

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

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 1067](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

An Act to Amend the Mortgage Brokers Act (Bill No. 109) Hon. Mr. Macdonald. Introduction and first reading — [1067](#)

An Act to Amend the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Act (Bill No. 119) Mr. McGeer. Introduction and first reading — [1067](#)

An Act to Amend the Protection of Children Act (Bill No. 111) Hon. Mr. Levi. Introduction and first reading — [1067](#)

Oral Questions

Vancouver Island natural gas pipeline. Mr. Morrison — [1067](#)

Flooding of Skagit Valley. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1067](#)

Release of information. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1068](#)

Labour-Management conference. Mr. Chabot — [1068](#)

Report on B.C. Hydro finances. Mr. McGeer — [1069](#)

Purchase of apples from China. Mr. Wallace — [1069](#)

Amalgamation of Kamloops. Mr. Fraser — [1069](#)

Government purchase of Ocean Falls. Mr. McClelland — [1069](#)

Employment in B.C. Insurance industry. Mr. Gardom — [1070](#)

Diphtheria toxoid for school children. Mr. McGeer — [1070](#)

Annacis Island sewage treatment plant. Mr. McGeer — [1070](#)

Special ceremony

Mr. E.K. DeBeck called to the Bar — [1070](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [1070](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1070](#)

Hon. Mr. Bennett — [1071](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1072](#)

Mr. Wallace — [1072](#)

Committee of supply: Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce estimates.

Mrs. Jordan — [1072](#) Mr. McGeer — [1081](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1073](#) Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1082](#)
Mr. Radford — [1074](#) Mr. Nunweiler — [1082](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1074](#) Mrs. Jordan — [1083](#)
Mr. Fraser — [1074](#) Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1084](#)
Mr. Brousson — [1074](#) Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1084](#)
Mr. McClelland — [1075](#) Hon. Mr. Barrett — [1086](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1076](#) Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1087](#)
Mr. McGeer — [1076](#) Mrs. Jordan — [1087](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1077](#) Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1088](#)
Mr. McGeer — [1078](#) Mr. McClelland — [1088](#)
Mr. Lea — [1078](#) Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1089](#)
Mr. McGeer — [1079](#) Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1089](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [1080](#) Mr. McGeer — [1089](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [1081](#)

Department of Education estimates Mr. Schroeder — 1090

Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1092](#)
Hon. Mrs. Dailly — [1091](#)
Mr. Nicolson — [1093](#)
Mr. Curtis — [1092](#)

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MORTGAGE BROKERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Macdonald moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 109 intituled *An Act to Amend the Mortgage Brokers Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 109 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRITISH COLUMBIA HYDRO AND POWER AUTHORITY ACT

Mr. McGeer moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 119 intituled *An Act to Amend the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 119 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

AN ACT TO AMEND
THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN ACT

Hon. Mr. Levi moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 111 intituled *An Act to Amend the Protection of Children Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 111 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Seymour.

MR. C.S. GABELMANN (North Vancouver Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I think I missed my chance a bit earlier to make a couple of introductions and I wonder if I might do that at this point.

Leave granted.

MR. GABELMANN: Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today — and I would like the House to make both groups feel welcome — are a group of students from the Argyle Secondary School in North Vancouver and a group of Girl Guides together with their leaders from North Vancouver.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): I am afraid I missed the opportunity myself. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would join me in welcoming a group from the Grace MacInnis NDP Club in Victoria.

Oral questions.

VANCOUVER ISLAND
NATURAL GAS PIPELINE

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Premier and President of the Council. Has the Public Utilities Commission written any correspondence to the government requesting instructions concerning the proposed natural gas pipeline to Vancouver Island?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the Public Utilities Commission is waiting for a government policy decision on whether or not natural gas will be used for the generation of electricity. That policy decision has not been made by the Government at this time.

FLOODING OF
SKAGIT VALLEY

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In his discussions in Washington Wednesday next with Rufus Smith of the State Department, may I ask him whether he will be formally presenting the province's objection to the flooding of Skagit Valley?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will not be meeting with Rufus Smith on Wednesday; it's on Tuesday. The meetings are scheduled to discuss the problem of potential oil tankers travelling down the coast. At the present time the matter of Skagit Valley is in the hands of the federal government who have agreed with the provincial government's position and we have an understanding that they are taking our position as a federal government on this matter to Washington.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask whether the Premier will indicate to this

House early in the future whether or not the province will make a clear statement regarding

[[Page 1068](#)]

liability for previous undertakings entered into by the provincial government of B.C.

HON. MR. BARRETT: That is a matter under discussion between the Province of British Columbia and the federal government.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I ask one further question, Mr. Speaker? Will there be some definitive statement on this in this House prior to any trip to Washington of the Premier?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, in terms of a trip to Washington, as I made clear, the trip to Washington is based on the oil tankers and the opposition the provincial government has taken to that oil tanker route and the submission to the United States of an alternative proposal.

The alternative proposal will be made available to all of the MLAs on Tuesday afternoon. There will be a Press conference at 8:00 Tuesday morning here in Victoria, a simultaneous Press conference in Ottawa along with the Press conference in Washington after we have made a formal presentation of our alternative proposals.

We will be notifying the Prime Minister, the official Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party and the leader of the Ralliement des Creditistes of our position on Monday next, one full day before we have our public Press conferences with our position.

The matter of Skagit Valley. Again, the Skagit is not a presentation we will be making to Washington. Negotiations are continuing with our federal government and when we arrive at a mutually satisfactory position between the federal government and the Province of B.C. In terms of the possibility — and I use that word advisedly — the possibility of compensation, there will be a public statement.

RELEASE OF INFORMATION

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the severe criticism that has taken place regarding the Columbia River treaty and the alleged failure of adequate discussion beforehand, may I ask why the information will be provided to federal politicians and not to Members of this House prior to the Premier's trip to Washington so it can be discussed and, if there is the possibility of improvements to be suggested either from my friends on my right or on my left or ourselves, this could perhaps be incorporated into the presentation in Washington,

HON. MR. BARRETT: I think the matter is one of protocol. We have an obligation, we feel, to deal through our federal government. No contact was made with the United States government without prior approval of the federal government. I have had phone conversations with Mr. Sharp and his departmental staff. I made our position clear at that time through telephone conversation. If Mr. Sharp wishes to make the content of the conversation public, I am prepared to do the same.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the question was perhaps misunderstood. I understood the earlier reply of the Premier to indicate that leaders of the federal House — not the federal government, but leaders of other parties in the federal House — were being informed prior to the information being presented to Members of this House.

It is that point that I would like cleared up. Why is it we have the leaders of the Ralliement des Creditistes informed before leaders of the Social Credit Party of British Columbia? It is this thing which the Premier could comment upon and clear up as to why it is necessary to inform federal politicians prior to provincial politicians.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I have no objection to make my office available at the same time that the federal Prime Minister receives the material in advance. It will be on the same condition that I have advanced the throne

speech and the budget speech. That is, no statement until the official Government policy is announced. If the leaders agree to that, I have no objection to them having a pre-release, none whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Columbia River.

LABOUR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): A question of the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether all parties invited to participate in the joint labour-management conference to be held in Harrison Hot Springs early in April have accepted?

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't had confirmation from all the parties as yet. They're still coming in and we have received quite a number.

MR. CHABOT: A supplementary question: Can the Minister advise the names of the parties that have failed to acknowledge or have indicated that they will not attend?

HON. MR. KING: Well, I can make that information available to you, if you wish to place a question

[[Page 1069](#)]

on the order paper. Certainly you'd have that information then. At this point, though, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I've had no indication that any party has refused to attend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

REPORT ON B.C. HYDRO FINANCES

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): A question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier received any report from the Comptroller General regarding the financial operations of the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority?

HON. MR. BARRETT: ...to immediately move into B.C. Hydro and B.C. Rail as to the internal operations and the accounting procedures. The first draft report has been received on Hydro; no report yet on B.C. Rail.

AN HON. MEMBER: You've never been there before?

MR. BARRETT: Was that a question for me, or for the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. McGEER: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would the Premier table that initial report?

HON. MR. BARRETT: I don't think I can table it at this point. I haven't even had a chance to share it with my colleagues. But I certainly take your request, under advisement.

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

PURCHASE OF APPLES FROM CHINA

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture apropos the "buy B.C." policy. Could he tell us if government-run institutions are actually buying solid pack apples imported from the People's Republic of China.

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): It was brought to my attention that one government institution was buying solid-pack apples packed in Formosa. When this was brought to my attention, I did take it up with the Minister and was assured that this would be looked into and changed. If the Member or any other Member has some more recent information, I'd certainly be pleased to take it up again with the Minister concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Cariboo.

AMALGAMATION OF KAMLOOPS

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister now had an opportunity to review the ruling of the Supreme Court judge that the residents of Kamloops are to be given a democratic vote on the amalgamation question?

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, I haven't seen the report from the court. I expect to have it this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Incidentally, Members will recall that you can't ask what a Minister is going to advise the Crown to do about it.

The Hon. Member for Langley.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF OCEAN FALLS

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. I have at hand a telegram from the president of Local 312 of the United Paperworkers International Union of Ocean Falls, British Columbia, which reads as follows: "Could you please confirm or deny television reports that the provincial government has purchased Ocean Falls. Those rumours are creating confusion in our community." Mr. Minister, can you now give to the House either confirmation or denial of this question about the purchase of Ocean Falls?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Well, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly deny the statement that the Government has acquired Ocean Falls. That is not the case. I would like to say, however, that we are generally concerned about the northern coast of British Columbia, various communities of northwestern British Columbia, and the future economic viability of that area and employment in that region.

It's an area that has not been shown the concern that was needed by the previous administration. We are carrying on active discussions yet with Crown Zellerbach regarding Ocean Falls, and with others with respect to all of northwestern British Columbia.

MR. McCLELLAND: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, after that fine speech from the Minister. Do those acts of negotiation include the possibility of purchase?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: There's always a wide

[[Page 1070](#)]

range of possibilities. There's a considerable amount of social capital in Ocean Falls that the former administration agreed to. We have \$2.5 million invested by the previous administration in a new high school — an administration that apparently didn't confer with Crown Zellerbach Corporation at the time the investments were made. We're looking at all of the possibilities with respect to the northern coast of British Columbia, unlike the previous administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was pretty sharp, Bob.

MR. SPEAKER: On the same question? Proceed.

MR. McGEER: The supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is would he confirm reports in the newspaper that under no circumstances will the Government be buying all or part of the Columbia Cellulose operation in the Prince Rupert area?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. You cannot, as you know — you've been circulated with this matter — you can't ask questions of that sort, as to whether you confirm or deny something somebody read in a newspaper. It's just not done.

The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

EMPLOYMENT IN B.C. INSURANCE INDUSTRY

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): A question to the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Highways give assurance to the House that he has plans to find employment for individuals in the B.C. Insurance industry who face loss of their jobs as a result of the provisions of Bill 35?

MR. SPEAKER: There again, we're not in the speculation business in this House in that form under question period. Nor are we to refer to, or debate in effect, some bill that's on the order paper that's appointed for a different time to be debated in full. Therefore, I must rule that out of order too.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. First Member for Vancouver-Point Grey rising on another question?

DIPHThERIA TOXOID FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

MR. McGEER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am. This one is a question to the Minister of Health. Will the Minister of Health be recommending booster doses of diphtheria toxoid be given to school children throughout the province?

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): Mr. Speaker, in those areas that were affected — and they've been isolated now. The carrier, as you probably are aware, was in the United States and there was a small concentration in the upper island area. In that area we've already administered those dosages. Certainly, the health department will be checking out whether or not the children in the province are well protected. Unfortunately, I can't give you the dosages that are necessary, but my department is looking at it very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member again.

ANNACIS ISLAND SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

MR. McGEER: I have a question for the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister tell us when the Annacis Island sewage plant will be opened? Will it be delayed beyond the 1975 plans as a result of his order that there be secondary treatment included?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: To an extent, that's up to the Greater Vancouver Regional District, Mr. Speaker.

We have advised them through the Pollution Control Board that further treatment is necessary at Annacis because of our concern with respect to the fishery resource and others, a concern unfortunately not shared by the federal authorities. It's entirely up to the regional district. We have set our conditions and I think they understand them.

