

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, APRIL 3, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 2063](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

An Act for the Restriction of the Use of Spring Traps (Bill No. 171)

Mr. Gardom. Introduction and first reading — [2063](#)

Oral Questions

Mincome payments to old age pensioners. Mr. Chabot — [2063](#)

Changes in Real Estate Act. Mrs. Jordan — [2064](#)

Negotiations re elevator strike. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2064](#)

Reduction of ferry rates. Mr. Morrison — [2064](#)

Pollution standards for government pulp mills. Mr. Smith — [2065](#)

Operating losses of Columbia Cellulose. Mr. McGeer — [2065](#)

Insurance agents' commissions. Mr. Gardom — [2065](#)

Two-price system for lumber. Mr. Chabot — [2065](#)

Pollution in Semiahmoo Bay. Mr. McClelland — [2066](#)

New ferry design for Gulf Islands. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2066](#)

Sale of meat containing D.E.S. Mrs. Jordan — [2066](#)

Purchase of private hospitals. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2066](#)

Committee of supply: Department of Public Works estimates.

Mr. Fraser — [2067](#)

Mr. Gardom — [2068](#)

Mr. Chabot — [2069](#)

Mr. McGeer — [2070](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2071](#)

Mr. Chabot — [2074](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2075](#)

Mr. Curtis — [2075](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2076](#)

Mr. Morrison — [2076](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2076](#)

Mr. Gardom — [2077](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2077](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2078](#)

Mr. Gardom — [2078](#)

Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2079](#)

Mr. Chabot — [2079](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [2081](#)
Mr. Smith — [2081](#)
Mr. Chabot — [2082](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2082](#)
Mr. Williams — [2082](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2083](#)
Mr. Morrison — [2083](#)
Mr. Williams — [2083](#)
Mr. Chabot — [2083](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2083](#)
Mr. Morrison — [2083](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2084](#)
Mr. McClelland — [2084](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2084](#)
Mr. McClelland — [2085](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2085](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2086](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2086](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2086](#)
Mr. Chabot — [2087](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2088](#)
Mr. Chabot — [2088](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2088](#)
Mr. Wallace — [2089](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2089](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2089](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2089](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2090](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2090](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2090](#)
Mr. Cummings — [2091](#)
Mr. Smith — [2091](#)
Mr. Fraser — [2092](#)
Mr. Kelly — [2092](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2092](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2093](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2094](#)
Mr. Williams — [2094](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2095](#)
Mr. Phillips — [2096](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2096](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [2096](#)
Hon. Mr. Bennett — [2098](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2098](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [2098](#)
Mr. McGeer — [2098](#)
Mr. Williams — [2099](#)
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2099](#)
Mr. Williams — [2099](#)
Mr. Wallace — [2099](#)
Mr. Smith — [2099](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [2100](#)

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

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

MR. E.O. BARNES (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to join me in welcoming a group of students from Templeton High School and their teacher, Mr. Gary Sanders. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the more refreshing moments in my day — you might call it the pause that refreshes. This afternoon I had an opportunity to speak to these students and I think it is something that we should do a lot of. I felt really good; there were about 50 of them and they were excited about looking at what was going on. I hope the House will be on its best behaviour to give them some political knowledge, so they will get somewhat of a false impression of how it is in the House. (Laughter). Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Omineca.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): Mr. Speaker, I have three residents from Omineca in the House today. I believe they are here somewhere. Canada's finest. They are Lazare Pius, the chief of the Necoslie Indian band at Fort St. James, Peter Prince, one of the band members, and Ray Prince, a resident of Fort St. James. I would ask the House to join me in welcoming them here.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT FOR THE RESTRICTION OF THE USE OF SPRING TRAPS

Mr. Gardom moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 171 intituled *An Act for the Restriction of the Use of Spring Traps*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 171 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): The Hon. Member just asked me if I knew the difference between a spring trap and a fall trap, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to answer that question.

Oral questions.

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

MINCOME PAYMENTS TO OLD AGE PENSIONERS

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): A question to the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement. On February 23, 1973, the Minister reported to this House that 11,575 persons over the age of 65 were in receipt of less than \$20 per month by way of Mincome payments. Would the Minister inform this House that, as a result of the federal pension increase of \$17.12 on April 1, as of that date 11,575 old age pensioners in British Columbia will, in fact, now be cut from the Mincome plan?

HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement): I can't comment, Mr. Speaker, on the figures but for about the fifth time I have announced that we are not going to give the increase that the federal government is giving. It is going to remain at \$200. Nobody is going to be cut from the plan in essence — it is just that we are not going to add to the \$200.

MR. CHABOT: A supplementary question: this was in reply to a written question placed on the order paper — these figures that I am quoting at the moment. I don't want to get into a debate on the matter, but I am wondering whether the Minister will tell us whether these people that received \$20 or less — 11,575 old age pensions — will be cut from the Mincome rolls.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question has been answered several times. Not in the specific terms of the numbers ...

HON. MR. LEVI: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the Member I'll take it as notice and I'll answer it

tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think I have heard the question three times in here already this session.

The Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the Minister would inform the House when the adjustments for inflation which he promised both last fall and again this spring will be permitted to allow the \$200 figure to be exceeded.

HON. MR. LEVI: We are not doing any adjustments until the fall, Mr. Speaker — that's when we go into making adjustments.

MR. SPEAKER: That question was also asked

[[Page 2064](#)]

before.

The Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

FORTHCOMING QUESTIONS TO HON. MR. TRUDEAU BY WESTERN PREMIERS

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the meeting of the western Premiers last weekend and our Premier's statement that they would be asking questions of the Prime Minister to which they want "yes" or "no" answers: will the Prime Minister receive advance notice of those questions and would the Premier be prepared to tell the House what they are?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Yes; no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for North Okanagan.

CHANGES IN REAL ESTATE ACT

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Hon. Attorney General. Has the Minister had any discussions with representatives of Block Bros. Industries in contemplation of a change in the *Real Estate Act* which would limit a bona fide real estate agent in British Columbia to the employment of 15 salesmen?

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): No discussions, but I expect to have discussions with the real estate industry generally, in line with comments I made earlier in this session of the Legislature about the whole question, including the matter of amount of commissions and some other things. So we are going to have those discussions following this session in May or June.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Moving into July 3.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: July.

AN HON. MEMBER: What year?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: On the same subject?

MRS. JORDAN: Yes. Am I to understand from the Attorney General's statement that he has had no discussions with Block Bros. Industries or any member?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's correct.

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

NEGOTIATIONS RE ELEVATOR STRIKE

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, whether the negotiations he had this morning regarding the elevator strike were successful and whether he can report to the House progress in this matter?

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there were no negotiations this morning. I presume the Hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. D.A. Anderson) is referring to a meeting I had this morning in my office with representatives of the elevator constructors and union people.

I can report that the union has instructed their members to return to work this morning and that meetings have been arranged between the parties with a mediator from my department. The first meeting will be held at 3 o'clock this afternoon and I expect that meetings will continue, hopefully until a contract is arrived at.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know whether the Minister could report further on the question of damage suits and whether or not this subject was discussed at the meeting he had this morning — whether or not damage suits against union members will be dropped.

HON. MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a matter that still is before the courts. I don't think it would be proper to comment on that at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't. The Hon. First Member for Victoria.

REDUCTION OF FERRY RATES

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): I'd like to address my question to the Premier. Did the Premier over an open-line programme through Powell River announce that ferry rates for highway ferries operating in Discovery Passage were going to be reduced?

HON. MR. BARRETT: I discussed the ferry rates. I was asked a question about ferry rates. A request was made about reduction in ferry rates and I said all these matters are under review — just like the former administration.

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

POLLUTION STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT PULP MILLS

[[Page 2065](#)]

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

Now that the Government has taken over two of the coastal pulp mills, both of which have severe pollution problems, has the Minister made an estimate of the capital requirements for these two particular pulp mills to clear up the pollution problem?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): I'd like to say, (1) that these were negotiated purchases by the Government of British Columbia and, (2) I am most pleased that the Hon. Member has suddenly developed an interest in pollution standards in the public sector. These are part of an ongoing review with respect to these new corporations.

MR. SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it then a fact that the deal to take over these two particular pulp mills was completed without the benefit of an expert's advice on the capital that would be required to bring

them up to the pollution control standards that we wish to observe in the province? Have you no indication of the amount of money that would be required in that respect prior to making a deal to take these two particular pulp mills over?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: The pollution standards of 20 years of the former administration is something you were happy to live with, Mr. Member. The whole question is under review in terms of future capital expenditures of these new corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey, followed by the Second Member.

