us pause to realize that careful planning of such a huge urban area is extremely necessary if we are to give people the best quality of living possible without sacrificing efficiency.

One thing that we must remember is that cities should be for people, not just for offices and highrise apartments — for stores and other commercial complexes. Boyce Richardson, who is a journalist and a member of the Canadian Council of Urban and Regional Research, has written a book called "The Future of Canadian Cities." In it he points out that "we will never be able to build the institutions needed to keep the pressures of urbanization under control if we do not accept that the basic problem is to redistribute wealth, to equalize opportunity and to extend areas in which the public interest has priority over the private."

He states that "approximately one-quarter of Canadian families are now living in poverty — and that the deterioration of our environment is the reflection of the deterioration of our society." This quarter of population must be assisted in such a way that they are capable of obtaining the basic necessities of decent living — and that neighbourhoods in which they live will not be infested with irretrievable deterioration.

Throughout his book he suggests that the organization of our cities is a primary task on which our human future depends. The type of deterioration he speaks of, Mr. Speaker, developed rapidly following World War II when the middle class families, not only here in British Columbia but everywhere across Canada, began to desert the cities in droves and fled to the suburbs. Once there they demanded all the amenities that they had left behind that the cities had to offer.

These small satellite suburban areas formed their own autonomous councils with their own mayors. But most of the people still worked and did business in the cities. At the same time the core of the cities began to show decay. The poor were left behind and were unable to keep up the repairs and renovations.

Most of them lived in rentals, with absentee landlords who didn't give too much heed to the type of living accommodation that they were providing for the poor. As a result city revenues dipped.

Eventually, to rationalize that problem here, at least in Vancouver, the Greater Vancouver Regional District was formed. This has become almost like a third level of government in this provincial system. It is now no longer enough to think just of Vancouver or Burnaby or Richmond or New Westminster, et cetera. Planning is becoming

looked upon in terms of the entire regional district.

This has already been done in the case of hospitals, a service that knows no boundaries. Other services that should be included in this category are rapid transit, police and fire protection, ambulance service, water, sewer and pollution control, and light and power.

At the other end of the scale, Mr. Speaker, to rationalize city planning, individual citizens have started to show more interest as to what is happening in their own neighbourhoods. Many local pressure groups, in the form of citizen's councils, have sprung up to express their needs — and also to express their objections to the developments in their immediate neighbourhood without consultation.

It has resulted in the preservation of Gastown, of Chinatown, and has produced a highly satisfactory projected development of Arbutus Village. There's a hopeful spirit of overt cooperation developing between the city of Vancouver, the Greater Vancouver Regional District and the Provincial Government. With these three levels of government working together much can be accomplished.

The Vancouver citizens and their representatives in this assembly are looking forward with great expectations to the projected programme outlined by Mayor Phillips in his inaugural address early in January. No doubt not only will the citizens of Vancouver be watching with interest the development of the more people-oriented city, but so will the entire lower mainland.

As an integral component of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, the City Council of Vancouver has projected the policies which appear to be dovetailing effectively into those outlined by the provincial government in such areas as land management for the good of the city as a whole — reorganization of the city's welfare department; plans to preserve historically significant structures, - housing improvements in the depressed areas of the city, particularly skid row; development of an improved transit system, and a broader concept in the area of recreational needs.

Now concerning land management: Of all the influences on urban development, the management and control of land is the most important. In my view, unchecked speculation in and around cities and

[[Page 94](#)]

towns in B.C. is the most damaging result of the adherence to the theory that private interest is more important than public interest.

Saskatoon developed a good stock of land under public ownership by tax default following the depression — while most other cities across Canada, who have picked up land by tax default, sold it again to developers and to private enterprise. As a result, Saskatoon City Council became the biggest land developer in that city.

This intervention has done away with land speculation in Saskatoon and has kept the price of residential lots down to about one half or less of that of other cities such as Edmonton and Vancouver.