MR. SPEAKER: The question period is over. The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a request of the House to move that the rules be suspended to pass the following motion.

Leave granted.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House acknowledge the auspicious occasion of the ninetieth birthday of the Clerk of the House, Mr. E.K. DeBeck, and tender to him our affection and esteem for his many years of service to the assembly and its Members; that we wish to mark the historic anniversary with suitable symbols and indications of that respect. For that purpose we hereby call upon him to be escorted from the chamber and returned to

[[Page 1071](#)]

face the assembly at the bar of the House without the embellishment of his robes of office. Seconded by the Hon. Official Leader of the Opposition.

Motion approved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Attorney General.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a presentation to Mr. DeBeck who, if I may say in just a brief word, is a friend of us all. His family is well known to me — five children, some of them present here today, four of them, I think; 22 grandchildren and only five great-grandchildren.

I want to present this charter to Mr. DeBeck, and it reads as follows — it's under the hand and seal of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:

"Elizabeth II by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom, Canada and her other Realms and Territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith, to all to who these presents shall come or to whom they may concern, Greeting:

"Know ye that reposing trust and confidence in the loyalty, integrity and ability of Edwin Keary DeBeck we of our especial grace, certain knowledge and mere motion do constitute and appoint the said Edwin Keary DeBeck to be one of our learned Counsel in the Law during our pleasure, with all and every the rights, fees, authority, profits, privileges, emoluments and advantages unto the said office of right and by law appertaining;

"And we do hereby confer upon the said Edwin Keary Debeck rank and precedence from the day of the date of these presents in all our Courts."

This may be the only "Q.C." granted this year. (Laughter). It's not really a precedent. We're being consistent. It's a ninetieth birthday celebration and if there are any questions, they may have to wait longer, that's all. It's not a precedent but it's a gesture.

I want to thank the Law Society who helped to expedite this very nice presentation to our friend Mr. DeBeck.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Attorney General and the Hon. Premier present it to Mr. DeBeck, are there any statements that the different party leaders wish to make?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government — on behalf of myself — Ned has been a "father" to this House ever since he came. I feel that as one of his parliamentary "grandchildren" I have a very special honour in being able to make this presentation to him today.

I want to make a public confession. Ned felt that I would always be a failure when it came to the rules of this House and I'm afraid he was consistent, as he was in all other things, and was correct again. Although I have been studying very hard, and the rules book that they gave me will remain with me for the rest of my life, that rules book was referred to one other time in this House, and I'd like to remind the House of it.

On one particular occasion — it was a rare instance when I was in trouble in the House and I was moved out of trouble by the Clerk's adroit manoeuvring. I received the next day a copy of the rules of the House. Written in the copy of the rules was a note &h. from Mr. DeBeck, and it goes, as I recall, almost word for word:

"Given to the young Member from Dewdney on the first occasion in his years in this House when he showed any desire to learn about the rules."

(Laughter).

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very happy occasion. It's been my pleasure in over 30 years as a Member of this Legislature to know Mr. DeBeck extremely well. When we weren't so busy in the early days, before being called to lead a Government, many an evening I spent with him playing bridge. He is as good a bridge player as he is a good Clerk.

In a serious vein I want to say this, that Mr. DeBeck is 90 years old today. His life is an example to all British Columbians, especially to the youth of our province; a man who has had in his lifetime many careers and who has been successful in each and every one.

He is a good family man. He is a great friend of those people who work with him and for him. He is a great person to cooperate with people that work with him in this Legislature. He is, I say again, a great example for all of us in this House and outside this House for a life well invested.

Mr. DeBeck, I want to congratulate you on reaching this ninetieth birthday. It has been my pleasure to rise in the House, as the Leader of the Government did today, each year to make some remarks. I hope that some of the Members in this House will be here 10 years from now when they will again give you some presentation and a new decoration from Her Majesty the Queen on your hundredth birthday. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. leader of the Liberal Party.

M R. D. A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it

[[Page 1072](#)]

is with great pleasure that I too join with the other party leaders in the House and all Members of the House in congratulating Mr. DeBeck on his ninetieth birthday and on receiving this very unique honour — or what may become a very unique honour — of the province.

Mr. DeBeck is a man who is totally non-partisan. We're all aware of that and we all admire him for that, in spite of the fierceness of debate that sometimes goes on around him and over his head.

It was not always this way. At one stage he did take part in partisan politics, but managing the campaign of the uncle of my Hon. friend immediately on my right, the Hon. First Member for Vancouver Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) persuaded him that partisan politics was to be put aside. Thereafter he, of course, has become a paragon of non-partisan behavior in this House.

HON. MR. BARRETT: We all have skeletons in our closets. (Laughter).

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I am sure the Premier and I, when we are 90 years of age, will have as many perhaps as there are now.

I checked the horoscope, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's instructive to read the horoscope of our Hon. Clerk:

"If today is your birthday, you are introspective, selective, capable of perceiving when something of importance is about to occur."

Well, we've all seen his ability to do that.

"You are able also to gather and delineate information which is hidden from others."

That no doubt was the talent to which the Hon. Premier referred to earlier when he said that he could never see how he was out of order, but Mr. DeBeck always did.

Sir, it's a great pleasure to join with the other party leaders and all Members of this House in wishing you a most successful ninetieth birthday and many more to come.

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

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, it gives us a great deal of pleasure to offer our congratulations and very best wishes to Mr. DeBeck. Mr. DeBeck is not only distinguished as a Clerk in this House but I think a well known and distinguished citizen of British Columbia. In fact, he is part of the history of British Columbia.

If there is one outstanding quality which Mr. DeBeck conveys to me, this is his constant sense of dignity and decorum in this chamber. It seems to me that he brings an atmosphere of dignity in his personal poise and in the manner in which he conducts himself. Sometimes I think if there's anything that's really needed around here, it's dignity and decorum.

One might even say that he sometimes brings an atmosphere of reverence to his role. With his famous quill pen he reminds us of a more elegant era.

I wouldn't want to leave the thought that I regard him as being necessarily old-fashioned in his attitudes and in his performance. I think one of the really outstanding features of Mr. DeBeck is that he has an alert and active mind and is very interested in a wide scope of the affairs of this province, including the youth, as he has done in his past life.

Mr. DeBeck, we wish you the very best of health for many years to come.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I move that because of this occasion that this House on rising stand adjourned until 3:30 p.m. this afternoon. I wish to advise members of the public that they are welcome to visit the Douglas Building cafeteria until 3:30 p.m.

The Members will attend the ceremony in the new Ned DeBeck lounge.

The House adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

The House resumed at 3:30 p.m.

Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Ms. Young in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT, TRADE AND COMMERCE

(continued)

On vote 119: Minister's office, \$19,406.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I'd like to refer back to last evening's debate for a moment, in relation to the give-away gimmicks that are practised in British Columbia. I ask the Minister's position on this.

I would like to make one more point in suggestion, because I don't want you to use a sledge hammer where a tack hammer will do the job. In considering the banning of these in British Columbia, would you please look in depth to the situation where some service station operators have installed equipment at their own expense?

I would like to cite an example of a service station operator who has just put in a car wash. He's put in \$40,000 of his own money. He uses this as an

[[Page 1073](#)]

in-service attraction for his customers. He gives them a free car wash. I think it would be a shame in drafting any new legislation to not leave the option open for the operator himself to offer some type of in-service benefit to his customers.

In doing so, I think one must recognize that this could leave a loop-hole. I'm sure it wouldn't happen, but a company might wish to exert pressure on an operator to provide this in-service benefit, regardless of whether he wanted to or not. I would hope that in taking these steps you would provide an avenue for appeal for an operator, with the proviso that the appellant would not necessarily be identified, so that there would be no repercussions on him for appealing this pressure that might possibly be applied to him. I would invite the Minister's comments on that.

I would ask for the Minister's comments on another situation. That's in relation to an article that appeared in the *Vancouver Province* on February 10, 1973, I believe it was, about a wharfage hike hitting port cargo. My understanding is that the National Harbours Board, through various means, is imposing or undertaking action that will impose an increase on wharfage charges in British Columbia, particularly in the Vancouver harbour. Tankers coming in here will face an increase of 30 per cent berthage charge and 75 per cent wharfage charge, which adds up to an increase in cargo of approximately \$ 1.05 a ton.

We can't help but be concerned about what this will do to the competitive position of the Vancouver harbour, in relation to the eastern harbours, which are under the Harbours Board's jurisdiction. I understand that the same facilities will be offered in the east in the ports that are under the National Harbours Board's jurisdiction at 86 cents a ton there, on the average. So we have \$1.05 per ton average in British Columbia and 86 cents per ton there.

It's recognized that there has been some difficulty, even now with a competitive rate, of attracting cargo to Vancouver because it can be as cheap to ship your cargo from the Pacific Rim countries via the Panama Canal up to the eastern ports. This would put Vancouver in a very unfavourable situation, as well as helping to overbalance the problem we already have, or enhance the overbalance of freight shipping by railways. In other words, it may prove less expensive to ship from the Pacific Rim countries to eastern Canada, and freight back by rail or truck to British Columbia, again upsetting the balance or the inequities that we're trying to correct. The inequities of the freight charges by the railways are based on the fact that we don't ship as much east as they do west.

I would invite the Minister's comments on that, and ask him if he has looked into the situation in detail and what he is prepared to do about it. I do recognize that the National Harbours Board doesn't come under your jurisdiction, but I don't know who else in British Columbia would have the authority to present a case to stop this.

It also has a great effect, I think, in relation to Seattle's ports which, as you are aware, are offering very severe competition to the British Columbia port. A number of items which are sold in British Columbia, both imported and exported, are going to the Seattle port. This increase in tonnage there, as I understand it, will enhance that now less than competitive situation.

I would also ask if it can come under your purview for comment as to whether this type of increase in tonnage charge will be considered for Roberts Bank, for the bulk tank carriers. If so, what is this going to do for Roberts Bank's competitive position, both in relation to Seattle and in relation to eastern ports?

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce): In answer to the Hon. Member, in the first place I can't regard a car wash as one of the three G's — games, gimmicks or giveaways. I think a person in that kind of an enterprise should be protected.

In answer to that second question, you'll notice that in vote 122 we're voting \$35,000 to a new organization called P.T.A.C., Pacific Transportation Advisory Council, in cooperation with Alberta and Saskatchewan. The office will be in the city of Vancouver. It will be of the three governments and some transportation companies involved to a minor extent in sharing the expense. It will be our eyes and ears and our advisory source with respect to all of our transportation problems. It will also be our instrumentality as a western unit to make representations to the federal government in regard to things like wharfage and freight rates.

MRS. JORDAN: I have a supplementary question to ask, Mr. Minister. I appreciate your comments on this; I think this is an excellent programme. Have you done anything in relation to this increased charge to date? Is it in effect and is it hurting our position in the interim time?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I'll just have to say that we're looking into that. I appreciate your bringing it up.

MRS. JORDAN: Do you feel with confidence that the prairie provinces, our neighbouring provinces, are sympathetic to the use of Vancouver ports, as opposed — to eastern ports, if there is no price difference? In other words, have they a slight tendency to be for the development for western ports, as opposed to eastern ports'.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: I would ask the Hon. Members to address the Chair.

[[Page 1074](#)]

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Yes, Ms. Chairperson, may I reply again by saying that I think that in terms of western transportation we have a lot of common interests with the prairie provinces. I think they want to use our outlets; they want to eliminate the bottlenecks that have occurred from time to time in British Columbia. They are as interested as we are in decent wharfage charges and low freight rates. I think we'll be able to make representations to the federal government in their sphere of jurisdiction in a unified way, including the problem that you've raised.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver South.

MR. J. RADFORD: (Vancouver South): Ms. Chairwoman, I would like to ask the Minister a question.

Has the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce given any consideration to the increasing of or inducement of the industry of building and constructing of more pleasure boats in B.C.? The reason for asking this question is that pleasure boats and boating in B.C. are big business. It's a fact that boating is one of the largest recreational industries going. I suppose that this is because we have a year-round climate and we can boat year-round. We have all the sea that lends itself to this sport.

In a survey in May, 1971, Statistics Canada showed that 25 per cent of the families in B.C. own a boat. It's also startling to find that 90 per cent of pleasure crafts in B.C. are imported. Also, a survey in 1971 shows that B.C. produced 3,000 pleasure craft — this also includes home-built craft. Also in the year 1971, 27,583 pleasure craft costing many millions of dollars were imported into B.C. This includes imports from all countries. Approximately 93 per cent of these imports were from the United States.

