

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

---

**Official Report of**  
**DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**(Hansard)**

---

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1973**

Afternoon Sitting

[ [Page 45](#) ]

**CONTENTS**

**Routine Proceedings**

An Act to Amend an Act Respecting Medical Services (Bill 10). Hon. Mr. Cocke. Introduction and first reading — [45](#)

Oral questions

Beach access to Christina Lake. Mr. Richter — [45](#)

Effects of cutbacks on natural gas supplies. Mr. Nunweiler — [45](#)

Indication of natural gas shortage. Mr. Curtis — [47](#)

Incentives for natural gas exploration. Mr. Smith — [47](#)

Revenue allocation for Vancouver Island natural gas pipeline. Mr. Morrison — [47](#)

Workmen's compensation for Alex McClellan. Mr. Chabot — [47](#)

Ratification of B.C. Rail contract. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [48](#)

Purchase of Panco Poultry Products. Mr. Phillips — [48](#)

Throne speech debate

Hon. Mr. King — [49](#)

Mr. Schroeder — [52](#)

Mr. Brousson — [57](#)

Mrs. Webster — [61](#)

---

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Commercial Transport and Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very special pleasure today. Many years ago, when I first became interested in politics in the CCF, there was an MLA representing the great riding of Mackenzie. His name was Bert Gargrave and he represented that constituency for many years. Bert Gargrave is on the floor with us this afternoon. I'd like the House to make him welcome.

Another special pleasure related to the first one is the fact that, finally, when Bert went the way of all politicians and left this House, three years later his young brother went in and won the constituency, became the seatmate of a premier for many years and he was one of the delights and one of the most well-liked Members of this House. I'd ask you to welcome as well as Bert Gargrave his brother, Tony.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join in the welcome to the Gargrave brothers and also to welcome to our chamber today a group of students from Victoria High School, my own former high school, and I hope that they not only enjoy their time here but, perhaps, learn something of how we conduct our business.

### **Introduction of bills.**

## AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT RESPECTING MEDICAL SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Cocke presents a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor: a bill intituled *An Act to Amend an Act Respecting Medical Services*.

Bill 10 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

### **Oral questions.**

## BEACH ACCESS TO CHRISTINA LAKE

**MR. F.X. RICHTER (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct this question to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams).

My question is: is the government going to take any action on behalf of the resort businesses of Christina Lake, who have asked for government intervention, regarding beach access from a public road that has been virtually cut off by private land owners?

**HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources):** Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would provide me with details with respect to the location, I'd be pleased to pursue the matter further.

**MR. RICHTER:** A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. While the information has been provided through a considerable amount of correspondence with various Ministers, I'd be pleased to do this. But will the Department of Lands be undertaking a physical survey to establish legal boundaries of the properties in dispute?

**HON. MR. WILLIAMS:** Certainly, in most cases like this we'd be prepared to carry out the survey work, But I note, Mr. Speaker, that we did offer to provide a major access on the lake and provide three-quarters of the cost. The local people were unwilling to contribute; and that was a major new precedent set. Unfortunately the community didn't take advantage of it.

## EFFECTS OF CUTBACKS ON NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES

**MR. A.A. NUNWEILER (Fort George):** I'd like to direct a question to the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald).

I note, in an announcement by West Coast Transmission, that they are going to cut back on natural gas supplies. Since this is a part of my region, it is of a great deal of interest to the people of my region and, I'm sure, to the rest of the people of the province. I'd like to ask the Attorney General what effect this is going to have on our

area.

**HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General):** Well, Mr. Speaker, it isn't only a serious matter for my friend's area and some of the pulp mills around Prince George; it's a serious matter for Cominco, which gets West Coast gas through Inland; it's a serious matter for Can-Cel, which gets it through Pacific Northern, and for other industries of British Columbia — commercial enterprises, What has happened is that the Beaver River fields...and I'd like, with the indulgence of the House, to make a little longer statement on this than simply to reply to the question.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** No, no. It's the answer

[ [Page 46](#) ]

that will be the surprise. (Laughter).

Interjections.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** That's surprising and refreshing.

Anyway, the Beaver River natural gas field, due to water in the reservoirs, has been cut back in its output by — I won't go into the amount...but when gas is replaced by West Coast from other sources, there will still be, overall, a 10 per cent reduction in the through-put through West Coast's pipeline.

West Coast has said that they will reduce supplies to all customers on an equal, pro rata basis. To this the Government of British Columbia takes exception that everybody should be treated equally with our gas. We think that the National Energy Board has been remiss in not making provision for a reasonable contingency reserve for this kind of a situation, rather than permit, as it has done, all of the gas gathered by West Coast to be shipped partly in British Columbia and mostly over the line.

We think that the National Energy Board made a mistake in allowing the last 70 million cubic feet per day to be exported without ensuring that British Columbia's position would be safeguarded. The result is that the Government of British Columbia is concerned. We have sent today a telegram to the Hon. Donald S. MacDonald with a copy to the National Energy Board, Robert Stanfield, Pierre Trudeau and David Lewis. It reads as follows:

WEST COAST TRANSMISSION TODAY ADVISED NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES TO B.C. UTILITIES WILL BE CUT BACK 10 PER CENT ON PEAK DEMAND DAYS THIS WINTER. CUTBACK THREATENS EMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES, ALTERNATIVE FUEL SUPPLIES UNCERTAIN AND COSTLY.

That would be bunker fuel.

GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ASKS THE MINISTER AND THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD TO ENSURE THAT BRITISH COLUMBIA REQUIREMENTS ARE MET IN PRIORITY TO EXPORTS.

Interjection.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One minute, please; is this a supplementary or is it another subject? Anyone with a supplementary to this statement? I'd like the House to stick to the supplementary before we go on to another subject.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** My question will be on discussion of this subject, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker — and the question is addressed to the Minister of Finance and the Premier (Hon. Mr. Barrett): in the light of the problems that have occurred with this company, and in the light of the problems that are occurring with respect to energy transmission in British Columbia, which are basically related to an extremely highly capital-intensive industry incapable of rapid changes from year to year and therefore, of course,

a problem dealing with getting money from or in B.C. for capital purposes and in the light of the uncertainty this company and others have fared during the past year over nationalization plans of this provincial government, when will the Premier or Minister of Finance make a clear statement in this House of his plans respecting this and other energy transmission companies? Unless this is done, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get problems of this nature year after year because these major corporations which...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. You've asked your question.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, I trust I'm given the same courtesy as the Attorney General was given earlier. We didn't criticize him on this side of the House. My question is: when are we going to have clear statements of the government's plans on expropriation of companies in the energy and the energy transmission field?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** One of the problems in the provincial government setting a firm policy, Mr. Speaker, is the week-by-week change of the federal government's policy in energy. We had a great deal of difficulty in asking the National Energy Board to consider British Columbia's position before it makes decisions.

However, despite the federal government's changing policy, on Friday of this week I will ask the Attorney General to release to all the Members of this House a copy of the B.C. energy board report.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The basic problem is not that of energy, but this government's policy towards investment and policy towards nationalization of companies. May I ask the Premier whether on Friday of this week or Friday of any following week in this session we can get a clear statement from him of this government's intentions respecting nationalization of companies in the energy field?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Member doesn't raise this for political purposes. (Laughter). If anyone would do that from the Liberal Party, they'd be sorely embarrassed considering the

[ [Page 47](#) ]

lack of federal government position.

I have stated that the Government of British Columbia will be filing a complete energy board report this Friday.

## INDICATION OF NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE

**MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands):** To the Premier. The news of the gas shortage reached the general public yesterday and today. Did the government or any Member of the government have any advance indication that this would be the case?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** No, we did not have any advance indication, Mr. Member, but within 24 hours the energy board gave us an immediate report after contacting the three principal wholesalers. The energy board report was delivered to my office this morning and I must commend the energy board for prompt action in preparing the material and making it available for us.

**MR. CURTIS:** A supplementary, then, Mr. Speaker; I just want to pursue this a little further. There was no indication to the government that suddenly black headlines would speak of a possible winter gas shortage?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** No. The earliest notice of a possible problem was in July. Since the problem, the Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and the energy board immediately set out to have a report, and I must thank them both for giving us the information within 24 hours.

## INCENTIVES FOR NATURAL GAS

## EXPLORATION

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** A supplemental question concerning the same problem of the supply of natural gas for British Columbia, to the Attorney General. In view of the fact that it is a problem apparently caused by the overproduction in some wells which results in a condition which produces salt water, has the Attorney General or the government any plans to actively encourage drilling companies to increase their rate of exploration for natural gas in the Province of British Columbia?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** The Premier said the energy report and recommendations will be filed with the House on Friday. In a section of that you will find that the question of royalties and incentives for exploration are dealt with. Those are only recommendations to the government, but they will be taken very seriously.

## REVENUE ALLOCATION FOR VANCOUVER ISLAND NATURAL GAS PIPELINE

**MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that we've had leave of the House for a statement by a Minister, perhaps we could ask if we could have a slight extension of the question period by leave of the House. I'd also like a supplemental — and I'm not quite sure in view of the answers that we've had from the other side who to direct this one to — but I believe it should be directed to the Lands, Forests and Water Resources Minister (Hon. Mr. Williams).

My question is: has the Minister set in motion any measures for ensuring a natural gas supply to Vancouver Island in view of the gas shortage predicted for the winter of 1973-1974, and would the Minister give any consideration to the possibility that any portion of federal money received as a result of revenue allocation to the provinces, as a result of the two-price system for oil, be used to partially finance a natural gas pipeline to Vancouver Island?

I would also like to ask the Minister: would he not agree that a Hydro natural gas pipeline to Vancouver Island would greatly expand rapidly declining exploration for natural gas, and what, if any, are the current plans for a pipeline to the island?

**HON. MR. WILLIAMS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that under this government no, consumer in British Columbia will suffer and that policies that develop will take care of that.

But with respect to Vancouver Island in particular I would simply say that B.C. Hydro is carrying out very intensive detailed studies of alternate energy sources for the Island and that covers a wider range than the Member suggested.

## WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION FOR ALEX McCLELLAN

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** A question to the Minister of Labour: has one Alex McClellan, executive assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, been granted by the Workmen's Compensation Board a permanent partial-disability pension?

**HON. MR. KING:** Mr. Speaker, I have no idea; I don't monitor the day-to-day applicants for workmen's compensation benefits. I would suggest that the Member for Columbia River direct that question to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I might point out the rule has been, and was adopted by this House, that these be matters of urgency and importance. Surely that is one for the order paper.

**MR. CHABOT:** I think this is of importance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Well, it may be for your purposes, but the question is for the purposes of the House.

**MR. CHABOT:** A supplementary question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the same subject?

**MR. CHABOT:** On the same subject, yes. Would the Minister be prepared...?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think your question is out of order, therefore you cannot ask a supplementary.

**MR. CHABOT:** The Minister has access to the files and I'm wondering if the Minister would be prepared to table the claimant's file with the House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

Interjections.

## RATIFICATION OF B.C. RAIL CONTRACT

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** A question for the Minister of Labour arising out of his answer yesterday that there is an agreement that will bind both parties to voluntary arbitration in the case of the B.C. Rail dispute. May I ask whether the agreement, as it comes down from the government-appointed arbitrator, will have to go to the membership for ratification, or whether or not, when it comes down, it will be the final settlement?

**HON. MR. KING:** Mr. Speaker, the agreement that was reached between the management of B.C. Rail and the representatives of the United Transportation Union simply provided for the acceptance of the Industrial Inquiry Commissioner's report as binding. Now, what the trade union does with that award in terms of ratification with their members is an internal question for the trade union, not a matter for consideration by my department.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Could I ask a supplementary of the Minister then, Mr. Speaker? Is it therefore that once the report comes down there will be no further reference back to the commissioner, back to the arbitrator, no further reference to some other body? Will it be up to the union to put it to their membership or accept it as it is?

**HON. MR. KING:** Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time, I have indicated that the trade union asked for voluntary arbitration and they undertook to accept the award of the Industrial Inquiry Commissioner, whatever that award may be, and, that's final and binding.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The reason I ask these questions, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, is that there appears to be some contradiction between the CP story out of Vancouver quoting Mr. Smeal and the questions and answers of yesterday. I just want to have it clear in my mind that once the arbitrator brings down a report, that's it, it's final, and there will be no further negotiations, there will be no further use of arbitrators, or panels, or the Minister's good offices, or anything of that nature.

**HON. MR. KING:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could ask the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey to explain it to the Second Member for Victoria. For the fifth time, the award will be binding.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** On whom?

**HON. MR. KING:** On the members of the trade union and on the B.C. Rail management, and I don't know how we can clarify that any further.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think that should terminate the matter.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, I think what would terminate the matter is if the Minister would inform Mr. Smeal in Vancouver of his views, because his views are different from Mr. Smeal's.

## PURCHASE OF PANCO POULTRY PRODUCTS

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. On July 6, 1973, the Minister announced negotiations for a partnership with Pacific Poultry Co-op to purchase Panco Poultry Products Ltd. Would the Minister please advise me where these negotiations stand at the present time?

**HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture):** For the purchase of what?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** A partnership with Pacific Poultry Co-op to purchase Panco Poultry.

**HON. MR. STUPICH:** There have been discussions between my department and the poultry co-op with a view to acquiring or constructing a broiler-processing plant. These discussions are still going on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are already three minutes over. I allowed a little additional latitude.

[ [Page 49](#) ]

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Would this be going through the British Columbia Development Corporation...?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! Order, please.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** ...or what vehicle of...?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. We are already three and one half minutes over the regular time for question period.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I am asking you to allow me the courtesy of putting my question. I have a supplementary question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm afraid I cannot because the bell rang, and I rang it. (Laughter.)