With the co-operation of the provincial government the City of Vancouver, like other cities, must discontinue the trend whereby more and more families are being forced into apartments where children have no backyard in which to play and where old people eke out their years abandoned in loneliness and misery.

Many of the family homes now ruthlessly torn down to make way for apartments or shopping centres are still good homes. A little renovation is all that some of them need.

We all waited with concern the results of the vote on the hospital referendum. It came as a great relief that it passed with such a sizeable margin, making it possible for health services to be delivered, satisfactorily in all areas of the lower mainland — in the interim period while adjustments are being made provincially in the health services field.

The health department is to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, for its open investigation of health services under Dr. Foulkes in order to seek more progressive measures for medicare and hospital benefits for B.C. residents.

The Greater Vancouver Regional District is to be complimented on its over-all work and planning on a sewerage programme, and its co-operation in this respect with the Pollution Control Board. This is one of the most pressing problems of a modern city. Co-ordination in environment and pollution control is needed throughout the entire province.

I think this is being developed quite rationally with committees that are working along the Fraser River in relation to pollution control on the Fraser.

Related closely to pollution control is another problem of major importance, however. As the city and the district continue to grow, the number of cars increases, producing noise and air pollution. But of greater importance is the orderly movement of traffic. This is particularly important in the core area of the city and along the highways during periods of heavy traffic flow.

The B.C. Hydro has taken the initiative in improvement of the lower mainland bus service by purchasing approximately 100 new buses to be delivered later this year. This is a first step toward better transit and eventually toward some form of rapid transit.

In Vancouver South, the prospect of the completion of the Hudson Street bridge will relieve the pressure of traffic which normally proceeds along the Oak Street bridge toward the airport. It will be heartily welcomed by the residents of Marpole who look forward to a revitalization of that area which has suffered severely since the closing of the old Marpole bridge.

It is regrettable, however, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government did not have the foresight to include two extra lanes which could have been allocated to buses only, for rapid transit linking Vancouver and Richmond.

In all urban centres careful consideration must also go into the planning of the recreational and cultural aspects as they affect the lives of the citizens. It has therefore come with great satisfaction and relief that the Premier announced early in December of 1972 that the provincial government will provide a grant of 1/3 of the capital cost up to the first \$1 million to assist in the construction of community centres by municipalities, cultural, ethnic or religious organizations as long as the facilities will be available to all who wish to use them.

In my constituency of Vancouver South, Mr. Speaker, the East Indian community are very happy and expressed their thanks for being able to participate in this programme. They are planning the construction of a community centre adjacent to the Sikh temple at Marine Drive and Ross Street.

The grant will also greatly benefit the Vancouver Parks Board in the erection of their new recreational centre in Vancouver's West End.

Co-operation of the provincial government has also been warmly welcomed in its promised assistance to the city in the matter of reinforcing the Point Grey cliffs. This will end the fears of many in regard to further erosion and possible damage to some university buildings in the immediate area overhanging the foreshore. The most dangerous area appears to be the foreshore just below Cecil Green Park.

Special attention is being given at present to that area immediately above the cliffs to the establishment of a Museum of Man. It is a unique concept and will be built primarily to house the vast collection of Indian artifacts of the Haida, Kwakiutl and Salish Indians of this coast. These anthropological pieces of art have been assembled over the years by Dr. and Mrs. Walter Koerner and by Prof. Harry Hawthorn and his wife, Audrey.

Many of the projects related to this endeavour will include special technical assistance and training of curators for museums in Indian communities, training Indian artists and giving assistance to Indian people in

archaeological work. These functions have in the past been shared among the Provincial Museum in Victoria, the city museum in Vancouver and the university museum. To aid in the construction of the new museum, the federal government is to be commended and thanked for generously allocating \$2.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily welcome the reference in the throne speech to plans for the development of the University Endowment Lands. Allow me to dwell on this topic for a few moments. This large tract of land has been preserved from the days of the McBride Government in the public interest to benefit the university. Unfortunately, even though it was originally intended to be used for profitable means whereby to endow the University of British Columbia, this has never been accomplished. Instead, little by little, a sizable portion has gone into the development of residential subdivisions of high quality without benefiting the university financially.