Now this industry, Ms. Chairman and Mr. Minister, is a fairly high labour-intensive industry. It's a clean industry, the demand is here and the increase is expanding every year. The labour rates in this industry are comparable to that of most of the countries that we import from.

I think our Attorney General opened the last Boat Show. I think he has a little knowledge of what went on in that area. At the last Boat Show we had a display valued somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$4 million.

Also, most of the industry type vessels that are produced in B.C. — tugs, fishing vessels, barges — most of these types of vessels are produced in B.C. contrary to what I've said about the pleasure craft. I think, Ms. Chairman, that this department, the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, should do some research and some feasibility studies on building more pleasure craft in B.C., because I think it's a terrible situation where we have 90 per cent of the pleasure craft being built outside of B.C. Thank you.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I think the Hon. Member has raised a very good point. We've surveyed the fishing tackle industry, we've not really thoroughly surveyed what you are suggesting. We should.

May I add to that that Captain Bob Masters and Audrey Masters, his wife, are going to, as you know, circumnavigate the northwest passage and the world in a ferro-concrete boat, under sail, built solely of B.C. materials. We're supporting that programme because all of the components except the engine - I think there'll be an auxiliary engine — have been manufactured in British Columbia. It's just a very modest beginning in terms of what the Hon. Member suggested.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Member for Cariboo.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Ms. Chairperson, thank you.

I have a question that I want to ask the Minister of Industrial Development, in whose area of responsibility both major and secondary industry fall.

I would like to refer to a document which lists the resolutions presented to the NDP convention last fall at the Bayshore Inn in the City of Vancouver. I'll only refer to two of the resolutions. They're called "priority points". 1) That the NDP nationalize the leading forest industries in the province.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's another portfolio.

MR. FRASER: 2) That the NDP nationalize MacMillan Bloedel.

My first question is: Is the takeover of the forest industry top priority with the Department of Industrial Development? Secondly, how soon do you plan to negotiate for the takeover?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The answer to the first question, Ms. Chairman, is no, and the answer to the second question is ditto.

MS. CHAIRWOMAN: The Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Capilano.

MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver Capilano): Madam Chairman, addressing some comments to the Minister in this department, I really

[[Page 1075](#)]

think that the estimates of the former minister in this department were really more fun.

I'm sorry to say that, Mr. Minister, but this has been rather dull, last evening and this afternoon. But I really think also that in the past many of us used to despair, as a result of those estimates of that former Minister, that anything very much was going to be accomplished. I hope very much that this will be different now.

I think it's very clear, Madam Chairman, that the Minister is concerned, and his department is concerned. The important thing here is that this department is the one that, regardless of policies in finance, and policies in resources,

and policies in mining and many other departments, has the opportunity to develop wide diversity, a wide range of jobs. This is an important thing to recognize. Unfortunately, I don't think the previous Minister did recognize this. There are so many ideas and there is so much material in this field.

I recall that a year ago I spent 30 or 40 minutes listing available ideas in this field, and really, as far as I can determine, very few of those ideas, or any others that were suggested by many Members of the House were implemented.

I haven't seen a copy of the chart that the Minister held up last night. He didn't seem too familiar with it. He had to look at it pretty closely to find the little boxes. But he did indicate that he had something going on in his department. I hope those things will begin to happen.

Let me give the Minister just one example of the kind of thing that's being done by his counterpart in Ontario. The Ontario Ministry of Industry and Tourism has recently announced the opening of an industry, trade and travel centre located at King Street West and University Avenue in Toronto:

"The object of the centre is to provide product displays, a catalogue centre and audio visual facilities to promote Ontario made products. You're cordially invited to visit the centre any time you're in Toronto. If you have products made in Toronto which you wish to either list or display, will you please contact ..." so and so.

[Mr. Dent in the chair]

Now there's a simple example of something that this department, Mr. Minister, could be doing now in aid of British Columbia made products. We've listed in the debates in this department, over the recent years that I've been in the House, dozens of suggestions of that kind and we've heard nothing happening. I hope that this Minister will see that some of those things happen for British Columbia.

I hope that this Government will have a Minister that gets out and sells B.C. products around the world. We've never had that before. The Premier used to go out and do the selling job for British Columbia. He used to go to Europe once a year and things of that kind. I think we need a Minister of Trade and Industry to do that selling. That's his job.

Mr. Chairman, if we have this concern, and if the Government really wants to demonstrate the concern it has in this area, to recognize the importance of it, will the Minister please answer one question? When will this Government honour the importance of this job by giving it a full time Minister?

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Yes or no?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, that's under the jurisdiction of the Hon. Premier. You already passed his salary without putting that question to him. Your timing was wrong, it's too late. You can't ask me.

MR. CHABOT: Cop out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I recognize the Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two questions to the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development. The first has to do with a problem that appears to be emerging in Canada with regard to community antenna television, CATV. Many of the governments of the provinces of Canada are talking about this particular problem and what kind of control they want for their provinces. I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development has been considering the matter of CATV, and whether or not the Minister of Industrial Development has any plans for the provincial control of CATV in the future.

The other question I'd like to ask the Minister of Industrial Development has to do with what I consider to be a remarkable increase, Mr. Chairman, in the amount of money needed this year for the data processing centre — a total of 86 new jobs in that department alone, and a budget that's almost double, Mr. Chairman, in that department alone. Of the total increase in the whole of the Industrial Minister's vote of something less than \$3 million, over \$2

million of that increase is in data processing, which seems rather remarkable.

I heard from across the floor a comment about car insurance. Is that total increase in that vote for the automobile insurance or the insurance commission? And if it is for that commission, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister of Industrial Development whether that increase will be shown as a charge against the *Automobile Insurance Act*, or will it be hidden in the data processing centre? And will we be told what that money is going to be spent for?

[[Page 1076](#)]

HON. MR. MACDONALD: In answer to the Hon. Member's first question, cablevision gives us a great deal of concern, because we've seen really incredible profits made in what is essentially a public service. I think that the greater Victoria area is a prime example. I can't blame in any way the initiators of the plan in this area, but the profits in providing a simple service and using, I suppose, B.C. Tel lines, or Hydro lines, has been a little bit out of control.

Now, we haven't had provincial jurisdiction in that area. But, on the other hand, the Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Pelletier, has indicated that, as Saskatchewan has done, there could be some relaxation of federal broadcasting control in order to give local control in a field such as has been brought up by the Hon. Member. So we're very actively studying and pursuing that subject. We want to know just what our powers are in the field of telecommunications, including cablevision. I think it's a very important area, but I can't make any further statement on the matter at the present time.

So far as the data centre is concerned, that is something that will be in motion in the coming year. That is, it will be floating out of this department, because it really serves a number of departments of the government. It's not related really to our work nearly to the extent that it is to the work of other departments like Finance and, in this case, Highways and auto insurance.

A lot of the increase in personnel will be attributed to the development of the auto insurance plan. I have no doubt about that. Whether or not that will be charged to the plan is a question you should address in committee, I presume, to the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan).

AN HON. MEMBER: It's under your vote.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Yes, I know. Of course we're paying for it. But whether something will be charged to the new plan which hasn't come into effect yet, is a question I ask you to address to the Minister of Highways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. McCLELLAND: We realize that the Minister of Highways has responsibility for the insurance but, as was pointed out, it is under the vote of the Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce Minister. It is part of the wide question that we tried to bring up earlier, and that is that we don't want charges for the cost of automobile insurance hidden in a department like this one. Will we be able to tell?

The other question, of course, is how much of that increase is attributable directly to automobile insurance? Is it 80 of those 86 jobs or 70 of those 86 jobs, or how many?

With further regard, Mr. Chairman, to the CATV, I wonder if the Minister is giving any thought, as some people appear to be, to harassing, perhaps, the CATV people by refusing them the use of Hydro lines. Has this ever entered into the minds of the Attorney General or the Industrial Development Commission? It is happening in other jurisdictions.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, we don't proceed by harassment of anybody, any company, any person, in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw the *Land Commission Act*.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No heavy hand so far as this Government is concerned. Just good social policies acceptable to the community.

In terms of the data centre, my best estimate is that about 80 per cent of those jobs are from the expansion of the very capable services that have been under Mr. Hatfield in terms of driver licences, drivers' records and car records and they are attributable, I think, to the new auto insurance plan. Probably about 80 per cent.

Put a question on the order paper. If there is a way of breaking it down, we will try and break it down for you. You have got to address the questions about the other bill to that Hon. Minister who I am sure will have a very good answer for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a few questions at the Minister of Industrial Development — do I have the name of the department correct, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That is what it is now but it is changing every day.

MR. McGEER: I know he is having difficulty. I feel a little like the admiring boy that said to shoeless Joe Jackson when it was found that he had been throwing a ball game: "Say it isn't so." I thought the last person in the House that I would have to stand and criticize and draw attention to his actions, regarding a slur on somebody in British Columbia, would be the Attorney General and Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Be my guest. Go right ahead.

MR. McGEER: "Go right ahead," says the Attorney General. With great respect and honest

[[Page 1077](#)]

regret, Mr. Chairman, I am going to do that. The Attorney General, or rather the Minister of Industrial Development, in December of last year, closed down the industrial development offices in San Francisco. He sacked a total of four people in a decisive economy move.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Two people.

MR. McGEER: Two people.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: One was re-employed and the other has not applied.

MR. McGEER: "I have examined these operations very carefully," said the Minister.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Which I had.

MR. McGEER: "I can tell you quite frankly that since 1969, we have had practically nothing in the way of a report out of San Francisco."

HON. MR. MACDONALD: True.

MR. McGEER: "No echo as to any sign of life down there." Mr. Chairman, I have visited that office in San Francisco upon two occasions under the former administration. I couldn't believe what I read. So I wrote and asked exactly what had been sent to the department.

Mr. Chairman, this is one year's worth of "life" from down there. It is two inches thick. It is a file of reports — a description of opportunities for industrial development for firms in British Columbia. It is a plea for the

department to show some "life", some echo of activity up here.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's right.

MR. McGEER: May I quote just one plaintive memo from the civil servant who was sacked summarily because he had no sign of life.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Come on. He has a job in the United States. There is no problem there.

MR. McGEER:

"I believe that at this time, if you are concerned about expenses, you should limit them, but in the form that I and any other officer can interpret. By this I mean that if I knew I was allowed only 1,000 miles per month, \$300 per month entertaining expenses, et cetera, then I could plan my months ahead of time. The way it is now, I'm getting my expense accounts returned for adjustment after I have made the expense. If I do make an adjustment it comes out of my pocket. However, this is secondary."

Now, I illustrate this for two reasons, Mr. Chairman. One is that this civil servant, who was sacked for no sign of life, was quite prepared to pay out of his own pocket the expenses that were necessary to do his job effectively for the people of British Columbia. This memo merely draws attention to the fact that he cannot possibly make the appropriate contacts with leading industrialists in California if he isn't even allowed to take them to lunch. What is he supposed to do? Take them to the hot dog stand on the corner?

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): How many did he take to lunch when he had an expense account?

MR. McGEER: Well, I would be very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to make the file available to the Second Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk). I don't intend to take the time of the House reading it from one end to the other.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I should hope not.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, I have studied this file, and it is very clear that the Minister was not aware at the time he sacked these two civil servants ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Don't say that. He wasn't sacked. You're running the man down. The office was closed.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's right. That's not sacking. He has a job in the United States and he is quite happy with it. The girl is re-settled with the Canadian commission.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. McGEER: Well, Mr. Chairman, he wasn't sacked — he was laid off, at a time when we were making hundreds of thousands of dollars available as bonuses to welfare recipients. I have no complaint with that. I think generosity near Christmas is a very Christian virtue and that we should have done that for these people. But to choose as an economy the firing of people who are trying to find jobs for British Columbians, to accuse them of having no sign of life when they have been more than doing their job — when the lack of life has been in the home office, specifically the office of the Minister — is not only unfair, but is a disgraceful slur on people who have given more than their all for the development of this

[[Page 1078](#)]

province.