**Orders of the day.**

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

*(continued)*

**HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour):** I appreciate this opportunity to participate in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, and before continuing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome all Members of the assembly back to this, the 30th session of the current Legislative Assembly. I should at the same time like to welcome and congratulate the newly-elected Member for South Okanagan, Mr. Speaker. I certainly wish him well in continuing to represent his riding with all the same aplomb as his illustrious predecessor. I stop just short of wishing him the same successful tenure of office. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

**HON. MR. KING:** Now, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, a substantial portion of this session will be devoted to consideration of labour legislation. Surely it is not necessary to emphasize and re-emphasize the type of volatile climate of industrial relations which prevailed in this province when our government took office just one year ago.

I think everyone is familiar with the history of confrontation and acrimony which has characterized labour management relationships in this province over the past number of years. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't hold as my purpose an attorney to make any statements which would further inflame that climate. I think to assess blame under these circumstances would run that risk, and I have no intention of playing that game. I think that would be a negative and backward approach to what we should be looking forward to with a positive attitude and with a cooperative spirit in terms of trying to develop a better climate and a better relationship.

It has been my approach from the outset to appeal to the reason of the parties concerned in an effort to establish a positive and cooperative attitude as a prerequisite to turning labour management relations around in this province. Mr. Speaker, there are those who think that legislative change alone will perform this task. Many who stand on the sidelines hold that the problems are simplistic, and hence legislative change is the answer to the problems in industrial relations. These advocates, in many instances, are the same people who criticized the previous administration for its failure to consult and collaborate with the parties affected by legislative reform and policy changes.

This government recognizes that healthy social relationships cannot be legislated. I think there must be a desire and a motivation to make new laws workable and acceptable to those who must work under them. What better method to develop this attitude, Mr. Speaker, than to ask labour, management and the public, but particularly the actual practitioners, to advise the government on the areas of needed legislative change. This kind of initiative by government in no way impinges upon the sovereignty of this legislature, nor upon the responsibility of the government for making the final policy decisions and translating that into legislation. The approach simply ensures that the experience and the expertise of those directly involved will be capitalized upon in formulating new policy. In short, Mr. Speaker, I think the phrase "participatory democracy" has been given meaning by the approach that this government has taken to legislative reform in the labour field.

In March of 1973, three special advisers to the Minister of Labour were employed: namely, Dr. Noel A. Hall, Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of British Columbia; Mr. Ted MacTaggart, a well-known labour lawyer from the City of Vancouver; and Mr. James Matkin, associate professor of Law, also with the University of British Columbia. These three gentlemen were chosen to assist and advise the government on new labour law on the basis of their wide experience and the broad respect which they commanded both in labour and management circles. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that they have completely justified the confidence that everyone held in them. For my part, I could only add that my association with these gentlemen has been extremely rich and rewarding, and I am sure that their invaluable contribution to analysing and assessing the need for change in industrial relations law in this province will be manifested for years to come and be proven when the legislation is introduced to this House very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the advisers were appointed in March of this year, and a series of conferences were organized to provide for the input of labour,

[ [Page 50](#) ]

management, and the public. The first such three-day conference took place in the City of Victoria on April 13, 14 and 15. A similar two-day conference was held in Prince George on June 22 and 23. Now, these were the main conferences that were held, and at that time at all of these meetings, the main representatives of industry and labour were invited. These conferences were extremely well attended by the Employers' Council Co-ordinating Committee, representatives of the B.C. Federation of Labour, the Teamsters' Union, the Law section of the Canadian Bar Association. Not only were briefs submitted, but a good deal of dialogue was developed in an effort to define any common ground that existed in respect to the points of view of both labour and management toward legislative change. During this period, more than 40 interested groups and persons representing management and labour submitted briefs.

Lengthy discussions were held, as I indicated, with the Employers' Council, the B.C. and Yukon Building Trades Council, Construction Labour Relations Association, the Labour Law Subsection of the Canadian Bar Association, and Canadian unions and many others. In total, in addition to these hearings, through private consultation and private meetings, more than 70 written briefs in total were submitted to the advisers. I think one



would agree that the government went to great lengths to ensure that those people affected by legislative change would have a great deal to say about the new structure that should be set up to deal with their problems. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the people who were invited were extremely vocal and extremely cooperative in putting forward their points of view. The advisers also spent considerable time discussing existing legislation with representatives and officials of the Department of Labour.

From this process of review, a number of problems became apparent. I should like to discuss some of these problems, and I might add that these problems were identified and recognized and acknowledged by the participants generally — by labour and by management. It's true that their recommendations for solutions were sometimes widely divergent; however, they certainly acknowledged the need for some action, some change, in these particular areas.

The first area that became noticeable was with respect to freedom of choice, Mr. Speaker. Freedom of choice has been discussed in this chamber on quite a number of occasions — I believe it was discussed yesterday, but in a different sense from that which I wish to deal with today. The process of free collective bargaining depends upon every worker having the right to join a trade union. One of the valid complaints to the advisers was that workers have been deprived in the past of their rights under the law to organize into trade unions because of intimidation and unfair labour practices by employers. Sometimes, the right of collective bargaining has even been denied after the employees have been certified by the Labour Relations Board because of the refusal of the employer to bargain in good faith. The right to certification is really meaningless if the true meaning of collective bargaining, and the true benefits of obtaining a collective agreement after being certified, are thwarted and impinged upon, and indeed denied, by an action of an employer in failing to bargain in good faith and execute a collective agreement with his employees.

We think that is one area that certainly needs attention. This message came through loud and clear on many, many occasions during the hearings.

Interference with the workers' free choice is a serious problem. Many times it's difficult to prove that interference has taken place. Many times it's impossible to determine the true wishes of the employees after unfair labour practices have been proven. In certain instances a delay injustice amounts to denial of justice because of time limitations upon certification procedures.

A genuinely free society, I submit, must ensure that workers are not denied their freedom of choice. There is a need for more effective enforcement of the law to ensure that the will of the majority of the employees is given real effect.

Now a matter of general concern for both labour and management is the wildcat strike issue. I am sure this is a matter of wide and general concern to the public as well. The economic waste that accrues from a breach of lawful contractual obligations has to be a basic concern to everyone who is genuinely interested in the economic welfare of this province.

One of the fundamental difficulties with illegal strikes, under existing legislation, is the inability of the law to respond to the source of these illegal wildcat strikes in an effort to alleviate the cause. The present capability of the law is as ineffective as stationing an ambulance at the bottom of a cliff to pick up the casualties, rather than erecting a barricade at the top to prevent the accident from occurring. There is a need for a new design and a better approach in this area — other than court injunctions and the focus of public opinion to simply inflame the matter — in an effort to prevent it from occurring. Surely this is an area where innovation and experimentation are sorely needed.

Another area that came to light in discussions that we held across this province was the problem of individual rights. This also has been mentioned in this House, both yesterday and on other occasions. And you know, Mr. Speaker, if I can digress for a moment, I find it just somewhat ironic that we have a self-styled defender of the individual rights of workers in the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) who points out and espouses the need for

legislative change to protect these fundamental rights. But where was he, where was his concern when he occupied this office for 18 months and made no effort, no attempt, Mr. Speaker, to bring in any legislative change which would guarantee the workers' rights? So that concern and the protestations ring just a little bit hollow, Mr. Speaker.

Collective bargaining, to be successful, must protect individual rights; I think everyone will concede that. While the principle of democracy is inherent in trade unionism, and I have no hesitation in making that statement, it is essential to ensure that the majority of a union, or the majority of employers in an employers' association, do not infringe upon the rights of minority groups or individuals. The way in which minority rights, and individual privileges and liberties are protected is perhaps the greatest hallmark of the maturity and the civilization of any society. There is an important need, I believe, to provide an opportunity for individuals and minorities to seek redress from the abuses of government, of trade unions, or employers. And I think that some attention must be paid to this important question.

Under our collective bargaining law some groups are given special rights. I think it's unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, to expect that society can also demand special responsibilities from these groups.

Another area which has been talked about, and one of the areas which I think is generally recognized as creating a great deal of industrial strife, is the question of technological change. More concern was probably manifested in this area during the course of the hearings than any other particular question that arose. There was a broad recognition by both labour and management that there was a need for some positive change in this important area.

The great advances in science and technology that we experience today bring with them problems affecting employers and the workers. While it is difficult to fully assess the dimensions of the problem, it cannot be denied that some special consideration must be given to those workers who are dislocated or laid off by new technology.

Perhaps improved technology would be indeed stimulated if the people most closely affected were offered protection from any disruptions that might accrue. The proposition that improved technology benefits all society must be given effect at the immediate source, Public interest disputes are of course one of the areas of concern. Again, I would point out that this question has already been raised on the floor of this House during the current session. I noticed though, Mr. Speaker, that those who express concern that the collective bargaining measure didn't apply in public interest disputes had no valid alternatives to offer. They simply said that collective bargaining and the strike weapon in public interest areas is archaic, it's outmoded and something should be done. But, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear one positive recommendation.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. KING:** "Something should be done," they said. But no one came forward with a specific recommendation to improve the system. Are you advocating compulsory arbitration?

Interjections.

**HON. MR. KING:** Well you should make that very clear.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute that has just been settled on the B.C. Railroad makes it abundantly clear that voluntary arbitration is available now. Perhaps these people should read the statutes. That always has been available, Mr. Speaker.

You know, that little group over there was labouring very seriously and mightily yesterday to portray themselves as credible critics. Indeed, I believe the second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) indicated that "we want to be rational critics" and we heard that. But I might add that nothing in what he said added to his credibility; only his plea to be recognized was heard and made any impression on this side of the House.

The process of collective bargaining faces its greatest test in public interest disputes, and there's no question about that. But you know, we have over the past years attempted to solicit the best brains in this province, to bring

together the greatest bulk of experience to advise us on new methods that might be undertaken to deal with this important question. The dilemma is to seek an alternative to the strike weapon when it seriously threatens or impels public health and the welfare of the province, without at the same time denying the workers their democratic right to the full measure of free collective bargaining.

Those people who advocate the abolition of the strike weapon can't be very concerned, or at least they're not very consistent when they say the balance of power must be maintained. Now, if we're to take away from the workers the right to strike, what equivalent action, what equivalent measure would you assess on the employers to ensure that the balance of power was indeed maintained? I've heard no recommendation in that respect, Mr. Speaker. But I think there are a number of innovations, I think there are a number of measures which can be adopted and can be developed to deal with public interest disputes.

Certainly the situation we have just seen on the BCR demonstrates that in some circumstances the workers are willing to be bound by voluntary arbitration. I think if they are willing to be so bound they should certainly have that option and be

[ [Page 52](#) ]

encouraged to do so. But I find it difficult to accept that in a free society with all that concern that's been expressed about individual rights, how you can suggest that employees should be bound in a compulsory way to accept the last offer of management without the right to strike. If they are willing to be so bound, they should certainly be encouraged along that route.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. KING:** It's quite interesting, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind that; I think that's quite interesting. I wonder if they speak with the same voice when they're out in the hustings and the public as they do in this House. I doubt it very much.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Yes they do, that's why the public buys. (Laughter.)

**HON. MR. KING:** Perhaps that's so; there should be a message there.

One of the other areas that's particularly irritating, and one of the real problems that we're going to have to try to come to grips with, is this whole question of strikes, picketing and enforcement — the legality of strikes. As a result of the briefs presented and the hearings conducted by the advisers, there were some areas where both labour and management found common ground, at least in substance. They agreed to a certain problem area, that a common approach was necessary and some need for change was certainly indicated.

One such area of common interest was the administration and enforcement of legislation. Both parties believed that a new approach was very important and justified. There was a common concern expressed about the failure of court injunctions and judicial proceedings to establish any degree of industrial peace. While there was a great divergence of opinion, again, on the substance of law relating to strikes and picketing, there was a real consensus between labour and management on the need for a new structure to enforce the law on strikes and picketing. These, Mr. Speaker, are but some of the main problems with which our legislation will deal during the session of the Legislature.

Quite frankly, I do not take the position that our new legislation will solve all the problems. Obviously it will need constant consultation to monitor the effects and to be receptive to any needed amendments that reveal themselves. I think it's important if we're to develop a cooperative relationship that we remain flexible and convince management and labour that if, in fact, any of the legislative change which is introduced proves to create inequities that we are willing and receptive to this kind of consultation and this kind of scrutiny.

At the outset of my address today, I think I outlined the need for more cooperation and the importance of positive, constructive attitudes by labour and management. Obviously the same need exists with respect to the public. This chamber is undoubtedly the greatest forum of public opinion, and attitudes which are developed here are subject to attention by the media and hence have a great effect on the public's understanding of events which unfold here. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the same sense of cooperation from all parties in analyzing and reviewing the legislation when it is introduced.

It is not my purpose to suggest that the legislation should be accepted without scrutiny, without criticism and without full debate. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that the debate should be temperate, should be constructive, and certainly not calculated to inflame; attitudes and destroy an opportunity for a cooperative attempt to make the system work. While I look forward to the introduction of the new legislation with a great deal of confidence, I'm conscious that the greatest need is for a mature attitude toward the important question of labour-management relations in this province.

I thank you for the opportunity of participating in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and as I indicated earlier, it seems particularly appropriate to me that the two main questions to be dealt with at this session are with respect to workers in this province — both in the industrial sector and the agricultural sector. I think this surely is an appropriate time to consider the need for improving the lot of these people who surely represent the vast masses and the vast majority of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, to this very worthwhile objective the New Democratic Party government is totally dedicated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack):** It's a delight to take my place in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been strictly an oversight, but no one in the House has deemed it necessary to extend congratulations to, I think, four very deserving individuals who are seated in the chambers, and they are the new cabinet appointees. I'm delighted and excited for the fact that not only did they receive their appointments, but that they assumed their chairs here. As I look at them now, I see I must make a correction, there are five.

I think it's a feather in your cap, those of you who are the new cabinet appointees, that at least your appointment was given due consideration; you were selected from those that were, which is different from the other Cabinet Ministers who were only selected because they were there. (Laughter.) They got their appointment by virtue of seniority, which reminds

[ [Page 53](#) ]

me of a very ugly story which I heard on tour this summer and which shall not be repeated in this House. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Aw shucks!