Sections of it have also been eaten away for other purposes. Recent suggestions have been brought forward as to the possible use of the remaining 1,600 acres. One was for a wilderness park, another for a bird sanctuary, and another to turn it into a housing development. There have been many other suggestions too, Mr. Speaker.

However, in my opinion, the best suggestion so far comes from a book that you may all know called *Politics in Paradise* by Dr. Pat McGeer. He suggests that this would be an ideal place to start a science city. He makes reference to a comparable development which exists in Palo Alto, California, adjacent to Stanford University. It has done much to thrust that area of the world into the glamour industries of this new age. Toronto has also developed one at Sheridan Park. It is the brain-child of the Ontario Government.

A science city on this location would have the benefit of being close to the B.C. Research Council and the technological and training facilities of the University of British Columbia. The purpose of a science city would be to research and develop new products. Eventually it could have a significant impact on the industrial life of the province.

We must begin, Mr. Speaker, to take responsibility for our own technological research if we are ever going to manufacture products acceptable on the world market that are distinctive from the products of other countries, or the other Canadian provinces for that matter, and if we wish to reduce our dependency on tariffs.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is a very exciting idea. Not only would it be a good use for this valuable land but it would also give new vitality to that part of Vancouver. It could create employment for many of our highly educated scientists and skilled technicians. Again I recommend this excellent suggestion, for which I give full credit to the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer).

Mr. Speaker, the West End of Vancouver is at present developing at an almost uncontrollable speed. Nearly every day one sees new high rise business towers and apartment blocks springing up. It is of utmost importance that the city planning department should work in close co-operation with the provincial cabinet in the conceptual use of the government-owned property of blocks 51, 61 and 71. These three blocks were set aside by the previous Government for a new courthouse complex. Halting of the construction of the 50 story high rise tower as part of that complex on this property has opened up a new area of consideration. It is much easier now to go back to square one and start over again.

The land itself cannot be moved but any commitment for its use is going to be a decision that will in all probability have to stand for decades. The people will have to live with it. Also it will influence everything that develops around it.

Dr. Edward Higbee, an American urban geographer of eminence, tells us that we are between 10 and 15 years behind the American cities in development. However, he suggests that this might be a good thing rather than a bad one. Although we have a tendency of following their lead, he warns us that it is not yet too late to avoid their mistakes. We must keep the city for people if it is to be at all livable.

As I suggested earlier, our west end is already getting to look like a little Manhattan. Let us, in the name of common sense, prevent it from becoming overgrown with high-rise business complexes and apartment buildings. There must be some breathing space. Stanley Park is one of the finest parks anywhere in the world. It has been

protected over the last 80 or 90 years by an independent parks board. However, it is a long distance from the corner of Georgia and Granville Streets. The preservation of Blocks 52, 61, 71, if developed partially as a park with trees and seating space to rest the weary shopper or the office worker, would create a delight for this entire area.

The modified plans for the Government building on this site as revealed by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) indicate a desire for slowing the density level of the West End. Similar care must be taken before any final decisions are made in the demolition of our beautiful architectural structures.

One cannot be but impressed in travelling to London, England. Here is a city of 10 to 12 million people, yet the British over the centuries have preserved the beauty of their historic past. Canadian tourists enjoy with delight visiting Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, the Tate Gallery, Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral and many other structures of historic fame. I only begin to name a few of

[[Page 96](#)]

these edifices. You could add many more to the list. They are all a part of the Britain that we love.

Also in this grand city, with its teeming millions of population, the British have had the foresight to preserve an amazing number of parks — small ones and large ones. If you have been to London, you will know that there are about four or five focal points in the City of London and from each of these you are within walking distance of any one of about five or six parks — small or large. The same is true of many of the other European cities.