Every person is entitled to his day in court. We have fired civil servants in British Columbia summarily and

not given them this opportunity. If my information is correct, Mr. Chairman — and the Minister can correct me on this, if I have been misinformed — when he went down to San Francisco, after studying this situation so carefully and informing himself of how much life there was down there, he got down right in the offices of the trade commissioner and didn't even know that those same offices were being used by the department of tourism. He thought they were in a different location.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's not true.

MR. McGEER: I said you would have an opportunity to correct the situation if my information is wrong, but I say this, Mr. Chairman: at least the Minister left the impression down there, when he appeared and closed the office on the same day — his first and last visit, as the Minister of Industrial Development - that he was not aware of what the department of tourism was doing in that same region, in co-ordination with Industrial Development, to see there were opportunities in this California market which alone has more people than all of Canada, and which has a purchasing power at least 40 per cent greater than our whole nation.

Mr. Chairman, whether you consider this kind of evidence a sign of life or not, the closure of those offices was an act of ignorance and mischief. I say mischief, Mr. Chairman, because I heard the Members that now sit in the Treasury benches when they were in Opposition standing up and attacking San Francisco House because they thought it was a . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member please withdraw the two words, "an act of mischief". I would point out to the Hon. Member that you cannot impute an improper motive to a Member of this House,

MR. McGEER: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I misinterpreted those speeches. But they were made. Mr. Chairman, you weren't here but I listened to those speeches. I didn't take them terribly seriously at the time. But of course it all came home when one of the first acts of the new Government was to close down those industrial development offices in San Francisco.

It may have been. I wouldn't dispute that the former Government thought that a defeated cabinet Minister was the man most able to represent us in California.

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

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: No, that defeated cabinet Minister. After all he opened the office. I can't pass any judgment on his contribution. He passed away.

But it was after that that I had the opportunity to visit San Francisco House on two occasions. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I had been alert to these accusations of political patronage. But having visited that office on two occasions I was most impressed with the work that they were doing; and I was quite frankly shocked when the Minister chose, as one of his first acts in office, to undertake that punitive measure, which has set industrial development back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member be seated. Would you state your point of order, please?

MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that after the Chair has directed the Hon. Member to follow a direct order from the Chair that he should do it. I'd like to see that order followed out.

MR. McGEER: If you'll recall I did acknowledge that I may have misinterpreted those speeches. But, Mr. Chairman, since neither you nor the Member for Prince Rupert were present on the occasions when they were given, I felt it only fair to describe the content of those speeches.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. In responding to your point of order, I'm sure that the Hon. Member did not mean to impute any improper motive to the Minister. Would the Hon. Member please carry on.

MR. McGEER: Perhaps the Minister will have occasion to give a more appropriate explanation to this House. I would certainly like to hear from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what offers were made to these two dedicated civil servants in California of alternative positions in the civil service? I'm pleased that one has had an offer to go to work for the United States. I am not sure whether that's an advance for Canada or not. I would view it with some regret, but that's a personal opinion.

What choices, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, did the civil servant in question have?

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I really have regrets in raising that particular subject because it involves human rights.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

[[Page 1079](#)]

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, this isn't gossip. This is ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member please address the Chair.

MR. McGEER: ... a file which I would make available to any Members of the House.

MR. LAUK: Have you read it?

MR. McGEER: Certainly I've read it. And I would ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member please address the Chair or be seated.

MR. McGEER: May I say that I have read the file very carefully and my regret is that the Minister obviously did not.

I want to shift the subject, Mr. Chairman, to ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Shall I answer on that now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. McGEER: No, I'd like to carry on for a minute or two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member continue please.

MR. McGEER: I just have one other general subject to raise. I'd like to hear the Minister's opinions on that too.

Mr. Chairman, the most important direction that we could take in industrial development in British Columbia is to shift our base away from the resource development field which we've depended upon almost entirely up to this stage in history.

I've spoken many times in the House before about the need for the Government to stimulate a breakthrough into the high-wage, rapid-growth technological industries which have really formed the base of development for those most rapidly advancing countries in the world.

The estimates of the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce for some years now have

almost been a joke. It's been a matter of profound regret to me that a subject which is so fundamental to the future of British Columbia should be dealt with year after year in this way.

The former Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Bonner) was the last one really who offered any real enlightenment to this particular portfolio, but he was more of a world economist and an expert on resource exploitation than he was an exponent of the modern industrial course in the world. So we never have had in our history, Mr. Chairman, a Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce who was alert to the third phase of the industrial revolution in the world and the proper part that British Columbia might play.

Of course the nerve centre or the brain of this kind of development must be technological innovation. It's in this particular respect that we have been so conspicuously lacking in our province.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, of the development a long time ago in evolution of the great dinosaurs and mastodons who achieved enormous physical stature. As specimens of size and strength of course they would have demolished homo sapiens. But their brains were very small and indeed as they grew in size their brains failed to keep pace.

They even developed enlargements of the spinal cord near their posterior that was larger than the brain itself. Because they lacked intelligence and could not adapt to their environment, of course they became extinct.

So it seems to be with our approach to industrial development. We've depended on strength of physical assets and ignored the nerve centre — the brain. Yet those nations which have placed a premium on this particular aspect have been the ones that have experienced the most rapid growth since the second World War. These are selected nations in Europe and Japan in Asia.

I had reason to quote in an earlier speech in the House this year the experience of the Philips Corporation, which was experiencing growth in employment of between 15 and 20 per cent per year in the number of jobs as a result of their constant flow of new innovation — products in demand in Canada and other countries in the world.

While this kind of growth has taken place in the sophisticated electronics industries, in computers, in plastics, in pharmaceuticals, the basic industries like forestry and mining are actually decreasing in the numbers of people who are employed. Of all the major industries that exist today, one of the slowest growing in terms of jobs is the forest industry.

In Canada the number of employees per unit of production is substantially decreasing. So nothing could be greater folly, Mr. Chairman, than for us to stake our future, in terms of provision of jobs or development of opportunity, than to bank entirely on resource industries, particularly the forest industry and the mining industry. Therefore we must turn elsewhere.

The Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce has to be the catalyst for all of this. He has to understand it; provide the directions, the stimulus, the interest, the inspiration. That's why it's heartbreaking, Mr. Chairman, year after year to go through these estimates, to scan them in detail,

[[Page 1080](#)]

looking for that little flicker of light that would indicate a change of direction and to find it every year totally absent.

One way that we could gain some indication that there is a change of direction would be the allocation to the B.C. Research Council. This is the repository, if you like, of technological innovation in British Columbia, sponsored by government initiative. Yet the appropriation for the B.C. Research Council has failed to grow for many years now. It's stuck right on dead centre. If we can't even see the advantages for enlarging activities in that sphere, how can we hope to tackle the much larger and more complicated job of spurring a whole new field of industry?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce why is it that we're making no effort at all in the technological area? Why is it that the B.C. Research Council is left to shrivel

on the vine year after year with no effort to improve it on the part of the provincial government? Why is it that we continue to put all our eggs in the natural resource basket and leave ourselves open to complete domination by the newer industrial species that are coming along?

We're the Brontosaurus, if you like, of the industrial world. The newer species that have far more brains, though smaller physical stature, are coming to command our resources and leave our working people at their mercy — whether they want to have the coal or whether they want to have the copper or whether they want to have the raw pulp, to make the more sophisticated goods the world's consumers are beginning to demand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I should deal with the first matter first — the matter of the San Francisco office. I'm astonished at the lack of research of the Hon. Member. He starts out talking about four people sacked. In fact, it was two people. The tourist side moved to a different location. He hinted about Christmas time. The fact of the matter was that the lease was expiring on December 31 on Market Street and the premises had to go anyway.

I acted upon a report from an industrial consultant with the highest credentials. I can give the credentials at some time if the Hon. Member wants them — Murray Bryce, who has acted in this kind of field for 10 to 12 different governments in various parts of the world — the United Nations and so forth. He reported to me on these offices on November 15. I didn't want to have to go into this letter in detail but perhaps I should.

"I strongly advise that both of these operations...."

that's the Los Angeles one too,

".... close, as they are doing almost nothing of value to the department or B.C. There are many reasons why the operations are not more successful."

And I'm going to leave out any comments about personnel in this respect. If my friend wants me to read that portion of it — the suitability of personnel — I will, but I'd rather not.

"They're going through the motions of maintaining contacts with banks and chambers of commerce but can point to practically no examples of even moderately successful dealings in several years."

We had no productive thing. When I went down to San Francisco approximately a month later, I went down with two things in mind: to check this out by personally speaking to the young man in charge, who is Mr. Steve Turbis — who was, incidentally, taking his M.A. I'm not criticizing that.

He was partially helped at the expense of the B.C. taxpayer during these years. That doesn't mean he couldn't also do this job, but don't talk about hardship too much. Think about the taxpayer too and think about the fact that we can't be in a straightjacket in these things. We have to take action sometimes.

In respect of the personnel, let me say this. Mr. Turbis was offered three months' pay on the closing of the office. He was also offered the opportunity to reintegrate into the civil service here in Victoria if he chose to make that application. As I gathered from him and as, in fact, has happened, he wanted to stay in the United States of America. He has done so and I'm informed that he is employed down there.

His secretary seemed like a very capable young lady to me — and a very attractive young lady, Trudy Friedli, I think her name was. Following this matter, I spoke with Jim Nutt, the Canadian consul in San Francisco. He asked me what I thought about the services of this person and said she would like to be absorbed in their organization.

I gave her a high recommendation and she is now working there — in the Canadian service, not the B.C. So the personnel hardship, I think, can be written quite off. The office thing remains.

"A large part of the time of the representatives of the department, especially in the San Francisco office, is taken up

answering inquiries from people thinking of moving to B.C. and helping them in such matters as information on employment and jobs, land purchases and similar business.

"While these are courtesy services to those who inquire, it is hardly a part of the department's responsibilities and, in any event, the people could get the information elsewhere."

So the tourist branch continued in a different location. They had to re-establish, and that kind of courtesy work is being carried on.

[[Page 1081](#)]

"An example of the ineffectiveness of the operation is shown by the experience of the San Francisco office, who over the past three years have mailed over 100 copies of industrial studies pointing out opportunities for manufacturing in B.C. These were sent to selected California firms in the same business. This operation failed to produce one single acknowledgment."

I have the file here too that my friend has.

"Another example of the ineffectiveness of the programme: The San Francisco office sent 500 letters to B.C. manufacturers offering to help them develop contacts in the California market. Only three of the firms replied and not one of them started exporting to California.

"In closing these offices, B.C. development will not be significantly affected. If, at some time in the future, B.C. does have an active, outgoing industrial development and trade promotion programme, it might be desirable to have one office in California, probably Los Angeles. But even this is problematical as it might be even more effective to send travelling representatives from Victoria to keep and to make alive the B.C. contacts, in not only California but the other western states."

I might also add that when I went down to check things out — I don't think I said this — I spoke to Mr. Steve Turbis for about three-quarters of an hour. We kicked the thing around as to whether the department could really show an example of how it was helping B.C. In the industrial aspect.

I put it squarely to him. I said, "I've got this report. It doesn't show that the department is getting a useful, productive return at all from this office in the industrial sense. Have you got any comment?"

My impression of the conversation was "no" — that he didn't really disagree with the report that I had in my hands. So I think it's partly our reorganization because, as that report indicates, we have to try a totally new approach. But it's partly that as a Minister in charge of a department, I've got to make sure that the taxpayer's dollar is being productively spent. And it simply was not productively spent in that San Francisco office in terms of department of industry activity.

My duty was to act upon it, particularly as the lease was coming to an end and if it was going to be re-established somewhere else in any case. I took what care I could of the two people who would be affected by that. I don't like my friend to say that they were sacked.

I know you may say it's a nice distinction between the two, but that is a derogatory reference to them. I wouldn't like it applied to somebody like Trudy Fredli, who is now profitably re-engaged. I don't think "sacked" is the appropriate word at all. They're now happily re-engaged — one in private industry in the States; one in the Canadian trade commissioner's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon, First I Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. McGEER: Really, Mr. Chairman, I think that it's all very well for the Minister to try and smooth over the damage that he's done with that glib two-page letter that he quoted from. Really, that could hardly be construed as an in-depth report. I think for the Minister ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member be seated please, while I make a point? The point is that this subject has been exhausted. The Minister has responded ...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of the Minister to continue the discussion, then the Member may proceed. I recognize the Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we're going to have to get one or two things straightened away. It's not up to the Minister to announce to the House whether or not he's willing to continue. It's up to the Members of the House. As a point of order it may be, through no fault of any Ministers or any Members, that an answer does not satisfy ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've made your point and I'll respond to it if you'll be seated.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that reasonable debate does not simply depend on a reply from a Minister which may or not be satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member for Vancouver–Point Grey be seated while I respond to the Hon. Second Member for Victoria?