**MR. SCHROEDER:** There was also among the cabinet appointments a very serious cabinet disappointment for which I believe the people out there in the flood plains still have not had a full explanation. My sympathies go out to the Hon. Member concerned. I don't believe that he was given proper and fair treatment. A man who has represented his riding since 1949 and has maintained a certain degree of credibility since that time certainly could not have lost that much confidence in a short term for conduct which is not uncommon to some of the rest of us in this House.

While I'm also in a congratulating mood, I would like to congratulate the personnel who are involved in the redecorating of the chamber. I think they've done exceedingly well. I could perhaps make some comment on the colour of the carpet, but I'll forego that comment.

Interjection.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** It's sort of like the shirt, isn't it? Yes it is.

Interjections.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Other congratulations go to the Premier for his victory in the Frisbee contest. I think it was amazing that he should accomplish all that and all with one hand, too, sir. Fantastic!

We are here to consider the Speech from the Throne.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Having done that... (Laughter.)

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Having done that? I think that the Cabinet is learning quickly. In one year they have already decided that it is not wise to go out on a limb in a Speech from the Throne such as they did earlier in their administration when they gave us some promises about specifics — for instance, the introduction of the bill of rights, which we have not yet seen. And so they have given us very little insight into the direction of their programme for this year. Seems that they have rather chosen to insulate themselves against any attack and they've created that insulation by saying nothing. However, there are some allusions to something we might expect in terms of labour or agriculture, consumer affairs (about which I'm delighted), mining, some discussion on energy sources, and some considerations in municipal affairs. And I'd like to confine my remarks this afternoon to these particular areas.

Before I do, I'd like to commend the government on one just one more thing and that is the institution of operative standing committees which held public hearings throughout the province during the summer months. I was a member of two of those working committees and I think the lion's share of approximately seven weeks of the summer work was dedicated to work on these committees. It did take time away from the constituencies and it did give the people of the province an opportunity to sense that they were being heard — at least that they were being listened to. Over here — and this could have been, perhaps, the text of my speech — I have the stack of the *Hansard* report of just one of the committees of which I was a member this summer. These are the words that were spoken before the Select Standing Committee on Social Welfare and Education. It is quite a handsome set; you can see it there. It's about twice as thick as the *Hansard* from the last session.

These are just the words that were spoken, Mr. Speaker. These are not the words that were given to us in written form; those form another stack about one-third as high as the one we have there. There was a lot said; I don't know how much was heard. But when we condensed it, Mr. Speaker, to the report that will be tabled in this House — and I shall not divulge any of the information that is in the report — it was a very concise, abbreviated report that will be presented.

I was a little chagrined because, when the committee met in its last deliberations, the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), to whom most of these suggestions will be directed, sat in our chambers and advised us that a brochure giving the direction of the Department of Health was already completed and that there had only been one change made — and that had been the flyleaf of the brochure.

So I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much of our summer's work was given due consideration by the department. I really wonder.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You say the report was already printed?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** No, that's not what I said.

The people who believed, in good faith, that they were giving information that would be utilized in the formation of policy and direction, must now know that the policy was already established before the final report was given, Mr. Speaker, and that all of their deliberations and all the number of hours that were spent by this committee were. . may I call it "window-dressing"?

There is every indication that philosophy and

policy will prevail and that it has already been predetermined what that direction will be and that input equals zero; and all I can say for the standing committee is that it will bring back many fond memories, Madam Chairman, and it will bring memories of good friendship and of good laughter in our quiet hours.

Let me speak of labour relations. I am delighted to see in the throne speech an indication that there will be consideration given, at least, to what has been called in previous sittings the "conscience clause."

It is that right which belongs to every individual to follow the dictates of his religious conscience regarding his association with labour organizations. I am delighted to see that it is there, and I won't make any more comment because all we have in the throne speech is that it will be considered. We don't have any indication of what will be the ramifications. So at the minute of seeing the ramifications I think we can make a more intelligent evaluation.

I appreciate the Premier's office using its influence to issue the back-to-work order for the workers of the B.C. Railway. I think, though, that the government has assumed a rather ugly position. It is somewhat on a hot griddle. In assuming the position of an employer, as the government has done and has intentions of continuing to do, they are also making themselves the object of strike. At the same time, their administration, the existence of their administration, depends upon the support of the very individuals who are striking against them. Do they think, in the light of all of that, that they can make an objective labour settlement — that they can defend the economy on the one hand and capitulate to an illegal strike on the other?

It is a strange precedent that we have established just recently. Is it any wonder that the Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr. Strachan) said, "In this settlement we have got a gun to our heads"? You had better believe he has a gun to his head, and the gun is on both sides. On one side he has those who represent labour, who have supported him in his election, and on the other hand he has the general consumers in our province, who await his judicial decision, one which, supposedly, is a decision that is fair to each and all.

Is it any wonder that the Minister of transport said that we had a gun to our head? Is it any wonder that he said that it is time we re-evaluate our position about giving the right to strike to civic employees? Oh, the change of position... I think the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) said something similar when she said, "We used to think, when we were in opposition, that all we had to do was just snap our fingers and we could change policy like that, but we are learning that it is taking just a little longer than that."

My, how the weight of administration brings change in the administrator, In the crucible of responsibility the big rocks grind against each other first and the grinding ultimately makes little ones of us all.

Interjections.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) says that he wants to defend the right of every individual to join a labour union. I would agree that every individual has that right. But I wonder whether the Minister of Labour would not also agree that, at the same time, every individual must also have the right to join the union of his choice — also, not only the union of his choice but whether to join the union, and not to make it a condition of employment. This is where the rubber meets the road.

I also wonder whether or not the government in recent actions is already giving us an indication that if their eventual position in labour relations is going to be compulsory arbitration. Are they going to come back to where we started when they first took office? Eventually someone, somewhere, has to make the ugly decision. Whether it is a group of people called a union, whether it's an employer, whether it's an arbitrator, whether it's a conciliator or whoever it is, somewhere along the line someone has to make a binding decision. And I am wondering if both this government and the federal government won't be taking that same position.

Away from labour relations to agriculture. I am glad to see in the throne speech that we have an intention by this administration to stabilize farm income. Very, very good. I am glad, for this other reason, that the Premier of the province moved quickly in the railway strike, because the indication that we have from the farmers out on the flood plain is that feed, which just a few weeks ago was costing them \$92 a ton, moved quickly to \$98 a ton — then to \$105 a ton. Then, in the light of the railway strike, the suppliers gave every indication that the cost of the feed was

going to be \$150 a ton.

Now the very pressure of the anticipated escalation in the price caused the farm folk to rush to the supplier and buy up every bit of feed that was there, thereby escalating the cost of the feed even more because of its shortage of supply. The pressure to buy now automatically makes the price of the commodity higher.

I think that the government, our government here, must influence the federal government on import curbs to ensure proper farm income. It is impossible for us in the Province of British Columbia to produce food products at higher costs — the truth is, at the highest costs in Canada — and then compete with the imports at the marketplace when the imports there at a lower cost per unit. Somehow or other

[ [Page 55](#) ]

there must be a curb; we must have the same privilege for the market man, for the farmer, as we have for the labourer.

The labourer, if he is not getting what he deems to be a proper return for his labour, can withhold that service. He can strike. If a farmer deems that he is not receiving a proper return for his product, can he withhold his product? No. The minute he does, or the minute he asks a dearer cost, the borders of our province are opened and we must compete with tomatoes, cherries, prunes, apples at a cost lower than we can afford to produce them. They can be placed in our marketplace from outside sources. We have no strength at all.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound):** Talk to the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan). You're all mixed up.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** We have no strength at all in the stabilization of our farm income as long as we have no import curbs at our borders. If you want high wages, fine. But if you want high wages, you must at the same time accept the responsibility to pay the price of those wages in the price of the product, and you must at the same time protect that product against imports.

A guaranteed income for the farmer, I think, is a desirable aspiration. However, a guaranteed income for the farmer must mean more than just ample return for his labours. It must also give him a fair return for the investment that's involved, and in almost every case the investment is a high investment.

In the field of agriculture I'm a little concerned about the Land Commission appeal procedures. I'm sorry, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), through you, Mr. Speaker, that this area falls into your jurisdiction and yet you're the only person on whose doorstep I can lay this. There are three characteristics to the land-use appeal, and the three characteristics are these: 1. It's slow. 2. It's slow. 3. It's slow.

It's easy to establish the policy that land use is to be determined through a commission, but it's altogether another thing to implement those decisions. Let me give you just an illustration: We have a 17-acre farm operating by the Wiebes just east of Chilliwack. Seven, now nearing eight, years ago they built a residence for the senior Mr. Wiebe on a corner one-half-acre lot. It was okayed, building permit, everything done on the up and up.

Now all of a sudden, since Bill 42, the 17 acres falls under the reserve. When the senior Mr. Wiebe wants to sell his farm to the junior Mr. Wiebe, but he wishes to retain the half-acre lot upon which his house rests for himself, it is impossible to do so. It must have an appeal. Therefore the process of appeal entered into and we began as early as last May. The appeal still has no answer, not even an answer of consideration, for something that needs hardly a decision at all: shall we allow the half acre to be divided from the 17 acres, as a decision which has been made by the regional council some seven or eight years ago? But this is what happened. We made our contacts through the various agencies. One says, "It's not our responsibility; it's another's." Eventually, when we saddle Mr. Lane with the responsibility as late as July, his excuses are: 1. He has no office; 2. He has no forms; 3. He has no authority; 4. We have no decision.

Mr. Wiebe is still on his little half acre there on the corner of his 17-acre farm, ageing, wishing to look after it

before he goes to his final rest, but no decision is made. Bill 42 has worked against itself. It's been a boon to inflation. It has not made farmers willing to farm. It has not offered a reasonable alternative to the development of residential clusters. It's just another indication of the futility of socialism.

Socialism is idealistic. It's great for musing, occupies the mind of the dreamer, looks good on paper, but when you start to ask a socialist to make a decision, he never knows whether it's the right decision. Being idealistic, he's not sure that he is making the only decision and as a result he makes none at all. The whole programme is programmed for self-destruct.

An example of a bureaucratic forest that was constructed in the Agriculture Department was this business of the freight assistance, for which our dear farmer friends were going to receive at least some remuneration for the high cost of bringing feed, which was at some shortage, from the Cariboo or from the North Peace. The red tape that they had to go through to qualify for the freight assistance frustrated farmers, who by the way don't have a plush office and a lot of bureaucrats to do their work for them.... They've got to take time out of milking to fill out those forms, and as a result they just took the forms and threw them all up in the air and they said, "Sooner we should pay \$8 extra for feed than to go through all of this rigmarole."

Then we move to consumer affairs. I'm glad to see this new department established in the administration. The basic word for consumer affairs is the word "protection." I trust that the new government in its development of this protection will consider that not all.... I'm going to say this right, because I don't want to get it backwards — they assume that all shysters are non-consumers and they also assume that all consumers are non-shysters, Mr. Speaker. We provide plenty of protection for one category of consumer and provide no protection for the supplier, who by the way is also a consumer. And the government must provide protection for the suppliers of the necessary commodities such as groceries and fuel, auto repairs.

This is what's happening: in an age when it is becoming more and more popular to pay for your

[ [Page 56](#) ]

purchases not in cash, but rather in cheques, a grocer is obligated to accept cheques — hundreds of them in a day. Bad cheques automatically come in. Why? It's because not all consumers are non-shysters. As a matter of fact, there is an increase, in the experience of a grocer who approached me, of 95 per cent in NSF cheques in just three years. At the same time, there's been an increase of 300 per cent in forgeries. I trust that the Department of Consumer Affairs will take this problem under its wing and provide some protection for grocers who must take cheques for the purchases but have no guarantee that the cheques will be honoured when they're turned into the bank.

Break-ins for grocers — up 300 per cent in one year. The man who approached me had nine break-ins in this past year. As a result, he is non-insurable. There is no way that an insurer will take the risk of this grocery. I'm sad to see that the president of Canada's largest insurance corporation is not here, but if he were, I must ask this insurer to guarantee the insurability of this kind of consumer and give him that amount of protection.

There is another category of consumer that has received more protection than he deserves, because if a person is a welfare recipient, and he passes a bad cheque, this grocer has had the experience that he can't touch it. As a result, it's a loss. What happens to the loss? The loss is passed on in higher prices for goods and you know who pays for it. The rest of us who are consumers pay for it.

Let's move on to the area of mining. We've heard in this House as late as this afternoon that it could be, unless some curbs are established, that there will be a gas shortage as early as this winter. I find that strange. If you look at the exploration rates from figures released from the mining industry, they tell us that exploration is down by nearly 50 per cent in just one year. If we've got a gas shortage that we can expect in British Columbia' this year, what have we to look forward to in two years or three years? Should this continue?

The area of municipal affairs: there's great concern expressed out in the areas of municipal jurisdiction on the basis of lost revenue. It is lost revenue because of the new classification of land — land which was considered residential or at least potentially residential, and which was taxed on that basis before will be potentially lost from



the tax rolls because of reclassification to farm use. How in the world is the municipality of Chilliwack to operate a balanced budget when escalating costs are representing some 14 per cent of an increase over one year, when the increase in allotment that they get from the government is only \$2 per capita per year? How in the world are we going to operate a balanced budget on this score? No way. I think that the concern is well-founded and I ask the government to reconsider, in the Department of Municipal Affairs, the allotments for the municipalities and give them at least a 10 — 14 per cent increase in a per capita allowance.

The **insurance** corporation is next. I'm chagrined to think that we haven't seen any announcement from the insurance corporation other than that it's going into general **insurance** as of October 1.

**Automobile insurance — no announcement; still no estimates; but worst of all, we have no interim insurance. What are we going to do with the dear individuals whose insurance has expired between March 1, and today, and whose previous insurer refuses to renew the policy on the basis that they have had to phase out their operation? It seems to me that the Department of Transport and our good friend the Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr. Strachan) have given no consideration to the fact that we cannot expect the insurance companies of British Columbia to carry their clientele in full force until the cut-off date. They have had to phase out. They've had to phase out personnel; they've had to phase out overhead; they've had to phase out offices; as a result they have refused to insure those of us whose insurance policies have expired between March 1, 1973 and today. What do we do for insurance when insurance is mandatory? No consideration.**

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You're a bad risk, I guess.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The question that I have for the Minister is: who will give these people the insurance until March 1, 1974?