I deplore the recent decision of the powers-that-be that wish to demolish Christ Church Cathedral in an attempt to build a revenue-producing high-rise block on that location. This church is one of the oldest examples of Gothic architecture in the city. It was built somewhere between 1889 and 1895 and it was the first church built in Vancouver's West End. It is an excellent example of the earliest phase of the Gothic revival style. The outstanding craftsmanship is especially evident in its interior, whose timbered roof and stained glass windows are incomparable. Let us in heaven's name try to preserve some of these beautiful buildings that are absolutely irreplaceable.

At present a huge development is being carried on in Vancouver South. This is a new subdivision. It takes up a large area of land. It goes all the way from 49th Avenue to the Fraser River and goes from Boundary Road to Kerr Street. The entire development is completely experimental and it is quite exciting. It will have quite a large population but the population will include a mix of upper middle-class homes, middle-class homes, low rentals, cooperative condominiums and some units in between that will be selected and are being used now already for welfare recipients, so that all of society can grow up together in one atmosphere. So different from where slums are in one area and low-cost housing in another and you leave Shaughnessy Heights and West Vancouver and places like that for the upper middle class and upper class.

The first phase of this subdivision has already been built and the people have moved into it. Generally speaking, those who are there now are very well satisfied with their accommodation. However, as in other cases throughout the city, as I have mentioned before, a regional council has been formed. The Killarney-Fraserview area council, which is watching the development and also helping by pressuring the developers to do the sort of things that they want to preserve the feeling of neighbourhood that they would like to have. For instance, the original concept was that there would be a population of 12,000 in that area and they have convinced the developers finally that they shouldn't have more than 9,800. That would be a much more realistic figure.

Another thing the area council is asking for in that area is to have the elementary school developed as a community school. That is a new concept in which the school is utilized fully for the whole community. They already have a day-care centre there but they would like a community school so that adults can also use the school in the evenings and that there is a continuous programme for the children. Because, particularly in highly dense areas, the children have to have someplace to go, someplace to play once school is out. It has been proven where they have community schools that there is far less vandalism than there is in the ordinary school.

Right next to this particular subdivision they have a very good example of what is very close to being a community school, and that is Killarney Secondary School, where the community centre was built adjacent to the

school, and the gyms of the school and the community centre are, interchangeable. Also the children from the school can use the swimming pool and the skating rink in the community centre and the playing fields are right there for them. You never pass Killarney but you don't see a hive of activity around the community centre, the school and the playing fields.

Also about five years ago they changed the library in the school to make it a public library. So that it is used as a school in the daytime and in the evening after 4 o'clock the doors are open to the library itself and it becomes a library in the afternoons and over the weekends for the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I like to think that while towns and municipalities are being amalgamated for efficiency and to cut down costs, that the people in these areas do not lose their identity as members of a closely-knit neighbourhood.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to quote from Boyce Richardson's book, *The Future of Canadian Cities*. This is what he says: "I want to awaken Canadians to an important fact. Many options are open to us. We have the tradition, the wealth and the knowledge to work on our political, social and economic systems so that we can create a decent and maybe even exciting country which will be a pleasure for Canadians to inhabit and an example to the rest of the world." Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Lauk moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General, that on Wednesday, January 31, 1973, and on all following days of the session there will be two distinct sittings on each day, one from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. and one from 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. unless otherwise ordered.

MR. SPEAKER: You heard the motion, are you

[[Page 97](#)]

ready for the question? The Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to that motion, moved by myself and seconded by the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after 11:00 p.m. in the last line thereof and substituting therefore "unless the unanimous consent of the House is obtained to proceed beyond the hour of 11:00 p.m."

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment appears to be in order.

MR. CHABOT: Speaking to the amendment, there have been indications here that the amendment — motion I should say — presented this afternoon is clear cut that the House will adjourn at 11:00 p.m. I want to assure you because of the discipline that I have seen exhibited in this House by the back benchers that it is quite obvious that we could be involved in very lengthy sessions indeed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not true.

MR. CHABOT: There might be rumblings in the corridors and other places in the province of a split between the cabinet and the back benchers.

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. CHABOT: But I assure you, when I speak to this motion, it's quite obvious to me...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would you stick to the motion please?