It is my responsibility to act in accordance with the rules of the House. I am acting in accordance with standing order 43, which I feel is important in this particular instance. When a matter has been sufficiently canvassed, then it's important to proceed on to a new subject.

However, it appears to be the wish of the Minister to continue the discussion. Therefore, you may do so.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the attitude of the Minister in this, more so than yourself. The Minister has indicated his willingness to continue canvassing a subject which

[[Page 1082](#)]

involves civil rights. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, standing order 43 refers to "tedious repetition." So far I've repeated nothing. What I said the first time around is laid at rest.

The Minister has indicated a report and I think it only fair to comment on the adequacy of that report. Because the things that are said in the letter which the Minister quoted from hardly coincide with the volume of information that I have.

I think it would be tedious, though not necessarily repetitious, for me to read memos while he reads pages from his report. But I think it only fair for me to tell the Attorney General that since he closed that office down I have had correspondence from firms in California which had previously been in touch with our industrial development commissioner regarding a desire to establish in south-eastern British Columbia. One such firm was McClary Plastics, and their interest was in locating in the area of the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick). This is an area that does have high unemployment and where we're terribly anxious to establish new jobs and new industries of a secondary manufacturing kind.

This kind of information I think is indicative ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: Would you expect yourself or any other private Member of the House to receive inquiries from an industry in California? When the thing comes down to a private Member, it's an act of desperation. I presume it was sent to me as former leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Chairman, the point that I am trying to make really is not to say, "Well, I've been asked to assist because they've closed that office in San Francisco down and they can't get anything out of the Minister." It's to point out that the justification of an industrial development office does not depend on his being able to say at the end of each year, "I founded five industries in British Columbia." If we look for that kind of evidence, which obviously is the kind of

thing implied in the report that the Minister read, we simply are never going to get anywhere in establishing the kind of manufacturing in this province that we have to have to bite into the 100,000 unemployed, which seems to be a way of life in this province — massive unemployment due to lack of manufacturing industry.

What we should be doing, Mr. Chairman, is everything we can to encourage this sort of thing. Because one or two industries, even in 10 years, would pay for themselves again and again and again.

Our industrial development commissioner should be a catalyst to establishment of contact between producer and consumer. I know the new philosophy of the Government is that they should run it themselves; they should be into that industry. But that can't be the criterion for success. The new Government can't take over the whole of the private sector. It still has to see its role as catalyst and initiator.

What we've really done is to see the establishment of those California offices as the bathwater of a previous election, and they've thrown the babies out with it. I think the Minister has made a dreadful mistake, industrially speaking, not just in impugning — no matter how he slides over it, the statements that appeared on the front page of the Vancouver *Sun* on December 12 were unfair and unjustified, and they deserve comment in this House. For a man like the Attorney General to have done this sort of thing — Mr. Chairman, once more I just have that feeling, "Say it isn't so."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Did my friend send that letter that he received to the department? It came to the department? That's fine.

I just want to say that the Ontario offices should be studied in this connection because, contrary to what the Hon. Member says, they're given goals, they have definite programmes laid out in terms of attracting new industries or selling products, and their justifiability depends upon their achieving those goals. They do report as to whether or not they've achieved the goals that have been set for them and whether or not in fact the office is justified. I think my friend has got a pile of correspondence there but he hasn't really indicated anything productive that really came from that office in terms of actual results.

Consequently, I think the decision taken was in the public interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Fort George.

MR. A.A. NUNWEILER (Fort George): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on labour-intensive secondary industries which to me appear to be directly related to the United States tariff charges against Canadian manufactured products. I'm thinking of manufactured products in general, including manufactured forest products.

The records show that Canadian exports to the U.S. on such things as plywood, which is a high intensive labour product, run around 15 to 20 per cent. In effect that means that just because it's highly labour intensive they encourage the production of that product in the U.S.

We go to the production of logs. There is no duty charged against any Canadian logs that go to the United States, nor is there any duty against lumber — just the labour-intensive products.

[[Page 1083](#)]

We also have examples of other manufactured products, such as furniture, which goes up to around 17.5 per cent and appliances go up to about 10 per cent. When we look at tires, Michelin recently was tagged with a 10 per cent surcharge on Michelin tires going to the United States.

In thinking about this, I notice at the same time that we do export one product which does assist them in manufacturing the products across the border, and that is our hydro. We sell our hydro at a very low cost. It reaches

them, they process our logs and products and in order to maintain their own market down there naturally they defend it with a tariff cost against us.

When we talk about Canadian plywood going to the United States, it is frustrated because of the 15 or 20 per cent tariff charged against it. We do have various parts of the province throughout the north — I can think of one in particular - that are suffering from the shortage of hydro to manufacture plywood where there is a great deal of good, round log, veneer-type timber available, but it cannot be processed into plywood because the hydro does not exist. I am talking about the east-central part of the province, namely Valemount and McBride.

There is a veneer plant in the area. It should be expanded, but it can't expand because our hydro is being exported to the United States where they want to produce our plywood in many cases with our logs.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if he has had his department or is in a position himself to look at these types of situations. Because when we talk about industry I think we should talk about labor-intensive industries.

We should also look, I believe, at another product in that area, namely cedar, which apparently has a low demand at this time. There's a large area there that has over-mature cedar that is just literally going to waste. Thousands of acres have a high percentage of cedar and it's just literally going to waste. Is there any action being taken to find a market for that product or some type of product that would emanate from cedar?

I'd like also to make mention of the large railway industry in British Columbia. Is there any action being taken to see whether the manufacture of rail cars can be accomplished in British Columbia? I think high labour-intensive industry is something that we should give our devoted attention to. I would like to have an answer from the Minister if I may.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I think that all three suggestions are valuable and particularly perhaps the last, in terms of the amount of employment, and they're all being looked at carefully and I appreciate the suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with great interest to the first Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer). I often find him an interesting speaker. But I must say that I'm sure the Minister was beginning to feel like the sweet young thing who'd been courted for six years by the same man and wondered when he was going to pop the question. I also would caution the Minister that when we have hard-core businessmen writing to neuro researchers for economic advice we're in trouble and maybe you better listen to some of the suggestions he makes.

I'd like to ask two questions with relation to that report. When was it commissioned, and who commissioned the consultants?

One or two other things that I would like to bring up in relation to the Minister's comments in answer to my question regarding a western province transportation authority. I recognize this subject is very delicate in relation to labour-management interrelationships. But would you undertake to examine very closely some type of protection for the producers of agricultural products when their products get to the various wharves in British Columbia.

We have a most thorny situation in British Columbia now, and they have had their problems on the prairies with the wheat. What happens is that the agricultural product gets to the docks and it's not shipped. It's not the dock people, it's not the National Harbours Board, it's not the Department of Trade and Commerce or anyone else who suffers. It's the producer.

If the policy of your government is to lock-in agricultural land and lock-in farmers, then I feel you must, you absolutely must guarantee the producer a return for his crop when it arrives on that dock.

If you can't do it through some understanding with labour, either yourself, or the Minister, or through this

authority, then you must set up some type of an insurance programme. Because it's one group in society, and I don't necessarily deny their right to strike, but it's one group in society making just too much of a demand on the fellow who's already got his problems in order to satisfy their own needs.

I would ask that the Minister look into this and come back to this House next year with a report on this and some type of a programme that will guarantee the producer the shipment of his crop

[[Page 1083A](#)]

regardless of the provincial situation, the labour management situation.

The next thing that I would like to ask the Minister, or point out to him, is again in response to one of the statements he made and this is what brought it up. I don't have my file on it, but you mentioned cablevision.

The CRTC, as you know, made a ruling where there could be no importation of American stations to expand any present system of cablevision in any province. One can certainly well respect the desire of the CRTC to develop Canadian talent, to encourage a viable television industry in Canada, and perhaps to provide alternates through CTV and CBC and any other station. But what it's done in actual fact is created poor cousins in all parts of Canada, and certainly in British Columbia.

I wouldn't bring this up, Mr. Minister, except that we know that current cablevision service areas have been expanded since this ruling came in. I think in Victoria, if you build a new apartment, you can apply for cablevision. You can bring in all sorts of American stations. This is where you sit right on the border and you don't even need a cable. You can switch around and get most of the stations anyway.

Now, in the interior of the province, not only are we poor cousins in this area by geographic definition, but we don't think that we're any more susceptible to the immorality or corruption of Perry Mason than you are in Vancouver, or the people are in Toronto.

Where it comes under your jurisdiction is that you're responsible for the economic development of all communities in British Columbia. As you know, the Okanagan for example, even the north, can prove to be very desirable places for retired people to live. But retired people like to watch television. I'm sure the Minister's been known to sneak the odd viewing of a programme. Retired people are interested in Canada, they're interested in the Canadian culture, but you know, their days of fighting are over. They can enjoy an American programme just as much as a Canadian programme. They want variety. So the problem is one that discriminates against this group of people. It also makes it more difficult for interior communities to develop a good viable retirement community.

Really the same applies for handicapped people, where television is a very important part of their life. There's no other word for it, they are discriminated against.

The tourist industry — tourists have been known to have a lovely day outdoors and want to have a picnic supper in front of the television in their motel. While they may be very interested in a Canadian programme or a current affairs programme, at other times they're relaxing and they're on holiday. They really just want to use television for entertainment or possibly to put them to sleep.

But as long as these cablevision companies are operating in certain parts of the Province of British Columbia, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, then the people outside that area feel they have a right to enjoy this.

I think that you could suggest, recognizing the intent of the CRTC ruling, that American stations pay a levy to CBC, perhaps a percentage to CTV, to help stimulate Canadian television. But we're never going to develop a national culture and Canadian television and Canadian talent by force. People have died for the freedom of the airwaves. You know that as well as I do. It'll develop if it's good. It'll develop if the people select it. But it sure will get a setback if it's rammed down their throats.

In light of the fact that the Minister brought up this subject, I would urge you to make representation to the

CRTC to allow expansion of imported programmes into other parts of the province. Again, perhaps bring back a report to us.

One other question I would like to ask briefly. That is again, your department and your relationship with Mr. Kierans.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: My relationship? We're not related.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Minister, you're a pretty humorous fellow in this legislature, but you're ruddy scared of the business community of British Columbia. And they may enjoy your humour, but they're not enjoying your actions. They are very concerned and we are very concerned about who you utilize in an advisory capacity for the development of industrial management and industrial programmes and trade in British Columbia. We have nothing against Mr. Kierans personally. But we would like to see you use advisors who have been successful in their own field, who have been successful in their own country. We don't feel British Columbia should ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: He's a millionaire.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, if you judge a man's character by how much money he's made, we're in even greater trouble than I thought we were.

He was a member of the stock exchange board of directors, and I must say he didn't do very much to protect the interests of the little people in that capacity. He was director of the post office for Canada, and if anybody can ever clean up that mess, I'll take my hat off to him and you can hire him as an advisor.

We want successful people advising you. We feel that you have some very competent people in your department, and we don't want you bringing some airy-fairy theoreticians into British Columbia. We feel

[[Page 1083B](#)]

that the solving of British Columbia's employment problem and secondary industrial development problem is not going to rest solely on theory. It's going to rest on the ability to make practical applications and tough decisions.

When competent business people in British Columbia suggest that that man's statements sound like Uganda, and when they say that Mr. Kierans — yes, this was a prominent businessman in Canada saying that Mr. Kierans' statements made one of the provinces sound like Uganda. Another businessman said that Mr. Kierans' statements sounded, and I quote, "It sounds as if he wants to confiscate everything." This is not the type of man that's going to increase the confidence of the business climate and investment climate in British Columbia.

We feel you should stay away from him. We feel that you should use the people you have in your department. We feel that there are many competent, successful business people in British Columbia whom you could consult with if you had some specific problems. We feel that there are other well trained, competent, theoretical, practical people who could give you good advice.