Moving to the field of education, there's a growing discontent out there on the flood plains, particularly in the teaching staff. I ask that the government return respectability to the teaching profession. The teacher is being alienated more and more from the student to the extent where it is becoming near impossible to gain the services of substitute teachers; it is becoming more and more difficult as time goes on. Words like "inhumane" have been attached to reasons why substitute teachers are no longer servicing our classrooms.

Staff — I know of one school in a constituency neighbouring to mine where the staff threaten to relocate. They have been encouraged by people in the constituency to create a new school, something on the basis of the school called the "ideal school" in Vancouver. They have asked that the return of authority be given to the teacher, not just back to the principal, but to the teacher so that the teacher can establish her own rapport with the students.

It's to the place in the school that I'm talking about where the students are using three- and four-letter words in refusing to abide by the teachers' wishes. Now the last straw comes with this: we have the announcement by the advisor to the Minister that we're going to consider student unions. When that

[ [Page 57](#) ]

happens, all I can say is: thank God for independent schools as an alternative.

Next to the area of unorganized territory which normally falls under the administration of highways. I would like to ask the government to consider that there are some unorganized territories which are quite heavily populated. The services to these areas are minimal, particularly in the area of transportation. I think particularly of Cultus Lake in my constituency where we have quite a concentration of retired folks who live on the lakeside, and who have absolutely no mode of transportation, not even to obtain groceries, to obtain drugs, to make visits to the doctors' offices. I'm imploring the Department of Highways to consider a subsidized bus service to this area, where perhaps on a one- or a two-times-a-day basis we can provide transportation to these unorganized areas.

There are more areas of discussion that I would like to draw to your attention. However, in the interests of time, I will leave those discussions until they come up in bills that are being introduced. Thank you so much.

**MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver–Capilano):** Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure to follow the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder). I realize, of course, that I don't quite have his histrionic talents.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, have been concerned at different times with the relevancy of some of the proceedings in this chamber and some of the speeches that take place in the chamber. Many of us have felt, I think, perhaps particularly during the past summer, that the committee work sometimes had more relevance, more meaning, and I want particularly to mention the Committee on Municipal Affairs.

This was a very hard working committee — I would go so far as to say, despite political differences, a very compatible committee — and I think it's going to file in a few days a very excellent, at least interim, report.

But I would like to describe for you a scene, Mr. Speaker, on the night of July 26 last, on the afterdeck of the *Edgewater Fortune*, sometimes called the *Greenpeace II*. It's about midnight, there's a full moon off South Gabriola Island, and the committee is holding a late meeting. (Laughter.)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Member, reports on what happens in committee are not really supposed to be in the House, but go on, go on. (Laughter.)

**MR. BROUSSON:** I'm just describing a scene, Mr. Speaker. And there, Mr. Speaker, the members of that committee learned the true abilities of the Member for Chilliwack as he told us the immortal story of the Phoo bird. (Laughter.) Mr. Speaker, you'll have to wait for the report of the committee to get the story. (Laughter.)

Like all the Members on the opposition side, I've been reading and re-reading the throne speech trying to find something of significance, something new, or maybe even something useful. I did find two new things and these are the only two new things in the speech that were not known before in terms of press releases or stories or announcements or whatever. First, the reference that the labour legislation will recognize the sanctity of religious beliefs. Well, Mr. Speaker, when this was read in the speech a number of people applauded this remark. But to me it's a shocking thing that we have such a Minister of Labour that this subject even has to be mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It should be taken for granted.

The second new thing in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, was the announcement of the seminar on nuclear power. My first instinct was to say, "Well, what's the use? The Premier has already got a closed mind on that subject. Why does he go through the window dressing of holding a seminar to discuss it?" And I think perhaps the Member for Kamloops (Mr. G.A. Anderson) would agree with that kind of thinking. But I've decided, Mr. Speaker, to give the Premier and government the benefit of the doubt on this subject and very seriously to say that I do welcome this study and I hope very much that the Hon. Premier will listen to it with an open mind and perhaps change his mind from the opinions he's expressed previously.

Now the speech also, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the Department of Consumer Affairs and, as others have done, I want to welcome this response of the government to my call for this last winter. I want to congratulate the new lady Minister (Hon. Ms. Young), to wish her well and I urge her to get as much as possible away from and out of the Attorney General's (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) office where the consumer affairs branch has been stifled for some long time.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the new Minister of my proposal last spring — the series of store-front consumer advisory offices across this province where ordinary people can get advice on budgets, on mortgages, credit, warranties, that kind of thing. It does not need to be an expensive programme. I detailed some of the costs of this for the Attorney General last winter. It could be a training ground for young lawyers and other young graduates.

I don't believe yet, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General has control over the mortgage brokers with the somewhat "Mickey Mouse" amendments that we've passed in the last session, and I hope this new lady Minister will carefully examine this field. I hope she'll institute an active educational programme in the schools and in the community.

Interjection.

**MR. BROUSSON:** I mentioned that the whole area of credit and training and education all needs examination.

Perhaps more noticeable, Mr. Speaker, are some of the things left out of the Speech from the Throne that were not said. I hope every speaker in this debate mentions them because all over B.C. the voters watch and wonder why these things are not happening.

School taxes are not coming off the land. There is no bill of rights. There is no right to sue the Crown and there is no ombudsman. Once again promises, promises, promises, and no wonder the public begins to lose faith in the politicians and their government.

One subject was left out completely from the Speech from the Throne and I think it's shocking that it was completely neglected — that's the subject of transportation.

The last decent debate we had in this chamber on transportation was nearly two years ago during the estimates of the former Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Black). On that afternoon, I remember so well, the NDP opposition at that time and the Socred government side took turns attacking the fat cats of the North Shore. That afternoon the NDP Members talked themselves into opposing the Third Crossing, and that's how it finally became government policy. Not because it necessarily makes sense to oppose the Third Crossing from a rational point of view, but because it made more political hay in Vancouver East and Surrey.

I think the transportation policies of this government are one of the biggest disappointments so far. We've had many, many speeches calling for unified plans, freeways, river and harbour crossings, ferries, appointment of Mr. Parker, all of these sort of things. But all of these things so far have produced nothing. One year later nothing much has happened except, well, we ordered 99 buses, we got about half of them, we've painted them fancy new colours, and I understand the upholstery is a little better — there is a little more space, like Western Airlines, for people with long legs like me.

One thing that I am encouraged in: for the first time, one or two people are beginning to realize and are talking about the necessity of including downtown parking as part of the problem of transportation. That finally is beginning to receive some recognition, I talked for three years asking for parking in downtown Vancouver and the central business district to be included in the things that government transportation policies must control.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the public and the government alike seem to be unaware of what, if anything, is being done.

I changed my mind on one thing on transportation — maybe free buses would work. I must say that in the election in 1972 I opposed this concept. The more I thought about it, the more I studied it, the more I think I was wrong and I'm prepared to say I might have been wrong. I think they might work. Seattle is trying an experiment of this kind now and I think there is much we can learn from Seattle's project. It's costing them only \$64,000 for a year.

Why don't we try one experiment, Mr. Speaker, for a period? For example, let's try the experiment of a free bus service from the central business district in Vancouver to the North Shore, to North and West Vancouver. Let's try it in rush hours only, say, from 7 to 9:30 in the morning, from 3:30 to 6 at night, and put on some express service, and let's see if it would not work.

The trouble with these kinds of things is that we talk about them from a very theoretical point of view but most of us don't really know for sure. The experts can make studies and that sort of thing, but until you really try it you don't know for sure.

Seattle's experiment is in the central business area; you have to pay to get into it and pay to get out of it, but travel within that area will be free. Perhaps we could try it from one enclosed suburban area to the downtown area, and try it for a reasonable period of six months and see what happens. Perhaps we could make a contribution to the

science of transportation.

One extra point on transportation. I've called many times for a unified approach to get all the factors into the equation: the crossings, the freeways, the parking, et cetera, et cetera. But there's one more I've never heard mentioned before now and that is the matter of taxicabs. Most cities in the world — London, New York, Chicago, wherever you go — have roving taxicabs. If you have to cross town, you can find one quickly and get there cheaply; you don't need your private car in the metropolitan or central business district in any of those cities. Some cities even have a system of scheduled taxicabs. Mexico City, Caracas in Venezuela, Trinidad, and a number of other cities particularly associated with Latin America have taxis that run on regular routes — no special times, but they shuttle back and forth over regular routes. They're cheap and they serve a useful purpose in giving people an alternate to their own transportation.

Well, Vancouver instead has a very limited fleet of taxicabs which cannot rove around the downtown area. It's against the law for them to pick up people when you flag them down from the sidewalk. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a programme for taxicabs would be a very useful part of an integrated transportation plan for the lower mainland of British Columbia.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Minister for Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) is in the House because I want to discuss a recent announcement of his. I give the Minister credit. He hasn't perhaps developed the corps of executive assistants and press secretaries and special assistants and similar administrative arrangements that some

[ [Page 59](#) ]

other Members of the cabinet have, but he's getting his own in now, Mr. Speaker. He announced a commission of inquiry into electrical inspection in British Columbia, and he announced this with great fanfare on September 7.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it's a great pity to start such a project in such a confused way. I wonder if this particular project is not chosen because the IBEW has the Minister's attention or his ear in some way. For five years, Mr. Speaker, I've been telling this House about the confused, dangerous situation in the whole matter of safety inspection in this province.

I want to review this very briefly. In Public Works, the Minister's department, under Safety Engineering Service, we have the inspection of electrical; of natural gas; of boiler, pressure vessels, and refrigeration. Over in the fire marshal's office in the Attorney General's department we have oil burners and propane gas being inspected.

I've explained, Mr. Speaker, many times — I'm sure you'll remember — how often the RCMP "inspect" oil burners and LP gas. I'm sure, while we all have a great deal of respect for the RCMP, as inspectors of oil burners and propane gas installations I would think they would leave something to be desired.

I've given the House many examples of danger to life, accidents and near accidents that have happened as a result of this slipshod system of administration because the fire marshal's office simply has no proper inspection set-up whatsoever.

I've explained how other provinces do it all in one department. I've explained the shortage of inspectors in electricity and natural gas inspection as well as in the fire marshal's office, but to no avail with the last government and it would appear to little avail with this. The new Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the new Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) agreed something ought to be done and might be done some time, but they've done nothing. I think basically, it's because the Attorney General and the civil service don't want to be bothered with trying to make the administrative arrangements that are necessary.

Finally, the mountain has laboured and out pops this little mouse of a commission on electrical inspection only. Let me read you the Minister's objectives; this is from his own statement. He says:

"It must be stressed that our concern is and must remain primarily to ensure safe electrical installations for the protection

of the public."

"However, times have changed. Technology has advanced and we must ensure that legislation and administration keep pace with changing circumstances. I have therefore asked for and received cabinet approval for a commission of inquiry into electrical inspection in British Columbia under the provisions of the *Departmental Inquiries Act*."

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is to be headed by a very distinguished Canadian, Dr. Hugh Keenleyside, much respected, well-thought of in British Columbia and, in fact, in Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what a pity we are not using the services of Dr. Keenleyside and the rest of his colleagues in this commission to do a complete study of all the similar inspection departments that are involved. Not just electric, but natural gas, propane, oil burners, refrigeration, boiler and pressure vessels — the whole package.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, the Minister to expand the terms of reference for this commission, and just for once do it right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another matter to raise with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley). There are very few businessmen in this chamber. That is something that this chamber lacks, and I think it is a serious thing, because very rarely do legislation and government in British Columbia get some input from those who are practising, working businessmen.

I want to tell you that it is not getting any easier to be a businessman in this province. We have complex and new income tax laws, we have a new provincial Companies Act, we have increased provincial taxes, and the Premier seems to take the attitude and attempts to explain to the public that the corporations and the companies of the province can provide any amount of taxes, whether they are profitable or not.

Most companies are pretty small, not large, but to hear the Premier talk about them he thinks that they are all great, big, huge, corporate giants. Most companies in B.C. are small and it's tough to deal with the things I am talking about: the awarding of contracts without tender that has been a practice of this government; the inflationary wage settlement that this government has been involved in lately such as the Barrett formula for the civil service, which is 10 per cent up to 20 per cent; or the Strachan formula for the ferry service, which is 15 per cent, maybe up to 20 per cent, something of that order — pretty inflationary settlements that the average little businessman also has to deal with when his staff sees those kind of inflationary settlements being made by Big Daddy government.

Then there is the attitude of the government as a union organizer. I refer there, Mr. Speaker, to the Public Works Fair Employment Act. I spoke in the House last winter when we discussed this Act, and I said that clearly the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) were becoming, in effect, union organizers in British Columbia. We have already heard the Minister of Public Works waffling about this Act; I heard him being quoted on the radio the other day saying, "We

[ [Page 60](#) ]

must be flexible." And the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) spoke yesterday explaining how flexible he was being on one particular tender here in Victoria. I have received a letter this morning, Mr. Speaker, from a member of my constituency from a company. It is a copy of a letter dated September 14 addressed to "The Hon. W.L. Hartley, Minister of Public Works, re the B.C. Ferries Deas Dock facility intercom tender." I received a copy in my mail today.

Dear Sir: This letter is intended as a complaint and an enquiry into the policies being followed by your department in the awarding of Public Works tenders. The dollar value of the contract in question in this case was small, but the principle is important for the future.

In July of 1973 we received notice of a tender call on an intercom system for the B.C. Ferries Deas Dock facility. We subsequently submitted our tender on August 3, 1973, as required.