OPERATING LOSSES OF COLUMBIA CELLULOSE

MR. McGEER: I have a question for the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. What are the operating losses of Columbia Cellulose for the past five years? Does the Minister have that information?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: I think it's public knowledge. The annual reports are available, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well then, it's not a question for this House. It's a matter of public knowledge. It's not a question ...

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: I might point out, however, Mr. Speaker, that it's very, very clear that the existing situation with respect to this major complex is healthier than it's ever been.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out that under (f) of the Beauchesne, p. 148, "seeking information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner." The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey, followed by the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

INSURANCE AGENTS' COMMISSIONS

MR. GARDOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Minister of Highways. It deals with something that is not a negotiated purchase. I would ask the Minister of Highways if he's had any discussions with the insurance agents in the Province of British Columbia or has given any indication to them as to what their scale of commission will be for processing government car insurance?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Yes, I have had meetings with the insurance agents' representatives of the Province of British Columbia. I am having further meetings with them this week. No indication has yet been given to them as to what the commission will be. As I say we are having further meetings — I think it's this afternoon, as a matter of fact. But this week anyway.

MR. GARDOM: One supplemental on that point. Is the Hon. Minister able to inform the House today as to when he will be able to afford us with information as to the scale of commission?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No, I couldn't give you any indication as to when that information will be available?

MR. GARDOM: Six months?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Certainly before the plans go into operation next March 1.

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

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM FOR LUMBER

MR. CHABOT: A question to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. In view of the statements made by the Minister of Highways that the increase in lumber prices on the domestic market on the part of the lumber firms in the province were "criminally irresponsible," and in view of that harsh reaction to the increase in the price of lumber at the domestic level, now that the government is in the lumber business in

northern British Columbia, are they considering establishing a two-price system for

[[Page 2066](#)]

lumber? One for the domestic market in British Columbia and one for the export trade.

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: We're not yet in the business, Mr. Speaker. June 29 is the date.

MR. CHABOT: Supplementary question. Will the Minister, at the time in which the government takes over the lumber mills in northern British Columbia of Columbia Cellulose, consider establishing a special price for domestic lumber sales in British Columbia?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: Many beneficial policies for British Columbians will evolve after that date, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHABOT: Rubbish.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. The Hon. Member for Langley.

POLLUTION IN SEMIAHMOO BAY

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Speaker, my question is also addressed to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. I would ask if he's aware that the shellfish harvesting in Semiahmoo Bay has been closed down because of pollution in that area. In the light of his comments earlier that he would ask for public hearing on a sewage outfall there, this new development would seem to make that a more urgent problem in the area. Is the Minister aware and does the Minister plan to take any extra action in that regard?

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: I wasn't aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, and we'll certainly take the matter up with the Deputy in terms of the hearing.

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

NEW FERRY DESIGN FOR GULF ISLANDS

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: This question to the Minister of Highways. May I ask him whether the new ferry that he's calling tenders for, for the Gulf Islands between Gabriola and Nanaimo, will be a repeat of existing inter-island ferry plans or whether it will be a new design?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: It will be similar to other ferries, but each ferry is designed individually. Some of the problems that are always out of the original ferry which was met for Denman Island, incidentally, have been overcome through the new procedures. One of important factors related to this new design is that it works well in other places. With the change that's been made in it, I'm sure it will be successful.

It's not just for Gabriola Island by the way; it's the kind of ferry we can use to fill in. It's important that the major part of the engines are made in British Columbia, not imported. That's a major factor in our consideration too.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The major factor being that they operate and the others have had great difficulty. So I understand the Minister is saying that it's a tender for construction and not a tender for new design. It's a tender for construction on existing plans.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: It's a tender for construction on designs for that particular ferry. When you say these ferries don't work, that's completely untrue. There hasn't been a bit of trouble on the one to Thetis Island. Just go up and try it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

SALE OF MEAT CONTAINING DES

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has any meat, either on hoof, carcass or processed from the United States or any other country, containing the growth hormone DES, been sold to British Columbia consumers in British Columbia since January 1, 1973?

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge this is all controlled by the federal authorities. Now, we can seek that information ...