I would ask the Minister; will you drop this hot potato and will you get some much more sound advice?

You've already, I'm quite sure unintentionally, created a very shaky investment climate in British Columbia. Let's not have a headline attributed to you six months from now, chastising investors in Canada and British Columbia for their temerity to invest in British Columbia.

You know, Mr. Minister, I don't think it's any news to you, but if it is, it takes approximately \$66,000 to \$70,000 of capital to create one job in the initial stages.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Bonner says it does and I happen to think he's more successful as a businessman than you are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. JORDAN: I said as a businessman.

It's going to take ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, really!

MRS. JORDAN: ...a lot of capital ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I had my own law office.

MRS. JORDAN: ...to meet the current unemployment rolls in British Columbia today, through you, Mr. Chairman. Let's face it. Let's stop kidding about it.

You mentioned yourself that British Columbia has a higher immigration rate than other provinces. In a previous presentation I pointed out these figures to you and I cautioned you at that time that the way you're going, you're going to upset the balance in immigration. You get a natural immigration and some people are drones, some people are doers and some people are entrepreneurs and some are retired.

If you upset that balance, if there is no capital, if there are no entrepreneurs, if there are no people willing to work coming to British Columbia, the drones are going to upset our economy.

Again, Mr. Minister, I caution you on those whom you seek advice from. I ask you to be very realistic in your statements and to assure this House that you will use respected advisers; that you won't do anything further to upset the confidence of the small investor and the large investor in the economy of British Columbia, and in the knowledge that British Columbia has been and should be and certainly has no reason not to continue to be a fine place to live and a fine place to make a fair investment with a fair profit for fair input.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, the report that was commissioned was early in October, the Murray Bryce report. If you'll put a question on the order paper, I'll give you the details. It was a three-month study, including this one subject I referred to.

MRS. JORDAN: What year was it?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Oh, last year — well, since we became Government. I couldn't do it earlier because I didn't have the privy seal.

As for Mr. Kierans, I accept your caution. I'll be a little careful with former Liberal cabinet Ministers in receiving their advice. I've consulted many people but you've made a point about former privy councillors from the Ottawa area. I'll watch it. I'll try to very careful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One or two quick questions.

I had a look at the *British Columbia Business Outlook* a publication printed under the authority of the Minister. In it I found interesting comments regarding growth and in particular employment. I was wondering whether or not we would have some point of view of the Minister as to whether or not the department itself, instead of simply listing the comments of the business survey in their so-called

[[Page 1083C](#)]

Business Outlook of 1973, is in agreement, for example, with the statement on the top of page 2: that many firms attribute their difficulties in hiring and retaining workers to the present unemployment insurance programme. I just wonder whether or not the department itself has an opinion on this or whether ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I'll list one or two things, Mr. Attorney General, through you, Mr. Chairman. Then perhaps the Attorney General may comment.

So that's one point I'd like checked out.

I noted with some concern in that publication that in a reference to the federal government's survey on investment intention — this was for October last — of the 200 large Canadian companies, it was revealed that there would be a capital investment growth in the country as a whole of 9.9 per cent on plant and equipment for 1973.

Although this was for the country as a whole, it would appear that British Columbia, and I'm quoting here, "it would appear that British Columbia will not share fully in this expected gain in the business sector."

I ask this question specifically, because earlier this week I was speaking to a conference on industrial development. While the subject of B.C. industrial development was not the one that I was talking about — I was more concerned with developments elsewhere in the country — this question came up frequently in discussions.

The point was often mentioned to me by people employed or running very large corporations, that they were a little concerned about how things were going. It appeared to me, as a result of these discussions, that their investment intentions in British Columbia were not going to result in much gain in terms of employment in B.C.

Another aspect I'd like commented upon by the Government, or by the Minister on behalf of the Government, is the reference to the strength of the Canadian dollar, which of course has become really very much more important now that the American dollar, despite a 10 per cent devaluation a very short time ago, is once more under severe pressure. Indeed, a short time ago, it was selling at 9 per cent off what it was meant to be listed at.

The forest industry in this province has consistently said, and I've heard them frequently state, that they do not want the Canadian dollar to get much out of line with the American dollar. It makes sense, as was pointed out by the Hon. former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) on many occasions, that for every percentage point there's a \$19 million loss. I believe those are figures which are indicative of the general area.

I would like to know whether or not the provincial Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce is making any representations along this line. I say this knowing it's a very complex problem. The obvious difficulty is that if the Canadian dollar is devalued as much as the American dollar, we will undoubtedly face some other method of attempting to reduce Canadian exports to the United States. Bearing that in mind, I wonder whether or not the Minister might like to comment upon this.

The most critical area in this business survey that I found most alarming was that dealing with employment. Only 27 per cent of the firms surveyed in 1971 indicated that they would be hiring more people. In actual fact in 1972, the year following that 1971 survey, 42 per cent actually did so. But apparently the survey that took place indicated that employment increases would not be as great in 1973 as in 1972.

These are comments which are particularly critical. We've had debates on unemployment before and I wouldn't like to repeat them. But in the light of the refusal of the government side at that time, in my opinion, to discuss seriously the question of unemployment in the province and what is being done to combat it, I would trust that the Minister would give a fairly detailed statement of employment expectations in the Province of British Columbia in 1973.

It's been said often enough and I trust it's been heard often enough that unemployment is up substantially and that, indeed in absolute terms, it's never been worse since the Depression. Yet we haven't really heard much to date from the Minister responsible — apart from the Premier perhaps the most important Minister responsible, the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce — as to what he thinks could be done to increase employment in the province in the coming months.

Those questions I have, Mr. Chairman, are as I said directly from a publication of the B.C. government, and I trust it will be possible for us to get some information on it.

On another point, while I'm on my feet, I had a look at the British Columbia Chamber of Commerce recommendations on the question of trade promotion. I notice that they do indicate that there should be an industrial development office in eastern Canada.

We've had earlier debate on the merits or otherwise of the industrial development office in California. The Minister urged us to consider the experience of Ontario and the practices of the Province of Ontario, which I quite agree is a good model to look at.

I believe he was quoting an Ontario report when he said that the "justifiability of such an office depends upon the goals set by the government which the office has to achieve." Well, without going over the ground already covered on whether or not this Government indicated to the California office what goals they felt it should achieve, I wonder whether or not he could indicate to us the possibility of implementing the recommendation of the B.C. Chamber of Commerce concerning an industrial develop-

[[Page 1083D](#)]

ment office in eastern Canada and whether he can indicate to us in terms of goals, as he suggested himself, that would be laid down for such an office.

The success that the Province of Ontario has had with industrial development officers working in conjunction with the Canadian government office overseas, does indicate that this is not an area which should be lightly abandoned. Indeed the comments made about B.C. House in London indicate that this government feels there is some virtue in having a B.C. government office at least in London.

I wondered whether we could have a more general statement of policy as to what the Government's thinking is in this area; whether it intends to follow the Ontario model; whether it does at the moment have no doubt high-priced consultants, such as the ones who closed down the California office looking at the possibility of opening up offices elsewhere, or whether or not the experience in California is such that the Government is moving out of the business altogether.

I see the Minister has the publication before him. The recommendation of the Chamber of Commerce is found on page 23 of their brief, recommendation No. 3.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: In answer to the Hon. Member, and without repeating last night's debate to any great extent, the statement on page 2 of The Outlook for 1973 that many firms attribute their difficulties in hiring and retaining workers to the present UIC programme, is merely the opinion of those firms and not the opinion of the department or mine.

Secondly in the case of the Canadian dollar we can only, more through the Minister of Finance than this department, view that situation with alarm, to coin a phrase. We're very anxious that we retain parity with the American dollar; otherwise our exports could be in a very serious ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Well, in terms of our exports, even over-parity. That over-priced dollar has hurt us pretty badly, I agree. That was what John Diefenbaker suggested a long time ago. I think the Hon. Member is quite right, that we should keep an interest in these things and keep our influence as a province and make sure that's felt in Ottawa. I am sure the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) will do that.

In terms of the unemployment figures, I ask my friend not to be pessimistic. It's true that the return of the surveys was 27 per cent last year but bear in mind that today that's the expectation. Bear in mind that today the expectation has risen to 32 per cent and that all cases actual performance exceeds these expected figures. So the fact

that we have a better expectancy figure in terms of employment in 1973 than we had in 1972, gives me the right to think that in fact employment will have a better aspect and there'll be more employment in 1973 than in 1972. I hope so. I hope that the actual — performance greatly exceeds that figure of 32 per cent.

In terms of the recommendation for an office in eastern Canada, I think it's a very good one and it should be very seriously considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I appreciate the Minister's remarks. I assume then that there is no opinion of this Government on the effects or otherwise of the unemployment insurance programme; that this statement here is entirely the result of a survey and that the Government itself has made no studies or has no opinion on the effects of UIC on employment levels or a desire to take work.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No opinions have been expressed by the Government that I know of.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The Minister says no opinions have been expressed. But at some stage or another I would expect some comment from the Minister and I wonder whether or not it is possible to get it at this time.

One question which I am sure he left out through inadvertence is capital spending and the effects in B.C. Perhaps he left this out because there is the figure in here of \$3.7 billion which is expected in the capital spending in the province. Has he had any reason, as a result of the development since October last, which is when this survey was done, of any revised estimates of that figure of capital spending?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: We're expecting further figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in terms of that forecast, but I may say that capital expenditure in the Province of B.C. is now running per capita at about 20 per cent over the Canadian average.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: This of course has been a tradition of this province, Mr. Chairman, that we generally do run over the average. The 20 per cent figure uncomparing to previous years, is perhaps not all that valuable. Perhaps the Minister would like to compare it to previous years instead of just mentioning it off the top of his head.

The other question was on employment. We appreciate the fact that the Minister "hopes so", I think I quote him correctly, he said he "hopes so",

[[Page 1084](#)]

when he talked about having employment improve in this year. But perhaps we can have more than hopes in this area. It is for the people unemployed an extremely difficult problem. We have attempted to have it discussed rationally in debate in this House previous to this day and we've never succeeded. We've had red herrings drawn across the debate and the Government has simply never come out with reasonable statements analyzing the unemployment problem of the province.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's the fisheries department.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Whatever the Minister thinks it is — fisheries, agriculture or any other, the problem is that it is no joke to the people unemployed.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I realize that.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I think that being in charge of industrial development, trade and commerce is perhaps the closest we'll ever get to the Minister responsible. I wonder whether or not we are going, either by way of a straight Government motion, to discuss this thing adequately in this House so all sides can hear what is the situation.

I must say on this side of the House, and I know I speak for the Members on my right as well as those on my left, we are getting a little bit tired of being told that the answer lies in shipbuilding subsidies or the problem is simply the result of poor-mouthing on this side.

We've had the Peace River problem and we were suddenly told by the Premier that in actual fact everything was getting better and better and all those letters we got from the area were fictitious or at least false.

We would like at some time to have the Government face up to the issues that are raised by unemployment and try and deal with them intelligently. Because there is little point in our sitting in this House debating, either across the floor when the Speaker is in the Chair or when the Chairman is presiding, as he does at present. There's little point in discussing this unless the Government will take these things seriously and come up with some detailed information which can be used as the basis for an intelligent discussion in the House.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: We did go through that last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. JORDAN: The Minister should have stopped while he was ahead. I thoroughly agree with the Hon. leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Minister. To sit here and have this issue come up and ask what you're doing, as we have for the last 8 hours now, and have you raise your voice now in indignation and say, "I have the right to think." We don't deny you the right to think but we think the people of British Columbia have a right to jobs, and they have a right to eat, they have a right to pay for that food through good, solid work and the opportunity of a job.

Mr. Minister, we have been listening to your programme since you got into office and we haven't seen one bit of concrete evidence that you're doing something. The unemployment figures in British Columbia in December were higher than they had ever been since the Depression. We have asked you consistently what you are doing. January we asked you. No programme, no answers, from your department or any other department. February we asked you what you were doing. No programmes, no answers from your department or any other department. March we are asking you what you are doing and we're still getting no answers. We see no programmes and we don't see any increase in the opportunity for jobs in this province.