The tenders were opened in public and it was found that three companies had met the requirements of the tendering

instructions by filling in the tender form provided by the Department of Public Works. The form encompassed the dollar value of the tender and required a signature acknowledging compliance with the *Public Works Fair Employment Act* of 1973. The fourth tender opened did not include the correct tender form, nor did it indicate compliance with the fair employment Act. This tender was the lowest in price of the four bids opened.

After the tender opening our firm inquired about the awarding of the contract, thinking that since we were the lowest of the firms that had bid in the approved manner, we had a chance of being awarded the contract. We were told that the contract was being awarded to the low bidder, and that the department had gone back to that firm and asked what their position was regarding a collective agreement. The firm in question does not have a collective agreement but assured the department that they were sub-contracting the work to a company with a collective agreement.

The matter was discussed with Mr. S.E. Edgcombe, contracts administrator, and his final suggestion was that we send in a formal complaint. We have also discussed the matter with one of the other bidders and they have the same opinion we do.

Our basic complaint is that, as we understand the *Public Works Fair Employment Act* of 1973, the company tendering for the Public Works department must have a collective agreement as well as any sub-contractors. We also feel that tenders which do not follow the tendering instructions should not be allowed.

We would appreciate your investigating this matter and stating to us on what grounds the department can justify awarding this contract, as it appears to contravene the legislative Act.

That is signed by Mr. G.A. Lane, President, Pacific Communications Ltd. Copies to the Hon. Mr. Wm. King, Minister of Labour, and to myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as someone who has participated in the construction industry for most of my business life, and has been very much involved in the tendering process in all kinds of contracts, as a supplier of labour, as a supplier of installation, as a supplier of equipment, I think I am very, very familiar with what is the ethical, fair and honest practice in submitting tenders. If there is a format laid out for that tender as to time and place and that sort of thing, all of those things should be followed, and if someone tendering does not follow those regulations that tender should be thrown out — it shouldn't even be opened. Now we have this new factor, nothing to do with the form of the tender, but the requirement under the *Public Works Fair Employment Act*. Now I fought that Act, I voted against it, but the fact is it's law and the government should follow it. No talk about the Minister, about "we must be flexible," can apply in this situation. Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, I urge your consideration of this and I urge your direction to your departmental officials to follow honest and fair tendering processes.

Mr. Speaker, I had one final topic, and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) will also be interested in this, because it's in his constituency. It's the Skagit Valley. Mr. Speaker, the public believes the battle of the Skagit Valley is won, and I think most MLAs in this House believe that battle is won. But I must tell you we are going to lose and the Skagit Valley is going to be flooded.

Let me tell you why. Last September, after the election of the new government, I told the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) that I was prepared to cooperate in every way possible and to take this issue out of the realm of partisan politics, provided he would assure me of his efforts to continue properly the former NDP policy. What has happened since then? Nothing. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, except that last winter, spring and on into the summer a considerable amount of logging went on in the valley under the auspices of the British Columbia Forest Service. The Minister has cooled that somewhat now, but it took him many months to do it.

The Minister made public speeches last fall. He made, at my request, definitive statements of policy in this House last February. At that time I explained to him privately the idea that a deal could be negotiated with Seattle. A combination of a little cash, a little power at the right price and the right time would solve the problem with honour and

[ [Page 61](#) ]

satisfaction to all parties, and no confrontations. Clearly a negotiation was possible; the olive branch was there.

The Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources knows how that could have been dealt with. The federal

government has a small group which has been ready to work on this. The Hon. Jack Davis wanted to work out a joint federal-provincial solution. But what about our provincial Minister? Would he do anything? Nothing. Nothing, Mr. Speaker. And why is that? Because he thinks the Federal Power Commission is going to solve his problems for him by turning down the Seattle application.

Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it isn't going to work. The Federal Power Commission is in the business of giving power permits — that's the American Federal Power Commission. I read to the House last spring a letter of March 6, 1973, from the ROSS committee. To the newer Members in the House, let me remind them what ROSS stands for — Run Out Skagit Spoilers. It was a letter from the ROSS committee to Jack Davis, and also to the provincial Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. That letter pointed out that ROSS had no funds and could not make a presentation to the American FPC, but Seattle would very likely succeed in that application and that if so it would be much more difficult and expensive after that to stop the flooding. But if the government would not or could not go, the ROSS committee was prepared to make a presentation if they were given some financial assistance.

I read this letter to the House last March. The Minister said he hadn't seen the letter but that he would see that it was replied to. His executive assistant asked for and got another copy but from that day to this there has been no reply, Mr. Speaker, not a single, solitary word.

Just recently the Federal Power Commission in Washington issued an amending order postponing its hearing from December 3 this fall to February 25, 1974. Let me read you the statement from the Federal Power Commission in that amending order:

"We are aware of the extreme necessity of construction of new generation at this time."

Then they go on to say:

"However, there are some legalities that must be performed and issuance of an incomplete draft statement by the staff would be self-defeating and could well lead to much greater delay."

So very clearly from those words the FPC has virtually made up its mind. They are aware of the necessity to get things going but they have to get these legal things out of the way first. Otherwise, they might have even more delay.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the Federal Power Commission in Washington at my own expense and on my own time. I have talked with members of that commission and some of their staff. I am listed personally as an intervener and so is the ROSS committee. We have no money, I doubt if I have the time to go and the Minister doesn't even answer letters asking for help from the ROSS committee.

The FPC in my opinion will issue that permit to Seattle. What do they care about the Skagit Valley? And then how will the Minister negotiate a deal? If he can, how much more expensive will it be to British Columbia?

I remember the work of the Member from Yale-Lillooet, the present Hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley), Mr. Speaker, in the Skagit campaign. He rode to Seattle with me on at least one occasion and I remember his eloquence before Seattle City Council and before the Washington State Ecological Commission. Where is that Member now?

I remember the speeches of the NDP federal member, Mark Rose. Where is the NDP policy of defending the Skagit from flooding under the ridiculous contract signed by Williston and defended by Bennett?

Mr. Speaker, I ran in August of '72 very largely because I wanted to finish the Skagit fight that I'd started. I very much doubt now that I will ever have the time or the money or the strength to finish that fight. But I remember so well in 1971 in Ottawa talking to Prime Minister Trudeau about the Skagit and he told me then, "If you want to save the Skagit, get rid of Bennett." Well, Mr. Speaker, we got rid of Bennett but I tell you that we are not going to save the Skagit because this new government and this new Minister of Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) simply don't care, and the Skagit is going to be flooded. We got rid of Bennett, Mr. Speaker, but look what we got.

**MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver-South):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start off by saying that early this week I took a walk around this building and really, from the outside of it, the southern side of the building is every bit as beautiful as the part facing the waterfront. I believe that it was originally intended to be the front of the building, with its beautiful columns.

In the southeast corner I noticed the cornerstone which was dated as having been laid on September 28, 1912 by the Duke of Connaught who was the then Governor-General of Canada. That means that this building is 62 years old and it has, from the outward appearance, been kept in marvellous condition. I am glad today to be able to see the refurbishing and the renovations that have been made inside the building because I think that there should be constant renovations in a fine, dignified building of this type, just as there always have been in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

[ [Page 62](#) ]

Year after year in the House of Commons special masonry artisans from Italy are employed so as to be able to continue with carving that has never been completed, and that will continue to go on in stages of completion, because the history of what is happening in Ottawa is being recorded in stone in the building. I believe that here too we have to maintain the beauty and dignity and serenity of these chambers, not only for ourselves but for posterity. It does not belong to the Members who are here; it belongs to the people of British Columbia, and when this chamber is renovated or when any of the Members or the Cabinet Ministers' chambers are renovated, it is not for personal aggrandizement, it is for the dignity of the office. I am very, very pleased to see the renovations that have taken place this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to some of the statements that were made by the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder). I was rather surprised to hear him say that the teachers were terribly unhappy and in a state of confusion and that the Department of Education was making things difficult. He should have been at the teachers' convention this spring. When they held the convention the chief speaker for the luncheon was the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly). The teachers were so happy to see her come in there that they gave her a 5-minute standing ovation before she even started to speak.

The morale of teachers in British Columbia is higher today than it has been in the last 20 years. Let me say too that there is not nearly the confusion that the Member for Chilliwack would have us believe.

Certainly new methods are being tried and new philosophies are being worked out in education but it's high time they were. You take for instance in my own constituency of Vancouver South there are two high schools that are not too far apart — the David Thompson Secondary School and Killarney Secondary School. So that there is a transfer of philosophy of thought in the schools, in the Thompson school they are using a lot of the new methods, the open school type of approach, and in Killarney they are using the traditional method and parents from both schools are permitted to send their children to whichever one of these two schools they want their children to go to. So there is no confusion as far as the children are concerned; there is certainly no confusion as to what the teachers want. They are given the opportunity to have input into what is to be taught in the schools. It is the first time in a long time that they have had that and they are very happy about it.

Certainly, during the last day or two, there have been reports on radio and television that the teachers are anxious to look for a bettering of teachers' conditions. But is that not true of the trade union movement? Is that not true in every movement? If they do not look forward to improving their conditions then they have nowhere to go. They are certainly not at the stalemate that they were until this administration came into being.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another subject. At the spring session of the legislature I urged the Minister of Education to give serious consideration to setting up a northern university and I would like today to repeat that plea. Last week it was reported that the enrolment at the University of British Columbia is once more increasing, that it is very close to or slightly over 20,000 people again. Simon Fraser University has the highest enrolment in its history and I believe that it is the same for the University of Victoria.

I believe we must face the fact that we are not only a great province, but that we are a rapidly growing one.



We're probably experiencing the greatest growth in population of any province in Canada. In yesterday's paper it was announced that the national population gain for Canada from 1968 to 1973 — that is the last five years — has been 6.8 per cent. But in British Columbia, during that five years, the gain has been a whopping 15.4 per cent.

We can no longer expect the lower mainland universities and the University of Victoria to serve the entire province, with a continuing increase in population of this kind. Fortunately, in the Okanagan and the Kootenays we have the University of Nelson, which takes care of the needs of many of the students in that part of the province, particularly for those who can't afford to or don't wish to come to the lower mainland for their post-secondary academic education.

But if we're growing fast today, this is only a taste of things to come. In the spring session, this government unveiled a programme for the opening of the north that will surely cause a tremendous population explosion far beyond our wildest imaginings. Our government is to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, on the introduction of an excellent programme to develop the northern part of British Columbia. The plans and the progress in the various stages of development fairly boggle the mind.

The town of Ocean Falls has been saved, ensuring the livelihood of those employed at the mill there. The government has taken control of Columbia Cellulose, saving the jobs of some 3,500 workers, many of whom are in the northern part of this province. A super port is to be developed at Prince Rupert. This, along with the CNR and the British Columbia Railway extensions, will be a joint federal-provincial effort. The railway development will mean the extension of rail lines from between Prince George and Prince Rupert, from Terrace through to Dease Lake, and north to Lower Post on the Yukon border.

Never before has there been such a programme of

[ [Page 63](#) ]

federal-provincial cooperation brought into being. Included in this federal-provincial agreement is the revision of the freight rate structure for wood resources. As a result of the freight rate changes, tremendous developments are also planned around Burns Lake in relation to wood utilization programmes by private firms.

It is estimated that about 1-1/3 million acres of land in that entire northern area will be utilized for parks, roads, transport corridors, watersheds, mining and agriculture. It's estimated that the development of this northern area will generate a whole new arena of employment. Forestry and mining alone, it was predicted sometime in the newspapers, will create approximately 18,000 new jobs in that section of the country.

Other sectors of the economy in that region will provide at least another 17,000 jobs, and it is foreseen that the programme will create around 65,000 more jobs in other parts of British Columbia and outside of this province. This will stimulate a significant influx of people into the northern part of British Columbia.

Along with the development of new industries and roads to resources there will also be environmental and ecological studies for the purpose of wildlife preservation and for the consideration of the rights of our native people living in that region.

We may well look forward to the creation of new towns and the expansion of others. Hopefully, this should take some of the pressure of population and density and increase from our metropolitan areas such as Vancouver and Victoria and from the Okanagan and the Kootenays.

Until now the development of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, has been a very lop-sided affair because past governments have ignored the potentialities and the problems of the north. Let me say again, never before has there been such a spirit of cooperation between the two senior levels of government.

Now to be able to accomplish such a programme of this magnitude, human resources must be taken into account as well as material resources. One of the problems of the north has always been the high percentage of transient population, which will no doubt increase.

Another problem that must be seriously considered, as I have stated before, is the condition of our native people and the way they're living. Positive direction must be shown towards housing, education and employment of our native Indians in order to improve their living standards.

I was interested, in the beginning of August, to hear the federal Minister of Urban Affairs, Robert Andras, express caution with regard to the problem of establishing new urban centres. This is what he had to say:

You are not going to get people to settle in an area where there is not the availability of cultural improvement and enjoyment. To develop a city where there is to be any degree of permanency of residence, there should be available such cultural amenities as an art gallery, a museum and a university. People hesitate to settle permanently in a region where there is no university.

Thinking people everywhere not only require work satisfaction, but leisure and cultural satisfaction as well. They desire it not only when they go on a holiday, Mr. Speaker; they want cultural satisfaction within their reach every day of their lives, every day of the year. When a family decides to settle into, a new neighbourhood or move to another city, the first things they look for in that neighbourhood are the social amenities that can add quality to their lives. These include a church of their choice, schools for their children, health centres, social centres, transportation and shopping facilities.

In outlying areas the school very often doubles for a community or social centre. This has been one of the stimuli for producing the community school. However, today this isn't sufficient; they also look for ways and means of improving their own education and of providing post-secondary academic education for their children.

Recognition of education as a continuing process throughout life has resulted in the development of our junior colleges and of vocational schools throughout the province. These institutions provide the first two years of university and programmes of training in trades for the upgrading of skills without having to leave one's own neighbourhood and one's own district.

Unfortunately, many young people who wish to complete their professional education are still forced to leave home to attend university. I know what a pull that is because that is the type of thing that happened to my parents when they wanted us to go on into higher education once our elementary school education was finished.