MR. SPEAKER: Well then, it's not within the jurisdiction of this House.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would ask the Minister to at least examine the situation on whether or not this meat is being sold in British Columbia. I would ask him for his commitment; it's just not sufficient to suggest this is a federal responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not the time for speeches, Hon. Member. It's not within the jurisdiction of this Minister. Would the Hon. Member be seated, please? The Second Member for Victoria.

PURCHASE OF PRIVATE HOSPITALS

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I would like to ask the Minister of Health Services when he intends to take

[[Page 2067](#)]

action on a request of 22 out of the 60-odd private hospitals in this area for purchase by the government, or whether or not these people will continue to remain uncertain as to the future operations of their hospitals.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): I'm not sure that I caught the first part of that, Mr. Speaker. Did you say the 60-odd?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The 22-odd that requested government purchase.

HON. MR. COCKE: Twenty-two have requested; I haven't announced that. We are negotiating with a great number of hospitals, Mr. Speaker. We're quite prepared to continue negotiations. We're negotiating with five locally and a number in other areas.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Could you give me an example, Mr. Minister, of the date on which these negotiations might possibly come to some fruition?

HON. MR. COCKE: Mr. Speaker, that's the problem. The negotiations are terminated at the time that a mutually satisfactory agreement is arrived upon.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is totally hypothetical.

Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

On vote 216: Minister's office, \$58,976.

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

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few questions for the new Minister. First of all, I imagine that he's enjoying his new role. He certainly seems to be getting around the country. I see he's the number one occupant of the Government airplane.

AN HON. MEMBER: Flying Bill.

MR. FRASER: I guess the best way to describe it is that we had Flying Phil and now you, Mr. Premier, have Bill. (Laughter).

Getting into your department, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what new provincial buildings are under construction at the present time, if they've been let since September 1, as well as the ones that are ongoing. Are you planning any new ones and, if so, where?

Mr. Chairman, I'd specifically like to know about the Vancouver situation. I think everything was stopped there. We're wondering now what is taking place in that area, but also in the rest of the province as well. I note in your estimates that you intend to cut back. In the construction of new buildings last year, the vote was \$18 million. It's \$18 million again this year. With inflation, we can only assume from that that you're going to cut back even further.

I'd now like to go into the parliament buildings, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I feel that the public galleries here are most inadequate. It's difficult for citizens to get in here, particularly at 2 o'clock in the afternoon on a great many days. I was wondering if your department was considering upgrading, improving and enlarging the public galleries in the building. Not only that, but I think the Press facilities are completely inadequate.

There is a lot of talk going on about contracts being let and changes taking place in here. I think it's about time that the Minister told us what changes are going on and to what final conclusion they are leading.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I would like to bring up another thing that takes us out of the general Victorian area. I refer to office space to be provided for MLAs in their ridings. None of them have it. In some ridings provincial buildings are available; in some they are not. I don't think that should be any reason why MLAs are not provided with office space in their ridings, whether the government owns the building or has to rent it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Permanent?

MR. FRASER: Well, I would say on a permanent basis.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): In existing buildings?

MR. FRASER: Yes, in the existing buildings. If the facilities aren't available in the existing buildings that the government owns, they'd have to be uniform with all MLAs and rent. That's the only assumption I could come to, Mr. Chairman.

For this type of accommodation, the public servants are looked after better than MLAs are. All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that maybe the MLAs could be looked after on the same basis as public servants. With those few remarks, I'd like to get a few answers now from the Minister, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

[[Page 2068](#)]

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

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): Well, it's nice to be able to have a few questions on this lively spring afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I see the Minister is continuing to sit tight. He's waited a long time for his estimates to come up. This is very much his day.

I don't intend to ask him the very embarrassing question as to how the Government's car insurance scheme didn't fall into his lap. You would obviously rule that question out of order. Perhaps he might have had a little too much heart for the very radical steps that appear to have been taken by the Minister of Highways, Hon. Mr. Strachan.

But I do want to ask the Minister a few questions about his concept of the automobile, vis-à-vis its very unsightly and, I think unnecessary prominence in being parked outside government buildings. For example, I refer to the Vancouver court house and also to these very lovely legislative buildings here.

I indeed appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that it's not possible for this Minister to look to the former administration for any kind of aesthetic guidance. Notwithstanding the fact that they were rather horse-and-buggy in many ways, they certainly seemed to revere the parked car.