Mr. Minister, if you think there's going to be an increase in employment opportunities in British Columbia in 1973, let me caution you. Three months of 1973 have almost passed and your Government and you as Minister have done nothing. We asked you in this House last night for large capital projects to replace the pulp mill projects that are now nearing completion. The only answer we got was a facetious Sukunka coal. While this may be a good project, which you wouldn't allow us to debate, Mr. Chairman, I ask you what Sukunka coal projects have you got in the northern part of this province? What Sukunka coal projects have you got in the Peace River area? What have you got in the Prince George area?

HON. MR. BARRETT: You're wrong on two counts. Look at your own Members denying your position.

MRS. JORDAN: We want to know where the major capital projects are going to be in this province, what jobs they're going to create, what tax revenues they're going to create, and we also want to know what small capital projects you have on tap. Then, when you have those, Mr. Minister, we'll agree that you have the right to stand up in this House and say, "I have the right to think."

Figures are great; but eating is better. The people

[[Page 1085](#)]

of British Columbia want to eat.

Now, Mr. Minister, we'll ask you again what small capital projects have you got on line in the six regions of this province? What large capital projects have you got on line in the six regions of this province? How many actual jobs do you anticipate that you're going to stimulate this month, March; next month, April; in May and June until the

agricultural industry comes into play? What provisions are you going to make in the agricultural industry so that that industry can afford to hire people?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind a debate when people know what they're talking about. But it becomes a little bit nonsensical when one Member says, "What are we doing for the north?" and the other Member is waving right back behind you knowing full well what you don't know. You said, "What about the Peace River?" Where do you think Chetwynd is? It's in his riding. Where do you think the Sukunka coal is? It's in his riding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Premier be seated while you state your point of order.

MRS. JORDAN: If Chetwynd is on the line, if you consider that a capital ...

HON. MR. BARRETT: That's not a point of order. That's a matter of debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member for North Okanagan be seated?

HON. MR. BARRETT: I'm pointing out to the Member that when she gets up in this House and says, "Well, the Sukunka deal in the north and Peace River at Chetwynd," Chetwynd is in that Member's riding.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You're just talking about things you don't even know about. That Member knows what 1,600 jobs are. \$85 million was voted in this budget for jobs. You are delaying, stalling, you have not made one positive contribution to this debate. 'Mr. Chairman, it becomes a little bit galling to hear that Member stand up — you'll have your turn. I've got the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you state your point of order.

MRS. JORDAN: I don't intend to be insulted by this "boy" Premier, who can't produce and can only play-act ...

HON. MR. BARRETT: Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's no point of order would the Member be seated.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: At no time have I ever accused that Member of innocence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let's deal with the reality of the Sukunka coal and 1,600 jobs. The proposition we have, through the Department of Trade and Industry ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Can't you keep that Member in order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member be seated.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member be seated. I am ordering you to sit down.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will respond to the point of order, and that is to the effect that the Premier may refer to Sukunka coal as it is relevant to the estimates of this department, but he is not to deal with details or substance of this issue.

HON. MR. BARRETT: The Department of Trade and Industry has regional plans for this province. I thought you were interested in this debate.

MRS. JORDAN: Any debate should involve both sides of the House.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I see that when attempts are made to discuss with the Opposition points that they raise, they are not really interested in the answers. I find that an incredible performance after all the stalling and delaying that has gone on in this House.

Now, what is the situation? We have had a regional request from the north, from the Mayor of Fort Nelson and the region of Fort St. John, from the Mayor of Fort St. John and the region of that area. He phoned the Government and said he was concerned. This Member's department said all right, you have a concern about jobs, come on down and we'll

[[Page 1086](#)]

talk about it. And they did. They were in the Premier's office within a matter of hours, an experience they have never had before.

After that they made a request for some help in terms of secondary industry and we said "yes", and from that department we sent up, within three days, Mr. Jack McEwan to do an economic research study. That Member knows it, and he was happy with it, and his colleague next to him was happy with it, and that Member, through you, Mr. Chairman, has the nerve to come in here with a basis of ignorance, making accusations that have no basis in fact, when her colleague who sits next to her stood up in the House and thanked me and thanked the Attorney General for sending Mr. McEwan into the Peace River country. Now, if you want to get on with the business, let's get on with it, but let's not deal with the fabrications and imaginary things. You don't even know the location, Mr. Chairman, where the action is taking place. It's the first time that a regional officer has been sent into that area after 20 years of absence of any planning for the economy of that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall vote 119 pass? I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: With due respect, the questions were not completely answered by the Minister.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: They were answered last night but you weren't here.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well I have here the record of what was said last night. I have been reading through it and I haven't come across them. I am quite willing to read them again.

The question of unemployment interests me and I will comment upon the \$85 million which we keep having thrown at us as a figure. This works out to \$850 per person for each of the unemployed. I don't necessarily think that will do much more than keep them in bread for the winter. I don't think they are doing very well on that level. It certainly won't do much in terms of creating new jobs under the emergency situation which I think we face.

I would like to see more and hear more, instead of the tirade and arm waving and loud voices of the Premier and cabinet Ministers. I would like to hear more as to what's going on and what's been done.

Vote 119 approved.

Vote 120: general administration, \$179,868 — approved.

On vote 121: promotion and development of industry and markets, \$954,619.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We notice a large increase in this vote. I would ask the Minister a number of questions. Where are you recruiting this personnel from? Is it private industry in British Columbia? Is it from other government services in British Columbia? Are you recruiting some of these people from the training programmes in British Columbia and if so which ones?

How many of these people are in fact British Columbians of the total new employed? How many are women? Did you make available the opportunity for employment in these areas for women?

We notice also in the second half of the vote that there is \$42,000 for travel expenses, presumably for the staff in this vote. Then we see another amount of \$98,000 for industrial and trade promotion missions. We would like to know what the \$42,000 will be used for and whose expenses. Is that interprovincial travel or is it international travel, and which countries do you anticipate it will be?

You have a number of research officers, you have a number of administrative officers and you have a number of directors, all seeming, by the look of the vote, to be working very much in the same area. Which people of these groups will be travelling, and under what circumstances? Will they be travelling? We hope you are not hiring a lot of competent people to sit around in Victoria and push pens, because it takes personal contact. We would also make one other observation and ask a question.

In relation to printing and publications, there seems to be no major increase there. Will you be continuing the current publications? I assume that's for the various research studies that are done in various areas. Do you not intend to increase these or are you intending to decrease them? Because even the cost of printing alone is up, so I would assume you are intending to decrease them and I would like to know your reasons.

In relationship to vote 1007, advertising and displays, this is a decrease from last year's \$118,000 — it's now \$108,000. In the general debate on your salary, pointed out various Members the desirability of having a display centre and information centre perhaps in Vancouver or in other parts of the world. It would certainly seem there is no provision in this small vote for that. If that is not what this vote is intended for, what is it?

I will ask any supplementary questions in relation to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce.

[[Page 1087](#)]

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The new positions will be through the civil service. A lot of them are advertised at the present time. Women will be welcome as applicants, of course, or welcome in the jobs.

In connection with the travel thing, the Hon. Member is quite right — we should increase our contacts with other areas, particularly of Canada, such as Ontario and Ottawa. Therefore, there is about a \$30,000 increase in the travel forecast so that we will break out of our provincialism in our industry programme.

What was the other question about the advertising? The advertising budget is about the same. I think it is about \$10,000 less but it is going to be totally different in nature. We want to evolve effective advertising. We are quite sure that just the good will kind of institutional advertising that has gone on has not sold B.C. products or promoted B.C. industries.

In connection with the final thing about the printing, we think we can live with that budget. If we can't we will have to come back to the Legislature. We will know next year.

MRS. JORDAN: In relation to your statement about your travel forecast expenses and breaking out of our provincialism, in a previous debate you stated that there was necessity to prove the value of these contacts. In light of that statement and your statement now, we hope you will be prepared next year to prove to this House, on the basis

of your own policy, not necessarily ours, that this travel is justified and has in fact produced some results.

Vote 121 approved.

On vote 122: share programmes and grants; \$1,015,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. JORDAN: In this vote we notice that the British Columbia Research Council grant has not been increased. It is the feeling of many of us that the B.C. Research Council has done some excellent work, not only in a very imaginative research area, but in a practical application. Certainly it helps some businesses. I think the Lacer business. I think they got started through the B.C. Research Council efforts. Are you anticipating a slacking off of their activities? Why haven't you increased the grants? Surely they are faced with the same inflationary problems that other businesses are — increased salaries, cost of facilities and cost of work.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The B.C. Research Council has been granted \$320,000 but that is only 12 per cent of its total budget. They sell their services and their products and their scientific research to industry and the governments. They have not requested us for an increase in our particular grant at this time, but the remarks that have been made in connection with the scientific industrial park are something that should be taken to heart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Victoria.

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister did briefly mention the next item — cooperative overseas market development programme. I wonder if he could give us a little more detail on it at this point. He was very brief in his passing before.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Well, that is a shared programme with the forest industry council of B.C. and the federal government.

In connection primarily with Europe and primarily with coniferous plywood sales, and we see a great capacity to produce plywood arising in the years up to 1976 and steadily increasing. In other words, the export potential of plywood is going to rise from 347 million square feet, in the case of 3/8 plywood, to 980 million square feet which we could produce in our industry in British Columbia by 1976.

With that great potential capacity in a very labour intensive product and a very dollar-valuable product, we have to make maximum efforts to sell in the markets of the world. We're not thinking only of Europe. We're thinking possibly of Japan and other areas of the world as well.

Vote 122 approved.

On vote 123: data processing centre, \$3,848,682.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I have taken the Minister's advice and placed a question on the order paper, but going through the notes of your comments last night I noticed at the beginning that you said you were losing this department. I wonder if you could expand on that? Where are you losing it to? Is it being transferred to the insurance corporation? Whose responsibility will it be in the future?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: It's not mine to decide. It serves many departments of government. It could be Finance, it could be in connection with the auto insurance. But that's not finally decided. At the moment I have the responsibility for paying the bills.

But there will be a change, in my estimation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could say a word or two about the I almost \$300,000 under temporary assistance. It's the t last item before the total. It seems like a massive amount of money on temporary assistance. In view of the fact that almost a quarter of a million dollars was spent last year on temporary assistance, why are we continuing the process of temporary assistance instead of perhaps hiring more permanent staff and putting this on a regular basis?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Operators of punch card emergency runs. That's about the size of it. It's the same figure roughly as previously. Oh, there's been an increase. You're quite right. I suppose it's proportionate to the total increase in the vote. But when there's an emergency situation they do employ extra help.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Can I assume from the answer, Mr. Chairman, that we will continue in future years to see this, that it's not something which is related to setting up the system but something which inevitably must occur when you have special runs on a year-to-year basis?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I think that's it. Emergencies. Over-runs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Victoria.

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): I'd like to have an explanation of the doubling of travelling in that particular department.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Of travelling? Well, we have very capable civil servants in many of these branches. Mr. Baird in data processing is a very good example. These people have been insulated from the world of their technical confreres. I think that's a mistake. So we're increasing travel allowances.

It's the same, for example, with our economics and statistics branch. Mr. Meredith, who's sitting behind me, has hardly made a trip back to meet the people of Statistics Canada. I think that's a mistake. I think we as a province are losing something. These are fairly small increases in travel expense, but we want our senior civil service personnel to be fully familiar with the good work and the advances that are being accomplished in other parts of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Minister, we've debated this quite thoroughly, in consideration of your being a new Minister in passing this vote and supporting it. We again reaffirm our position that you have excellent people in your department and certainly from the actions in this House we suggest that you take their advice and not the Premier's advice. You seem to get into a much more responsible position and more ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Oh, no. I rely on his advice every day.

MRS. JORDAN:...support with their advice.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I can't agree with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. McGEER: I wonder if I could ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, about this huge increase for rental of data processing equipment. Could he tell us what equipment we rented? Is this a Manitoba corporation, or who supplies the ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: A lot of the increased equipment is in connection with automobile insurance services.

MR. McGEER: I understand that we've had one tender from Manitoba in the bus field, not the automobile

field. But I just wondered what kind of equipment we operate on? What firm supplies the rental equipment?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Computers from organizations like IBM. None of it's coming from Flyer Industries.

MR. McGEER: It is Canadian-owned equipment, Mr. Chairman, or is this American?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: IBM is a large American company.

MR. McGEER: What we have is an IBM computer system, is this the ...

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's one of the suppliers.