We lived on a farm. It meant that my father had to decide to bring us into the city. He had to look for another type of work than farming to be able to support his family. It is a great pull indeed for people who enjoy the freedom of country life and enjoy farming.

Until 10 or 11 years ago British Columbia had only one university, Mr. Speaker. It took a great deal of drive and determination on the part of Dr. John MacDonald to survey this entire province for the potentialities of post-secondary education. This led to the development of the regional colleges throughout British Columbia, the establishment of the University of Victoria and of Simon Fraser University. At the same time as this was happening the University of Notre Dame at Nelson was being developed.

Now while this present situation may be

[ [Page 64](#) ]

satisfactory to people who live near the universities, who live on Vancouver Island or on the lower mainland or in the Okanagan and the Kootenays, the absence of a northern university does present hardships for students, and for the parents of students, living in that part of the province. Not only does it tend to concentrate all of our talented and educated people in the southern part of the province, but experience has proven that if young people come to the lower mainland for their university, many do not return to the northern part to practise their professions. As a result, our northern towns and cities have a constant struggle trying to get and keep professional people. Prince George is short of registered nurses and social workers right now, and doctors are at a premium in the northern half of the province.

I understand that Dr. Elliot said just recently that there are sufficient doctors in this province to service the entire province but, unfortunately, most of them congregate in the lower mainland. They don't go out to the boondocks around Hazelton, Prince Rupert, Prince George, Terrace and Lower Post, and places like that. Also, anyone who has lived in that northern part of the province, as I have, will know that many of the schools suffer a large turnover of staff every year.

Just recently, I read in the paper where Mayor Harold Moffat of Prince George predicted that within the next decade, due to intensive northern development, metropolitan Prince George will grow to a population of approximately 95,000 people. That's a great city, and it's grown very, very rapidly. I understand that metropolitan Prince George is between 65,000 and 75,000 at present.

In preparation for this tremendous change, we must make plans for the expansion of post-secondary education in that entire region. I would urge the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) again, to begin to plan for a university of the north in that area now. It would be an ideal place for the development of special programmes for young Indians wishing to enter the professions. It would be a good place for the introduction of an Indian studies programme in which the native people could participate in the planning and the development of the courses. But let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it should not be a university geared to native people alone.

Within the next few years, the northern part of this province will require many young professional people to carry out the development of the north. It will require educators, social workers, doctors, dentists, engineers, accountants, biologists, all on a permanent basis. Indian and non-Indian must study together and work together for a rational and well-balanced development of the human as well as material resources of their own area of the province. We should educate the talented young people who are already there to fill these positions, rather than import all our professional people from the coast or from abroad.

In relation to a university of the north, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn your attention now to the plight of the Indian people in British Columbia. This month's *Non-Status News*, the newspaper of the B.C. non-status Indians, reported the graduation of a native person from the law school at the University of British Columbia. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he is only the second native Indian ever to graduate in law in this province. Now isn't that utterly preposterous when you realize the University of British Columbia has been in operation for over 50 years, and the law faculty has been in existence for about 25 years or more?

Equally ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that although there are approximately 115,000 status and non-status Indians in the province, at present there are only about 140 registered in all our universities together. In all of British Columbia, there are only 45 Indian teachers in our public and parochial schools combined. I'm told that of these, less than one-half are involved in the classroom in elementary schools, and there are not more than five — five — native teachers in all of the province's secondary schools.

We pride ourselves, as Canadians, on being a people who place a high value on education. In fact, the appreciation of an educated society has become a world-wide trend. We recognize that the higher the educational standards of a nation, the higher will be its standard of living too. But education for whom? There must be a horizontal opportunity for everyone, regardless of race or colour, and when we consider this, we can do nothing but deplore the fact that the opportunities for the good life obtained through higher education have by-passed our native people. In the field of education, as in all other worthwhile facets of life, we have failed them miserably due to a lack of understanding of their needs. In the *Non-Status News*, one little quote I would like to read is this:

"Schools must be more responsive to the needs of all children, particularly those neglected by the school system because of their low economic status. The education of our native children is both a disaster and a national disgrace."

No race or ethnic group is superior when it comes to brain power or intelligence. We have many brilliant people among our native Indians. In the fields of painting, leather work or carving, their skills are second to none. They're outstanding workers in the arts, and they are first class hunters and fishermen and guides. But too often they have become frustrated and discouraged because their cultural values differ from ours — not because they're wrong, but they differ from ours. They believe basically in cooperation rather than competition. They find it all

too difficult, with lack of education and limited financial resources, to live successfully in our competitive society. Again, I quote from the Non-Status News: "What all children need, whether Indian, white, black, brown or yellow, rich or poor, are schools without failure." An Ontario study on the native Indian states this: "Institutional education among our native Indian population has served as an instrument of cultural genocide." That's every bit as true in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, as it is in Ontario.

Be that as it may, integration into the public school system has not been any glowing success either. In British Columbia, there are approximately 50,000 status and 65,000 non-status Indians. A non-status Indian report of 1972 estimated that over one-half of the non-status Indians in British Columbia received welfare in some form or other — over one-half. Because they do not receive federal grants and are not recognized as Indians, they're much poorer than the status Indians, and their chances for education are much less. In fact, they're much poorer, Mr. Speaker, than any other racial or ethnic group in Canada. Isn't it a shame that we've placed the Indian as the low man on the totem pole?

They suffer from dismally poor housing, from malnutrition, from lack of proper sanitary facilities, from ignorance of their rights as citizens and from unemployment. Add all these together, and you realize that their energies and ability to study must be at a very low point. We should not be too surprised, then, that depression, loneliness and frustration set in. In desperation, many of them turn to drugs, to alcohol, and to prostitution.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 40,000 Indian children enrolled in the schools of British Columbia and their record of school completion is sad indeed. Statistics show that 78 per cent of our native Indian children have dropped out by the time they have reached grade 10. Most Indian young people reaching high school have a reading comprehension level of about grade 4 or less. Under these circumstances is the drop-out rate any surprise? Is it any surprise that 95 per cent of them fail to complete grade 12? Where are they going to get the understanding and the ability to relate to our educational system and our values if there are no native teachers or coordinators to help them interpret them?

Of the 5 per cent who graduate nearly all are on the vocational programme. Only 1 per cent of the non-status Indians are on the academic programme, while 75 per cent of all non-status Indians in our high schools are in the occupational and special classes. Even those who complete the academic programme find it difficult going into post-secondary education of any kind and, of all the native Indians in our vocational schools, only 5 per cent of them were non-status Indians.

It was during the last few years, due to efforts of the better educated among the native people, that such changes have taken place. They have developed a certain self-awareness and a great number of self-help programmes. They have developed their own newspapers, for instance; they've begun a native homemakers association for young women to teach the native women nutrition, better homemaking methods, and the proper use of modern equipment.

They have developed a chain of friendship centres all the way across Canada, and 11 of which, Mr. Speaker, are in British Columbia. The purpose of these friendship centres is to find homes for young native Indians who come from the country into the heavily-populated urban areas so that they don't land up on skid row or some other undesirable place, to give them legal assistance if they run afoul of the law and also to perpetuate their culture through the arts.

It's not only just for the young people. In the friendship centre in Quesnel, for instance, they have a literacy programme that they started last year. It is for the older Indians and they have 50 Indians registered in that programme.

But, Mr. Speaker, they desperately need educated native people who can relate to their own culture as qualified teachers, nurses, social workers, nutritionists, and yes, in other professions too such as legal advisers and even architects and builders, so that they can do a great deal of their own work. Without these educated leaders from their own community they will continue to be under-educated and unemployed. They require a minimum of

education to be able to enter Manpower training programmes for trade training.

I was delighted to read once again in the *Non-Status News* that the vocational school at Terrace has recently moved into a programme of upgrading for Indians aimed directly at the native people which is proving very successful. They say that in the first year there has been only about 10 per cent drop-out. Many of these young natives come from the Stikine and the Nass River area. I was delighted to see that because I realize that they would probably go as far as Prince George but they might not want to go all the way to the lower mainland.

I think our Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) should be highly commended for her interest in what is happening to the native people and for her insight into some of their problems by hiring Mr. George Wilson, who has a Bachelor of Education degree, as director of Indian education for British Columbia. I realize, and I'm sure the Minister of Education realizes too, that he has a tremendous task before him. Here are some of his problems.

Of the 4,100 students in the Prince Rupert area, 20 per cent or 850 of them are native Indians, but there are no Indian teachers on staff for the year

[ [Page 66](#) ]

1973-74. There is only one home-school coordinator paid for by the Department of Indian Affairs. There are no Indian trustees. There are no Indian clerks, janitors, teacher aids or grounds men. Do you wonder that these children feel alienated in a situation that is completely foreign to them?

At Williams Lake, in that school district, of some 6,800 students, 16 per cent are Indians. Again there are no Indian teachers and no Indian trustees.

A top British Columbia educator and a former inspector said that it would be optimistic to suggest that, out of this 600 trustees in British Columbia, more than five of them would be Indians. The absence of Indian adults attached to the school system in this province in any way has a terribly alienating effect on the children.

Once again I would like to congratulate the Minister of Education for trying to ameliorate the situation. Only two weeks ago she announced the appointment of Mrs. Angie Dennis, who is a former teacher, to the Education Advisory Board. These are things that are a great step forward.

Other groups and associations have also tried to do what they can to help the native people. At Simon Fraser University the alumni association has announced a students' loan programme for Indian students going to university. They say:

"The projects that we are actually spending money on have almost all been to support the native Indians. We felt British Columbia Indians should be informed of the existence of the university as a relatively friendly place. They frequently look upon universities as institutions which are completely alien and where they are not welcome. We decided specifically to give bursaries to non-status Indian high school students, because they receive no financial assistance from government as status Indians do. Right now the problem, though, is that they never complete high school and our bursaries are intended to bring them up to the level where they can enter university."

Simon Fraser University has also hired an Indian teacher as a coordinator at the university, and the University of British Columbia has an office for the Association of Indian Teachers. This is an excellent beginning, Mr. Speaker, but I sincerely believe that if we are to encourage young Indians in the north to remain in school we must start right now by training more Indians as teachers. To encourage them to continue their post-secondary education, we must create for them a climate that is hospitable, with courses and disciplines to which they can relate.

Our coastal universities are already too large and sophisticated and they are too far away to entice the young Indians from the northern part of British Columbia. Williams Lake lies on the 52nd parallel and from that parallel north to the Yukon border the school population of Indians and non-Indians is about 65,000. In 1971-72 the Department of Education reported that there were some 3,000 students in grade 12 in that northern region, and about 3,300 or more in grade 11. With a university centred at Prince George, I am sure that many of these young people would be encouraged to continue into post-secondary academic work.

Let us not forget that, with the growth of population through northern development, there will not only be an influx of workers, there will be an influx also of their children who are the students who will be going into the high schools and into the junior colleges. We need a university for them, too, right in that northern area. I would urge the planning of a northern university in that region that should begin as soon as possible so that a deadline of five years could be set for its opening. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D.F. LOCKSTEAD (Mackenzie):** Thank you Mr. Speaker. It gives me much pleasure to take this opportunity on behalf of the people of Mackenzie constituency to congratulate the Hon. Walter Stewart Owen on his appointment as Lieutenant-Governor. I would like also to express my personal satisfaction with the ambitious programme of legislation outlined in his opening speech. I am in complete agreement with our government's expressed intentions to place in a position of top priority legislation which will assist and encourage those whose labour produces the food, goods and services which form the basis of our enviable standard of living in our province today.

As a Member of this government with some legislative experience behind me, I recognize the complexities with which our cabinet Ministers must deal in framing such vital legislation. I recognize also that the programme of legislation we are undertaking is a most ambitious one and its debate will constitute a heavy workload for us all. I intend, therefore, to keep my remarks brief.

I have expressed my personal satisfaction with the legislative priorities for this session, as outlined in the Lieutenant-Governor's opening speech. I feel, however, that I would be doing less than my duty if I did not respond positively to his challenging comment that it is our responsibility to ensure that the voices of our citizens are heard loud and clear through their legislators. It is because I believe that my constituents' concern must be expressed in this House that I intend to speak of problems in transportation, industrial development, local governments and land use.

In speaking of transportation, let me first say to the Hon. Minister of Transport and Communication, (Hon. Mr. Strachan) and the Hon. Minister of Highways, (Hon. Mr. Lea) that their efforts on behalf of the travelling public are appreciated. Improvements to the ferry service and highways have

[ [Page 67](#) ]

been noted and commented upon in the local press. However, growth demands more and better facilities and growth is occurring rapidly in Mackenzie.

Transportation remains one of the most basic problems to the residents of my constituency. This does not mean that I favour the spending of millions of dollars on these facilities without careful overall planning.

I must report to you that there are a great many people in my constituency who are greatly concerned about the possible effects of improved transportation to the areas, as yet relatively unspoiled, in which they live. This is a complex matter and it is clear that improved transportation, which is made necessary by growth, will in turn be responsible for further growth in any areas made more accessible. Planning is imperative.

There are however certain adjustments which could be made, particularly to the ferry service, which would assist residents in times of peak load on the system. It has been noted that much of the overload problem is caused by the movement of trucks, trailers and campers. Studies have been made and suggestions are being received for the improvement of the service.

A year ago I spoke in this House on the need for the planned development of industry in the central coast area and I called for a systematic survey of its resource potential. Since that time I have served on the Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries. I know that the job of planning for industrial development in this area is underway. I also know that more time will be required to do the job and we must ensure that economic development does not occur at the expense of our most valuable asset, the environment. We must also ensure that no industrial development is allowed to threaten our other important resources such as fisheries.

Nevertheless, if I have to speak for the people of Mackenzie, I must voice their concern. The industrial

development of the central coast has long been neglected. Ways must be found soon to assist the people in the economically depressed areas of the coast to achieve a more productive and rewarding way of life. That this government has made some significant move in this direction is appreciated.