MR. CHABOT: Speaking to the motion. I'm speaking to the motion as to what might happen. What might

happen, a motion might be put by the Government and I want to assure you that that motion would be readily rubber stamped by the Government supporters. I've listened on many occasions to the pleas of some of those Members and primarily the Member for Kootenay (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and I think it's only fair that I indicate what he had to say just couple of years ago.

He said this. "My reason for moving the amendment..." and he did move an amendment "...is that over the years the problem of night sittings, of late night sittings, has plagued this House many times. One of the problems that when we come back at 8:00 for the evening sitting as to when we are going to adjourn is left up to whoever is in charge of the House". And that's exactly what you are attempting to do at this time. But, in the afternoon we made a definite time limit from 2 to 6 o'clock. Now, why shouldn't there be a time limit on the evening sittings? We're only asking for it from 8:00 to 11:00 p.m. and if necessary at any time that you need to carry on after the 11:00 p.m. time on an emergency basis. Now I don't think that there's any necessity for the Government to have the power to force this House to sit beyond 11:00...

AN. HON. MEMBER: Where were you last year?

MR. CHABOT: Especially in view of the motion that they presented in this assembly in the month of October was very clear cut. They fail to indicate clearly that they support adjournment at 11:00 p.m. In view of the fact that they've made public statements that they intend making the role of Member of the Legislative Assembly in this province a full occupation, if that is the case I see no necessity really for carrying on beyond the hour of 11:00 p.m. I would hope that under the circumstances that the Members will look at the amendment that I have proposed and give it its support to ensure that there's no need to sit beyond 11:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Where? Is it signed? Or not signed?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I believe that the...

MR. CHABOT: You're challenging the Speaker, now — asking him to ...

MR. SPEAKER: One minute please.

MR. CHABOT: Stop challenging his integrity.

MR. SPEAKER: I may point out that the motion is well signed, The amendment is a procedural motion and therefore does not need a seconder. Therefore there is no seconder in this case. The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government rejects this motion. Events have surpassed that Member's ability to grasp them. There has been a dramatic change in this House. We accepted the amendment from the Liberal party early in October. We're looking forward to a complete rule change so that these things can be laid out but I must say quite honestly it's a little bit galling to witness

[[Page 98](#)]

this performance after my 12 years experience in this House where we've sat through all night until 12:00 o'clock the next day and I never once heard that Member get up and complain that we were working overtime or anything else.

I would find the amendment a little more acceptable if it were someone who was new to the House or someone who had no previous experience, but coming from the Member it is that the hollowness of what you've got left with no memory of what you inflicted on this House. We have made arrangements and agreed to amendments. The point is not well taken by the mover of the amendment. I find it an incredible lack of either sensitivity or

memory and we reject it.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The Hon. Liberal Leader.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it appears that the basic objection to the amendment is of course the mover of it. I think from our point of view, we do believe that — if I can start from first principles — we do believe sitting after 11:00 p.m. is not a good idea.

We'll be sitting probably from 2:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. with a couple of hours off for dinner, or as today we will cut that slightly short. We of course will probably have a number of committee meetings in the morning and many of us — in particular Members from Victoria city — have constituents who drop in early in the morning or relatively early and I have no wish to sit that much after 11:00 p.m. so we will actually be supporting the amendment. I do feel that...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, I think that we have a unanimous — and I see the Attorney-General shaking his head — but the amendment does provide for unanimous consent extending past 11:00 p.m. for any case of emergency which I think is fair. We agree with the Premier...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No parliament in the world has that foolishness.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, he says no parliament in the world has that foolishness. If he was the same man who was quite willing to rule out changes to the question period on the grounds that we were having a rule change later on and now of course he's willing to put in a motion to change things at this stage.