MR. McGEER: Who are the others, Mr. Chairman? Can we get that?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Univac is another big

[[Page 1089](#)]

one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Just to follow up that question, is there any requirement, or was there any requirement when this request went out presumably for tender of this equipment, that it be a Canadian owned company or if possible Canadian manufactured components? Were there any requirements of that nature?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I don't think so. It's a good point. If it's possible that any of these components can be made in Canada, it's something that we should be very concerned about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. McGEER: You don't know if it's tender or whether we're locked into long term or short term contracts?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I can't answer that. Put it on the order paper.

Vote 123 approved.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

On vote 45: Minister's Office, \$72,464.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Chilliwack.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been listening to the procedures of the House as we have been discussing these various votes. It appears to me that we have been working a hardship, and I don't think it was intentionally so, upon the Ministers, for whom it must be a rather gruelling exercise. Since the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) happens to be one of the more pleasant sights on the other side of the House, we don't wish to make this any more gruelling than she could imagine it to be.

Rather than to make a long speech in which we could refer to maybe a dozen or two dozen questions, I think that it might serve a better purpose to take the segments by subject and then ask the Minister whether or not she wouldn't like to answer that way. I think it would be far easier for you, Madam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Perhaps I could ask the Minister whether she would prefer to answer them

generally. May they ask questions from the whole of the estimates or would you rather they confine them to general comments about your salary or about the philosophy of the department?

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think the procedure in the past where everybody goes all over the ballpark on the salary vote, I'm not suggesting any change. It's up to the Member, if he wishes, to carry on that way.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you. The first area that I wish to discuss and have some report from the Minister on is the area of post-secondary education. Shortly after the new Government took office they made public an announcement that the whole issue of post-secondary education was going to receive a new review. There was going to be a study made and it was going to be province-wide, and the purpose of the study was to find out what really was the state of post-secondary education at the time, what would be the recommendations of a study such as this as it relates to post-secondary education, and I have noted with keen interest since the new Government has taken office that already we see signs of steps toward that study.

My question in this regard is: how much time does the Minister think that we can afford to take from such a study in view of the fact that previous studies have been made and in view of the fact that previous recommendations have been made? It is now six or seven months since the study was announced and it was just in this past week or the week before that we have even received notice that the co-ordinator for all educational studies has been announced.

I wish to know how many months it's going to take for this post-secondary education study. Then I'd like to know how long after the study has been concluded it will take to get going on the recommendations of that committee. Now I must make an assumption. I must further ask the question: does the Hon. Minister feel that we have four years to get going on post-secondary education, particularly when I am aware that in the province the facility for post-secondary education is in need of "hurry" construction?

I read a letter that comes from the Fraser Valley dated February 26:

"It has come to my attention again today how very unsatisfactory and lacking our vocational school programme in British Columbia is, and I feel I must bring it to your attention."

I'd like the entire House, by the way, to be aware of this situation,

"Approximately one year ago my son, who had above-average passing marks at graduation, applied to enter the electrical course offered by the B.C. Vocational School in September. He did not

[[Page 1090](#)]

receive an answer to his application until August 18, when he was told that he had not been accepted. No explanation was given at the time as to why he had not been accepted.

"I wrote to the regional director and was told that although my son had excellent marks and could supply the same type of references, that 109 students had applied for eight vacancies in the course. There are only 16 students allowed in this class, with Manpower supplying eight and apprenticeship and industrial training the other eight. I was also told that my son should re-apply for the course to begin on April 3, which he did.

"This morning I received a phone call from Mr. Cook of the apprenticeship and industrial training, telling me my son had not been accepted again due to lack of space and because he had not taken an electricity course in high school. This course was not supplied during his courses in high school.

"Evidently having the ability and the ambition to prove himself does not count in education in this province. The students from the rural, poorly equipped schools are penalized in higher education.

"I'm wondering why a person with your ability and intelligence would halt the building of a vocational school at Chilliwack when there is such a desperate need for these facilities. Do you prefer having young people become discouraged and turn to the welfare rolls of so many? Having been an NDP supporter since I first voted, I doubt the wisdom of my voting when I

see school building halted and money being spent elsewhere.

"I am not only concerned for my own son but for the many others as well who are discouraged in their attempts to improve their education, and I hope in the near future you will attempt to rectify this lack of vocational facilities."

This letter was sent to the Hon. Minister, and she has a copy of it, I am sure.

It seems to me, Hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that there is a certain amount of lacking wisdom that comes when a person decides to halt construction of a vocational school which is desperately needed, and then to take up a study which may take as long as four years, a study which eventually will come with a recommendation to construct undoubtedly a facility, perhaps in a different location, a facility something similar to the one that we have just discontinued.

I would like to know, and maybe the Minister could tell us, whether or not the proposed agricultural college that has been referred to by another Minister is actually in the planning stages or whether it has been recommended by the study which may or may not be in progress right now. If an agricultural college is indeed in the planning, does the Minister have any intention of having enough acreage around the college so that there will be enough land to conduct the experiments and the agricultural growth facilities that they will need at the college?

I am wondering whether or not the regional college and the vocational school will be made to be one and the same thing, or whether the two will be held separate as they have been in the past. Maybe, Madam Minister, you could respond to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: First of all, I would like to thank the Hon. Member who just took his seat for presenting some very clear, concise questions. It certainly helps me and I appreciate it.

The first question, of course, was dealing with the announcement that there would be a master study of post-secondary. That's quite true. This was absolutely essential because the former government had allowed our post-secondary institutions to spring up around this province without any pattern, without any policy, left entirely up to the local areas, particularly when it came to college construction.

Our Government does not intend to continue in that manner. We don't think it's going to provide the right service for the people and the consumers of education in this province. However, in making that announcement that we were setting up the post-secondary commission to recommend a master plan to the government, at the same time I realize as Minister that there are urgent problems which have to be dealt with. It certainly is not fair for the citizens of this province to wait and wait and wait for certain decisions to be made.

Overall the commission will be looking at the general picture of where we're going in post-secondary education. When it comes to changes in legislation, re the *University Act*, re the *College Act* they will be looking at the type of constructions we should be moving into, whether we should continue on this trend to the "edifice" complex, as another Member mentioned in the House, or whether we should talk about multi-purpose campuses.

We want to be sure as a Government that we're moving in the right direction, that we're spending the taxpayers' money wisely and yet providing the service.

However, as I said in the beginning, we do realize there are people in the province who are being deprived right at this moment and I put the blame squarely in the hands of the former government — the fact that here I am, Minister today, and they had a great number of years to provide these institutions and they are not here.

However, we have the responsibility to do something about it as the new Government.

Now as to the particular problem you brought up

in Chilliwack, I think you're aware that I have sent letters to the people in Chilliwack informing them, those who are concerned, and certainly there are a great number of concerned citizens. They had expected a vocational school when we came into office. I made the announcement that that construction which actually hasn't started, as you know — it was a very preliminary part of the construction, no building had been started on — would be halted. This was because in our opinion, and in the opinion of many of those who are experts in the area, the site was wrong. Unless you want to go into that again, you and I had private conversations on that, I have sent letters to all those concerned as to why we feel that was the wrong site.

That was going to be close to \$8 million. This Government in no way intended to spend the amount of money in an area which we considered unsuitable.

However, at the same time I've informed the people of the Fraser Valley that we're very concerned — and your letter points out the concern that you received from a concerned mother — that the students out there and the adults are looking for post-secondary services. Therefore, I have told the people in the area that we're ready to move as soon as possible into that area of post-secondary services for the Fraser Valley.

We want to move the right way. We want to place them in the right place. There is no way that they will have to wait for four years, Mr. Member. I have asked for delegations to come from the various areas of the Fraser Valley with their ideas.

That brings us to the matter of the agricultural college. We know that that is one area where certainly there should be an agricultural faculty. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) agrees with me on this. He and I have asked officials of both our departments to survey the area to see if there is a possible site which, as you have pointed out, should have the needed acreage. I can assure you that there are some negotiations which will be pending shortly in that area.

I want to inform interested groups and I want to consult with them so that they will know. I also want to point out that it is my hope that the facilities for the Fraser Valley will be diversified rather than being one massive institution such as was being planned in the past.

We will definitely move to try and service as soon as possible the people in the Fraser Valley.

Have I answered all your questions at that particular stage? Maybe I left out one.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Would you give me the question again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I recognize the Hon. Member for Chilliwack.

MR. SCHROEDER: Is it the plan of the department, through you, Madam Minister, to separate the regional colleges from the vocational school, or are you planning to amalgamate the two? I think you partially answered it when you said you are not going to create edifices.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I think you're talking about the melding policy. Already, as you know, the majority of the colleges and community colleges and the vocational schools in this province are melded. This was a policy started by the former government. I don't think in essence the philosophy is wrong. This government agrees with the melding theory. If you're going to have what you call a true community college it should involve academic and vocational.

However, unfortunately the former government did move into it without any preplanning. We have found a number of problems inherent in this melding which my department officials and myself are trying to iron out. But I can say right now that we do intend to continue the melding process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

MR. H.A.CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Just in the few minutes remaining I would like to ask Madam Minister if she would comment on the question of grants to the universities, in particular, the University of Victoria. An article which appeared in the *Victoria Colonist* last month touched on the subject, quoting the president of the university indicating that UVIC is likely to be out of pocket by some \$800,000 in meeting operating costs for the academic year 1973-74.

The president apparently told the Senate that the University of Victoria's share of the \$ 100 million — which I see is under vote 50 — \$100 million granted to the "big three" universities for operating costs is likely to represent less than 6 per cent growth over the previous years. Further in the article, the president told the meeting that UVIC faced money problems very similar to those found across the country, but that the problem appeared particularly crucial in the instance of the University of Victoria. The question genuinely seeks information with respect to this new government's attitude towards universities as such.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Perhaps if you recall in my speech during the budget I made a statement, if I may quote it again, that a responsible government must

[[Page 1092](#)]

demand greater fiscal responsibility and operational planning than has been demanded in the past. This is the policy of this Government.

It certainly doesn't mean cutting budgets for the sake of cutting. We do feel that in the past, the universities have come for their money — to begin with the whole structure of that is wrong, as you know. There isn't a proper structure for doing this. I was very dissatisfied with this and I'm hoping that the post secondary commission will make recommendations on a new structure for the presentation of budgets to government, maybe with an intermediary body, an advisory board, I don't know. We'll wait and see what they'll recommend. The present method is really not suitable. However, the actual amount of the money, as I say, we feel that the universities must be fiscally responsible. They must really justify increased expenditures.

The University of Victoria, to begin with, is facing some decline in enrolment and I think you're aware of that. Secondly, if they feel that they are in a position that is very serious, that is going to jeopardize the students at that university, and this is what we're concerned with, what happens to the students in the university and their programming. If they can justify that the budget that has been allotted to them is seriously going to affect the students' learning environment in that university, we are willing to listen to them, but we want justification.

I MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

MR. CURTIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Supplementary then to that — is a meeting planned with the University of Victoria president or Senate or representatives, or has one been requested, Madam Minister?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Most certainly, on this topic, yes. The very fact that, as I said just previously, if they can justify, obviously it means that I'm willing to listen to them to make justification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Nelson-Creston.

MR. L. NICOLSON (Nelson-Creston): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In listening to the Hon. Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder), I think he made a good point. I think he was referring to entrance requirements that one might lack because of his background, coming from, perhaps, a small rural high school where particular programmes are not offered. If this is the case, I would hope that the Minister would give it consideration — to see that pupils from these schools are not discriminated against for lack of background. For instance, if physics was a requirement, there should be a vigorous programme within vocational schools and technical schools to make sure that is offered — and I'm not sure if this is a problem. If he was referring to that, maybe he could maybe clarify that later. I wouldn't want to put words in his mouth.

On the matter of vocational schools. It appears that it's been the practice in the past to plan programmes perhaps because of the apparent popularity or desirability of a particular profession such as pre-apprenticeship training but have not been able to fit into an apprenticeship programme on graduation because the supply and demand hadn't really been looked into.

I would hope that in the future, and I think that I take from the Minister's remarks that they are planning to give a little bit better consideration to supply and demand rather than just the glamour of a particular vocation. I would hope that she would comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report resolutions and progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Levi files answers to questions and tables a return.

Hon. Mr. Cocke withdraws resolution No. 35.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

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