During my recent visit to Ocean Falls I have been happy to observe that the operation there is a thriving one and that the 900 people whose homes and way of life have been saved are determined to show that it will continue to be an asset to the people of British Columbia, and that Ocean Falls will continue to function in this important role as a centre for hospital, police and educational services for the entire central coast.

Local government continues to be an issue of great concern to many of my constituents. Whereas we have moved to improve the regulations with regard to the franchise so that it is now possible for tenants to participate more fully in local government, action is still required to make it more practical for them to do so. Registration is still the responsibility of the tenant and often the problems of registration are a disincentive to their participation in the electoral process.

It is my belief that the role of local government is one of increasing importance. We cannot move wisely on matters of land use or education without the intelligent assistance of local government. I believe that we must move quickly to encourage the widest possible participation in government at this level.

In the past year this government moved decisively to protect potential and existing farm and parkland. Although the forms of the legislation were not completely understood by the people of B.C. at the time, it is now apparent that the vast majority of our people agree with this legislation. There is a related concern, however, Mr. Speaker, which has been widely expressed by my constituents with regard to land use. Over the past 10-12 years, the cost of purchasing land has increased enormously. In some cases, land which sold for \$200 an acre is now \$2,000 an acre. Furthermore, there are many parts of my constituency where land is not available at any price. Private companies, many of them foreign interests, hold large tracts of land for speculative purposes. Crown land is not generally available for purchase or lease and real hardship is being experienced by people who wish to own their own homes or farms.

Again, I realize that the problems of land use are complex and will require time to solve, but I must report that there is a growing concern in my constituency that the land should be put to good and proper use. I believe that more provisions must be made soon for individuals to lease land for residential and/or farm purposes.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would, on behalf of the people of my riding, congratulate the new appointments to the cabinet. I feel that I speak for the majority of my constituents when I say that I am particularly pleased about the new Ministries of housing and consumer affairs. These are both areas of concern in Mackenzie and these appointments reflect our government's concern in these matters. Thank you.

**MR. C. LIDEN (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take my place in this debate, although I am not sure that this is the best sort of day for some of us in the backbench. We have had the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) and the "Minister for the flood plains of Chilliwack" (Mr. Schroeder), who is a candidate for the leadership in the party up there at that corner. From what I understand from my trip on the Gulf Islands and the stories that he told us about the Phoo bird and so many other things

[ [Page 68](#) ]

that he knows a great deal about, I am sure that he's got something going for him in that leadership race.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** What did you do to the Liberals?

**MR. LIDEN:** Well, I guess the things I am going to say aren't that interesting to them.

The first thing I would like to do today is to congratulate the additions to the cabinet. I think they are fine people and, from working with them last fall and in the spring, I am sure that they'll tackle the job that they have ahead of them with vigour and energy and that we'll see something accomplished. All their responsibilities are heavy

ones, and I am sure that they are the people who can do the job.

It is interesting to be back in the legislature this fall. With, of course, the added contacts that we made this summer and the additional information that we gathered, we are better equipped to tackle the problems that we have and the problems of the Province of British Columbia.

Certainly we have been encouraged, many of us. I found a great many encouraging things during the summer months, and some of them were along the lines of some of the discussions that were started here in the spring. I was most pleased that the Minister of Agriculture came to a meeting in Delta and listened to briefs presented by various groups on the question of the land commission and how it was going to function and all that sort of thing.

Most of the briefs that were presented were presented in criticism of the land bill and all that it is intended to do. But when you start to look at the people who were presenting the briefs... first of all, the agriculture committee of the chamber of commerce. The spokesman was John Friesen, who is one of the top dogs in Block Brothers. It is interesting that he should be so concerned that he really doesn't want to save any farmland.

It is interesting, when you look down the line at the people who are making the representations, that they are people who have vested interests in land speculation, people who are out to reap the profits, if they can have a free hand on the kind of development they want, regardless of what kind of land is used for whatever purpose.

The thing that pleased me the most, really, was the fact that after that meeting and after the reports in the press that indicated that farming and agriculture generally were finished in Delta, it was interesting that my phone started to ring and the farmers, one after another, were telling me that "these people aren't speaking for me." They were telling me that they had had a good year, that they had been farming all their life and that they wanted to continue farming, and "don't let anybody tell you that the question of agriculture is dead in Delta."

They wanted me to bring that message to the Minister. I had some messages to give those fellows too, because one of the things that happens on this kind of a job is that you are out to meetings every night — at least in Delta you are. And the farmers that phoned me did so at 6:30 in the morning. That may be a reasonable time for them, but it's not that reasonable a time for me.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the time from April 18 to September 13 passed by very, very rapidly. It seemed that we were so busy doing things we just didn't really have time to have a holiday. I, for one, managed to be on two travelling committees and found that I was so busy there was no time to do anything else.

I noticed today that some people were a bit critical of the travelling committees and the work of the committees between sessions, but I wonder if that isn't because they have other responsibilities in other jobs and it sort of interferes with the other work that they are trying to do.

I think that we're on the course of MLAs being full-time people. I think it is a correct course, but I don't have to make that kind of a statement. I have spoken to people who were in this Legislature prior to August of 1972, and some of those people have told me that they congratulate the government for setting up the Legislature on a year-round basis so that the people are involved on a year-round basis. And they have congratulated the government for setting up travelling committees so that the people are working between sessions.

When you really think about it, I don't think the previous people in this House, particularly those in the backbench, really had a chance. I don't think they really had a chance to properly represent the people of the province. I understand — and I watched the situation before and certainly I have been told by people on all sides of the House — that what happened in the past was that you came into the Legislature in January, you left in March and you went about your other jobs and you weren't able to serve the people in the constituencies. That was the sort of thing that really came home to me from all sorts of people all over the place. But there were other things as well about those travelling committees.

Certainly on the forestry and fishery committee we had a crash course in forestry. We learned something about the trees from the time they were little things till they grew to be tall timber, how their seeds developed in the



cones and how the professionals in the industry cross-pollinate and how they try to develop better strains and so on — sort of a story of the sex life of the fir tree. It was very interesting and very educational, and I think it is going to be very beneficial to those who want to make use of it and make better decisions in the

[ [Page 69](#) ]

future.

Besides the committees, all the standing committees this year, we had a special little thing that happened this summer that I think was very special, in any case, because it dealt with the fishing industry, my favourite industry. I want to particularly thank the people who participated in the commercial fishing trip this summer: the Premier (Hon. Mr. Barrett), the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Ms. Young), the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea), the MLA for Langley (Mr. McClelland) and the MLA for Skeena (Mr. Dent) — six of us in all.

I was a bit disappointed that more people did not take up the opportunity. We could have handled many more but I'm sure.... Well, I can report as well, Mr. Speaker, that no one got seasick. They learned something. The Premier learned to wash dishes on the very first day. On the second day he was punching holes in the water. It's all part of a very, very interesting industry, and I am sure that the rest of the people in this House would have gained something from that trip.

Most of all, though, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a special word for the skipper and crew of the Western Warrior, the Camano Sound, the Theresa 1, the Zodiac Light and the gillnetter, Premiere, and the crew of the B.C. Packers' fish camp and all those in the fishing industry that participated. Without their volunteer work the trip wouldn't have been possible. I think, too, for the six of us who participated, I suppose we should say a special word for all the cooks on the boats and in the camps.

You know, it is great to be out there. There's sort of another world out there. There is a community of a thousand guys out in the Port Renfrew area and most people don't know that they really exist. They have a complicated life, a tough life in a way, but it is a very interesting life, certainly very interesting for those who go along just to see what it is all about.

I want to say that while we were out in the Port Renfrew area — and we are dealing with clear blue water and seeing fish caught in a pretty nice surrounding — I want to tell the Members here today something about the habitat of the salmon and the lifestyle of the salmon and some of the problems that that salmon is faced with.

If you start with them as little fingerlings in the streams, in the lakes, in the rivers of this province away inland in British Columbia, some of them stay in there for a year but most of them head out to sea in the first year of their life. They stay out at sea, some of them, two years. Some of them stay out for four years, the majority of them — some five years and a few of them six years.

They must survive all of that in order to come back, in order to be part of that harvest that the people take at the mouth of the Juan de Fuca Strait, in the Fraser River and in the many places up and down the coast. First of all, those salmon must survive the predators of the ocean, and there are many predators out there. That's a natural sort of thing. They take a heavy toll on the salmon from the day that they are little fellows and get out in the ocean until they are near maturity and heading back into shore.

But the real problems that the salmon have to face are the problems created by man. In 1952 the nations of Canada, the United States and Japan entered into a treaty that allowed the one nation, Japan, to have a high seas net fishery. That was a treaty that was a product of the "cold war." That was a treaty that was developed in order to try to provide an opportunity for Japan to harvest salmon that were heading into the Kamchatka Peninsula, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Amour River — the Siberian coast generally.

But it really didn't work that way — not entirely. While it did provide them with an opportunity to catch salmon going into the Siberian coast, they also caught salmon going into Alaska and British Columbia; not so much

into British Columbia but certainly they affected the production in Alaska.

The saddest thing about the whole treaty is that when the fish are caught in the mid Pacific, they are only halfway to maturity. The product isn't as good, they are not of full size and it is an uneconomical operation. But it is the kind of an operation that might be welcome to a country that has no salmon streams and no spawning grounds of its own. Certainly that country of Japan has only had a couple of spawning grounds on the island of Hokkaido; these spawning grounds were ruined many years ago.

So the salmon that head into our streams are the salmon that leave our streams, make their trip out to the high seas, have to return to British Columbia and fight their way through that commercial salmon operation on the high seas. Sometimes they miss it completely; sometimes they're intercepted in that operation.

It's more than a coincidence in my mind that the operation on the high seas is sometimes very, very successful and the operation on the Canadian shores isn't so good. Then there are other years when they miss them completely in the mid-Pacific and there's a high production on the B.C. coast. There has to be something to that old question of that fishery out there, besides the fact that it's scientifically wrong and totally wrong for the world to accept.

The argument has been made by the Canadian fishermen for many, many years, including the years when that treaty was negotiated (the Canadian fishermen actually held up the signing of that treaty for one year), that the salmon really belong to the country of their origin. That's a basic position that we should adopt.

We enter into lots of treaties on how to divide up

[ [Page 70](#) ]

the salmon because the salmon that go to the Fraser River come down through Juan de Fuca Strait and are fished by the Canadian fishermen in the vicinity of Port Renfrew. They are also intercepted by the American fishermen from the State of Washington down in Puget Sound and at Salmon Banks, and incidentally right up to the Tsawwassen ferry. For those of you who have looked out the window of the ferry at this time of the year and seen seine boats working right in the vicinity of the Tsawwassen ferry, you'll find those are U.S. seine boats and not Canadian. And they're all fishing on Canadian fish. But that's also as the result of a treaty that I think was negotiated too long ago, should be reviewed and totally changed.

That treaty was negotiated in 1937. Either nation could have possibly destroyed the salmon fishery of the Fraser River so it was worked out that the United States and Canada would share 50-50 in salmon production, in the building of the Hell's Gate fishways and in various other things that took place in trying to build up the spawning grounds.

However, those times have long gone by, and while there may be some of the maintenance costs paid for by the U.S. budget, the important thing is that the spawning grounds are in British Columbia. There may be other things that British Columbians might want to do with those spawning grounds and there may be other approaches that we would want to make to them. If we adopt the principle that the salmon belong to the nation of their origin, then we also have to re-negotiate the treaty here in Puget Sound — the treaty that refers to all the waters around here as commission waters and shares the salmon between the two nations.

We have similar kinds of problems in the northern part of the province when we're dealing with the salmon industry. We have the Stikine and the Taku Rivers that flow through the Alaska panhandle. The spawning grounds for the salmon are in British Columbia and the fish are totally harvested by the Alaska fishermen.

It's a totally unfair situation and we get very little or no cooperation from the federal government when we set out to try and change some of those problems. At one time, a number of years ago, when I was living in Prince Rupert, we organized a campaign to go fishing in the Stikine River inside of the Canadian boundary and we were prepared to go and harvest some of the salmon that are born in British Columbia and that return to British Columbia to spawn. We thought that as a result of getting in there we might be able to bring the Americans to the negotiating table to talk about some of the problems that are common to both countries but on which we're at the short end of the

stick.

In that time, when we were trying to organize that operation, we had the cooperation of the fishing companies and the fishermen in the area; we even had an aircraft that was going to fly the salmon out after they were caught by the Canadian fishermen in the Stikine River.

And what did we find? We found that the cooperation we got from the federal department of fisheries was a statement saying that there would be no licences issued to Canadians to fish in the Stikine River. That's the kind of cooperation we get from Ottawa, and it's for those sort of reasons that I've long campaigned for a provincial department of fisheries so that we can get some interest in the British Columbia fishermen and the British Columbia economy in that great industry.

But really, that's just the beginning of the problems that the salmon have to face. When Mr. Salmon returns from his trip to the high seas and has passed by the various nets and he is heading into the rivers and streams, he's faced with the other problem that man has created — the problem of pollution.

Pollution comes with population it seems, and by the rapid population growth in the Fraser Valley we find that the pollution problem is accelerating. The Fraser River is getting worse and it really doesn't have to get worse. Certainly we don't have to go through the same sort of thing that we've seen happen in Europe where rivers, once clean, have become totally polluted and are now on their way back because they're starting to clean them up. They're starting to make industry do a better job and they're starting to clean up the domestic sewage and so on.

I say that we don't have to go the same route; we don't have to destroy our rivers and then try to bring them back. What I suggest is that we immediately set out on a programme that will clean up the problems we have.

When those fish travel up those rivers, they sometimes have 500 miles to go. They'll go all the way up to Omineca, up to see the Member (Mr. Kelly) there. There's some spawning grounds in that area that have to be looked after. Some of the problems they run into up in that area are the problems that nature creates, where the water is too warm, where there's not sufficient water in the streams. Sometimes that's created by logging and action by mankind that hurries along the runoff whenever there's rain, and it creates a real problem for salmon.

But it's the problem in between that I'm most concerned with: the question of dams on salmon streams. I haven't heard much about that sort of thing lately, but there were threats, there were statements by the previous government that there were going to be dams built on the Fraser River.