All I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we think that it's not a bad plan to have a requirement for unanimous consent for proceeding past 11:00 p.m. We will be supporting the amendment and we trust that it will be judged more on its merits than the person who actually proposed it, which seems to be such a basic objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. House Leader for the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I too am surprised at the speech by the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot). I also sat here until 11:20 a.m. one day — I forget what time it was — but anyway I was plenty tired when I went home and it was such a fruitless night. Nothing was accomplished. To have him stand up in the House now and piously get all upset about something that we decided in October at the special session, leaves me a little disillusioned.

But not only that. I'll go further and say that on the basis of what has happened so far, I thought we were trying to create an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, at least between two sides of the House, even if we have our philosophical differences. I think, Mr. Speaker, the sentiment of all of us, including even the Member for Columbia River, is that we will not go beyond 11:00 p.m. unless there is some very clearly demonstrated reasons so to do.

For that reason, this party will be opposing the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Mr. Speaker, even though the amendment to the motion does not need to be seconded as you perhaps pointed out to me rightly, I would like to speak on the amendment, if I might.

All I want to say is this and I'll be very short. That it has been demonstrated this afternoon as it will probably be demonstrated again in this House, that on occasion unanimous consent will be given to go beyond the ordinary adjournment hour. Now I've sat in this House for a few years and I've noted that regardless of what might be said by

either the Government side of the House or the Opposition, the thing that generally becomes involved when we get to a position at 11:00 p.m. wherein an adjournment is denied is that some time during the day or during the evening session there was acrimonious behaviour on the part of both sides of the House that led up to that decision not to allow that adjournment to take place.

Now this is a position that we'd be in as Opposition. If we do not have unanimous consent to go beyond the 11:00 p.m. adjournment in the evening, then it's just a matter of what the Govern-

[[Page 99](#)]

ment decides they wish to do. They know that they have the majority of votes on that side of the House and they can force any sitting, any night of the week beyond 11:00 p.m. if they so desire.

Now if it is a conscientious thing on their part and a sincere thing that we do not proceed beyond 11, they will accept the amendment, Mr. Speaker. They will accept it that on the basis of the consent — unanimous consent of the House — we do go beyond the 11 o'clock adjournment. I would hope like the rest of these Members that that does not have to happen too often.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver Centre.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): I would like to speak out for the Government backbench, Mr. Speaker. Most of us outside of this House in years gone past are most aware of what went on under the Social Credit Government in Victoria. We know the kinds of things that went on and we are not in support of this amendment. It is clear...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LAUK: Well, I just talked to everybody here. But after what happened in those years, to have the learned Member from Columbia River stand up and say, "The people of British Columbia — we've got to protect the people of British Columbia." It's a little bit galling, as the Premier has said.

I want to make another point, Mr. Speaker, directing my mind to this proposed amendment...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. LAUK: ...that they have not demonstrated the spirit of cooperation that we have really and sincerely desired from them. That is the first point that should be made and I'm speaking for myself, of course.

The second thing that should be made — there may be a time when this House should be able, in an emergency situation involving something of urgent public importance, to go beyond the 11 o'clock deadline. There may be a time that because of the responsibility of the Government, they have to go beyond 11 o'clock and there may also be a time when those obstructionists over there will prevent us from doing that.

Amendment negatived on the following division:

YEAS-12

Smith	Richter	Chabot
Jordan	Fraser	McClelland
Morrison	Schroeder	McGeer
Anderson, D.A.	Brousson	Phillips

NAYS-38

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

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS-41

Hall Macdonald Barrett
Dailly Strachan Nimsick
Stupich Nunweiler Nicolson
Brown Radford Sanford
D'Arcy Cummings Dent
Levi Lorimer Williams R.A.
Locke King Hartley
Skelly Gabelmann Lauk
Lea Young Lockstead
Gorst Rolston Anderson, G.H.
Barnes Steves Kelly
Webster Lewis Liden
Wallace Curtis McGeer
Anderson, D.A. Brousson

NAYS-9

Richter Chabot Jordan
Smith Fraser Phillips
McClelland Morrison Schroeder

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald presents the 51st annual report of the Liquor Control Board ending March 31, 1972.

Hon. Mr. Stupich files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

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