Interjection.

**MR. LIDEN:** There were statements from that

[ [Page 71](#) ]

group. I know there have been various tests taken in the area where the Moran Dam is proposed and I think they were well along the way of laying the base for starting that project. However, the change of government on August 30 changed all of that, I hope. I hope we can be assured that there's not going to be any major power project on the Fraser River.

There are other things happening on the Fraser River. Industrial development in many cases creates some great problems. Certainly there are many of those problems right in my constituency.

The first problem is that of the log booms. The amount of log booms stored in the water today is unbelievable. There are more logs in the water today, I'm told, than there ever has been. These log booms lie there, they burn together when the boats and the currents go by, and they drop off bark. The bark drops to the bottom of the river and creates a change in the kind of life that we can expect to have at the bottom of the rivers and waterways anywhere.

A log buyer told me just two weeks ago that he had been invited to go and look at a log boom in Burrard Inlet to purchase it and tow it around to the Fraser River. He said that the price was okay and it would have been fine, except that the logs had been in the water so long that there was no possibility he could get them around to the Fraser River without losing most of them. In fact, he predicted that probably he'd only have the boom sticks with him when he got into the Fraser River.

What happens to those logs once they get out of the boom? Some of them are submerged, some of them are partly submerged, and some of them are floating around the Gulf of Georgia where the ever-increasing sports fleet finds the danger of these logs. There are campaigns on to put flags on them so that people will see them and recognize them more easily.

Well I suggest to everyone here that almost every log that you see floating in the waters of British Columbia has a stamp on it — it belongs to someone and that someone should be responsible for the damage that log does, no matter who it does the damage to.

There is, of course, a new situation that has developed, or at least accelerated in the last while, and that's the question of oil spills. During this summer we had two oil spills in the Fraser River. Now the first one, everyone agrees, was a major oil spill.

That oil spill occurred one Sunday noon when most of us were up at the local ball field participating in the opening of a tournament. Some people noticed from their homes that there was a dark stream running down the middle of the Fraser River and heading out to sea and they came to the ballgame and told me about it. Four of us got together on a gillnet boat and went out there to see what was going on. We found an oil spill that was in some cases just two or three feet wide, in some cases 40 or 50 feet wide, and it was about five miles long. When it entered the Fraser River, there was a high-running tide that was moving quickly out to the Gulf of Georgia.

Environment Canada has a phone number in the phone book, and it says that it is a 24-hour number. On that day people phoned that number from before lunch and away on into the afternoon. When we made some statement to the Press about this, the Press people checked it out and phoned the number and found also that there was no one answering that "24-hour" number.

The second oil spill wasn't nearly as bad, but it was there. I was called by some longshoremen in the middle of the night and asked to go down and have a look at the oil spill, and I suggested that they should call some authorities. They said they had, but that the authorities said they didn't have time to look at the situation and couldn't be bothered coming down, I went down there and saw an oil slick behind the boat that was 40 or 50 feet wide and about 150 feet in length. That's all I could see from where I stood and from the amount of light that was available that night. That night there was no hard-running tide. As a matter of fact the river was standing still. We called the authorities and I was told by Mr. Cavanaugh of the Fraser River Harbours Board that he wished the longshoremen had called him instead of me. He didn't think they should have called me; they should have called him, and he'd be successful in dealing with the situation.

Well, I was pretty disappointed the next day when he made a statement to the press that there was only a "bucketful of oil" that had spilled in the river. Well, it couldn't possibly have been a bucketful. We went out by boat that night in the darkness, in two boats, found the spill, took samples from it, and it covered a large area. I don't like the situation when people in authority try to play these things down. They are serious situations and they have to be dealt with.

The SPEC organization, a year-and-a-half earlier, took some bottles, put some messages in them, and put them in the river just about the same place that the oil spills took place. Those bottles were discovered in the mouth of Burrard Inlet, as far up as Powell River, in the Gulf Islands, in Puget Sound, in Bellingham and in all the beach areas that people are looking to. If everybody just takes a moment to think about that, what happens to the oil that ends up in the Fraser River? It ends up going out of the river and onto the various beaches all over the place, from Vancouver to Bellingham and on the Vancouver Island shore as well.

There's a real problem in the maintenance of our environment and it seems to me that we just cannot allow it

to remain totally in the hands of the federal people, because they are not prepared to look after

[ [Page 72](#) ]

the situation. I think that in British Columbia we should be establishing an environmental protection service that may run into some conflict with the federal people, but at least it would guarantee that someone would be looking after the environment of British Columbia so that we could preserve what we have and make sure that we turn the tide and don't allow the Fraser River to continue to become polluted.

You know, when I was a youngster I used to swim in the Fraser River. Many of my neighbours tell me that they used to get buckets of water out of the Fraser for drinking water. Even the old Sunbury school used to send the kids down to the river for a bucket of water. That was their drinking water. Today the situation in the Fraser River is such that most fishermen use rubber gloves. They don't want to put their hands in that same water.

That is the sort of direction we've been going and has got to change. It has got to change.

Poor Mr. Salmon is fighting his way through the oil spills, the log booms, the sawdust that's in the river, the domestic sewage and all the rest of it, trying to find his way back up to the spawning grounds so that he can survive and so that people can have an industry to work on in the future.

We've got in British Columbia a Pollution Control Board. I've had some experience with that board in the last year and it's all been a sad experience. It seems to me that we've got a monster in the Pollution Control Board, that really isn't doing anything except issuing permits to pollute.

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Name names.

**MR. LIDEN:** The Pollution Control Board sent a person down to the oil spill in the Fraser River only because I called them. When he came down there he said, "This is a federal responsibility and all I can do is make a report," and he didn't even have a pencil and paper with him to do that. You know, that's the same sort of thing that we've been getting whenever we've been dealing with the Pollution Control Board. There's been no direction given by that board whatever. I know that the departments are very, very busy, and the new Ministers have got a lot to do, but I sincerely hope that the whole question of the protection of the environment is going to get much more priority than it has had in the last year and in the many years before that.

We've had a bit of a problem developing in White Rock where they have one of the finest beaches in the lower mainland. There is a secondary sewage treatment plant in White Rock. That plant is able to deal with some of the sewage, but it is not able to deal with all of it. It has an outfall there that is beginning to scare some people, and this year there was an application to take the outfall 2,000 feet into the bay. The environment-conscious people in the community started to raise some Cain about that situation and started to take some samples of water on the beach and have them tested in some sort of laboratories in the Vancouver area.

When I started to make some enquiries about that I was told that the environment people were taking the wrong kinds of samples; they weren't taking them — properly; there is an established way to do this, and so on.

As a result of some of the questions that were raised, I managed to get a meeting with the Boundary health unit, the fisheries people, the GVRD people, and the pollution control people, and I noticed that they all had standard ways of taking tests. They go out into the water where the water is at least a foot deep, take a sample of water, and take it to the laboratory to have it tested. The environment people went out when the tide was low, when there were tidal pools over the beaches of White Rock — and bear in mind that when there's people on that beach and using that beach that's where the children play, in the tidal pools, and that's where the environmental people took the samples. But they were told that's not the correct way to do it, that you must take your samples in the proper standard western way by going out when the tide is full and taking it out of at least a foot of water. The fisheries people suggested that there might be a total closure on shellfish if that outfall is allowed to continue to flow out into the White Rock beaches. The pollution control person who was there argued that it was a safe thing to do and it was okay to continue in that direction.

To me that just isn't good enough. When you try to get tests taken in the way that you think might be beneficial to the people. You are told that that would require a major change because we don't have budgets to take tests out of tidal pools, we only have a budget to take tests where the water is a foot deep.

It is an unbelievable situation. And it seems to me that that's the sort of thing that we've been getting out of our Pollution Control Board.

We've gone through the same hoops on the Annacis Island treatment plant. When we were first elected to power the treatment plant was going to be a primary one. As a result of some work done by the new government, the Minister announced that it is going to be a secondary treatment plant. We started some experiments to see if we couldn't even make it better than that. We spent \$5,000 on an experiment for coal treatment at the University of British Columbia.

You know, in order to get to that point we had meetings with all sorts of people, including the pollution control people, and they told us there was no point in going anywhere on the coal treatment because it doesn't work, that coal is no different than

[ [Page 73](#) ]

sand and it can't possibly be a benefit to sewage treatment.

After we managed to get \$5,000 to do a study to see if something good couldn't be found, we find that the Pollution Control Board authorized \$12,000 to prove that anything we found was wrong — to stop any progress in the right direction. A fantastic situation. That whole question of the Pollution Control Board in British Columbia needs to be overhauled and it needs to be overhauled now.

**MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo):** Take it to the Minister, Carl.

**MR. LIDEN:** I think the Minister really has had a lot to do and hasn't had time to give it the priority that I want him to give it. But the priority could have been given in the years before and it certainly wasn't then either.

I want to touch on another issue and that is the Workmen's Compensation Board. I've represented many people in taking up claims with the compensation board and I find that it's very difficult to get anywhere with an appeal. I want to use just one example. I want to use the example of a workman that was in his 60s — in his early 60's.

He had lost three fingers on his right hand many, many years prior in an industrial accident in another province of this country. He managed to get paid off by a lump sum when that occurred. He was working as a stationary engineer at Pearson Hospital. He had two fingers on this hand, the thumb and the index finger. He was able to turn his valves and do his job. He was able to mop up the floors and do the various tasks that he was required to do.

One day, when he was sweeping the snow off the steps, he slipped and fell down the steps and injured his back, not enough for him to lose any work, but enough that he suffered some pain. He also had to visit the doctor and he had to have various treatments and so on. He managed to do that and continue working until he hurt his finger. He cut his finger, it became infected and then he had to enter the hospital to have his finger amputated.

So he ended up with one finger on one hand. But during the time that he was off work his back continued to get worse; and he also had a car accident.

When that man goes looking for a job, he's got three strikes against him: first, he's in his early 60s; secondly, he's got one finger on his right hand — and it's the thumb; thirdly, he's got a collar around his neck that holds his neck up straight. I wonder how many employers will take a second look at a person in that shape. But when you try and make an appeal for his sore back and the impossibility of him getting rid of that collar, you find that because he had a car accident and because there is some doubt as to whether or not his back was injured on the job, you can't get

anywhere on the appeal.

Because he lost that one last finger he applied for a pension. I tried to discuss that in the same appeal that I was trying to appeal the injury to his back. I was told — and so was the secretary, incidentally — that you couldn't continue to discuss the question of his finger because the appeal was about the neck. While the finger was gone, that was another story and it had to be discussed at another time with another appeal and probably with another appeal board.

Now that man ended up moving to Edmonton to stay with his daughter because he couldn't find a job and he couldn't survive the way things were going. That's the sort of thing that's been going on for so many years in the compensation board.

The same applies to pensions for widows that have had their pensions fixed in the 1950 rates and have had increases on the cost of living basis, but haven't been brought into the 1970 wage scale or any percentage of it.

You know, I've campaigned for a long time to try and have the fishermen properly covered by the Workmen's Compensation Board. I'm not so sure whether that's the way to go, or whether we shouldn't work in the direction of actually eliminating the Workmen's Compensation Board. I'm beginning to wonder....

**MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay):** Make a new department.

**MR. LIDEN:** I'm beginning to wonder about all the duplications. Sometimes there's some argument as to whether a person that's injured on the job is going to have his doctor bills paid for by medicare or by the Workmen's Compensation Board. I'm of the opinion that it really doesn't matter whether the workman hurt his back on the job when he fell down the Pearson Hospital steps or whether he hurt his back in the car accident; he still has to live. This society has to make provisions for him.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Guaranteed annual income.

**MR. LIDEN:** Well, there are many things that can be done and we must work in those directions. I would like to take just a moment to talk about some of the serious problems affecting Delta.

In Delta we've experienced the most rapid growth rate not only in British Columbia or in Canada, but on the North American continent. With the rapid growth goes a host of problems — problems of transportation, problems of recreation and all those sorts of things. We've got a real problem boiling in Delta today because there are too many trucks travelling through the residential area.

Those things are all the result of rapid growth.

[ [Page 74](#) ]

While they talk about bus systems — and I'm very much in favour of getting them going — I'm so concerned about the problems we have there, because there are more people moving into the area. Those people must get to work and they can no longer get over the Pattullo Bridge. But I'm happy to say that the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea), shortly after he was appointed, came out to Delta to appear at a meeting to listen to some of the people's complaints. That was a very, very enlightened thing for him to do.

You know, we thought there might be 35 people at that meeting. We hoped that there might be 100. There were 400 people that came out to that meeting and they were very, very concerned about the traffic problems that exist there and how we're going to solve them.

That situation has to be solved and we can't continue to just have studies. We must produce some real bus routes and we must produce some crossings for those buses to go over. We must do something in that line because it's the most tragic situation facing that area today. It's a real problem; it's a problem to everyone concerned and it must be met.

While I'm at it, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the government for the purchase of the aircraft for the Government of British Columbia. I understand that stretchers can be moved into those aircraft and they can work on people that have difficulties.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Flying Bill.

**MR. LIDEN:** I'm very much in favour of the purchase of the aircraft so far, and I hope, if they can do a job in providing ambulance service in the outlying areas of this coast, that we purchase more of them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just sum up. I want to say that I dealt with my favourite industry, the fishing industry, and I've outlined some of the problems, and I once again want to call for a provincial department of fisheries. Secondly, I want to call for the establishment of a provincial environmental protection service, something that does a whole lot better job than the present Pollution Control Board. Thirdly, I hope that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) and his department will take a look at the possibility of perhaps eliminating the Workmen's Compensation Board and solving those kinds of problems in another direction.

I've dealt with some serious problems in Delta and I hope that all of these things will get immediate attention.

Mr. Lewis moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Filing reports.

Ms. R. Brown from the Select Standing Committee on Social Welfare and Education presented the committee's final report, which was taken as read and received: (see appendix).

Hon. Mr. Barrett files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

---

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