We find the parked car has become a distinctive feature outside of pretty well every government building. In the City of Vancouver, we find that out went the grass and geraniums and so forth. Whereupon one time we had a lovely lawn, magnolia trees, charming flowers and a historically recorded and distinctively put together fountain: out that went and in went the asphalt, blacktop and white lines. Suddenly, presto, overnight we had something that looked like a truck route and used car lot.

In the City of Vancouver, they're still there in front of the court house. This is the last tiny bit of garden-like calm and intelligent bit of nature and green. Indeed, you could call it the one remaining oasis amount the coal-black and grey walls of the high-rises and hotels and that sort of prison-like setting of Eaton's that surround it. Still, we find parked cars there. If the Hon. Minister would give me the green light, I'd be happy to go in there with a jackhammer myself and start tearing up those parking stalls. They're the very kind of monuments we do not need.

In front of these buildings, I would congratulate whoever in the government was responsible for at least taking out the parking down the curved approaches to the Legislative Assembly. But I would again advocate that there not be any parking at all within the perimeter of the grounds in which these buildings stand.

Maybe a little bit more exercise might not do some of the Members of the cabinet any harm at all. It might even cut down on some of their newly-found opulence. It would certainly provide them with an extra breath or two of our very fresh, clean spring air. Then, maybe when they attended cabinet meetings, Mr. Chairman, they might arrive there in more of an individualistic frame of mind, rather than in the collectivistic attitude that seems to be helping their decisions at the present time.

There's no question, Mr. Chairman, that when Mr. Rattenbury designed these buildings, it was not on the basis or intention to sanctify or deify the disciples of Detroit. I would say, "Out the automobiles and fast." The Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) made quite a talk about smoking and I'm making quite a talk about parking here. He said, "No smoking," and I'm saying, "No parking." Let's just start eliminating that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get a chauffeur.

MR. GARDOM: Have you got a chauffeur, Mr. Premier?

HON. MR. BARRETT: No.

MR., GARDOM: Well, that's a cautious step on your part.

Now, I'd also like to have a couple of words about the construction of public buildings. These definitely fall within the competence of the Minister, as do their standards of safety. Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, by virtue of his position in the Government, the Minister would be able to advance policies that would improve the standards of safety in their private sector as well. I'm speaking now of private structures and private buildings.

I'm talking, Mr. Chairman, about crowd control, fire protection, the very great difficulties that exist today with the electric automatic elevators; I'm talking about emergency lighting, sprinkling systems, disaster drills. Unfortunately, all these problems are problems seen to increase in direct proportion to the height of the building.

The situation in the province today is indeed frightening, Mr. Chairman. In most cases, what is constructed ends up being nothing more than a glorified furnace. These steel and glass buildings are structurally able to contain a fire almost indefinitely without collapsing. They're full of combustible materials, furnishings, equipment and so forth. They're also full of people. A writer recently stated this: 'A modern skyscraper is a perfect incinerator.' That's certainly a pretty alarming description and there could, indeed, be ghastly consequences.

I am asking the Hon. Minister, when we're going to be talking about the construction of new buildings in the Province of B.C. — would he please give the very

closest of consideration to these suggestions which I'm going to make?

We could find, indeed, a probability of hundreds of people being trapped, extensive damage being sustained with a high degree of personal injury and loss of life; people being burned, being asphyxiated, jumping to their deaths, falling in the dark or being trampled through the stampede of panic. Because when a fire starts, Mr. Chairman, maybe there's no sprinkling system, or it is malfunctioning, or it's inadequate, or there is not a sufficient number of them, or they're not sufficiently placed to do the job. Automatic elevators today have the wont to stop at fire floors and, being without any form of manual closing whatsoever, in rush the flames and poisonous gases and people die. The lights go out — there's no auxiliary power, and then we find a pitch black situation with the resulting panic,.

No drills. The only drills that I know of that are carried on today in the Province of B.C. In public buildings are in hospitals and in schools.

We've also got to consider the very stacking effect of smoke without detectors or smokeproof stairs. I think we've got a tinderbox situation.

I mention this to the Hon. Minister. There's no question in my view but that we need more effective controls and we need, indeed, a universal enforcement of better standards.

Several of the new buildings in the United States are demonstrating the new fire safety consciousness that I'm talking about. They include these things: a complete sprinkling system; smoke detection devices; a number of sealed-off fire zones as the building would increase in height; emergency power for lighting the interior stairs and escapes and elevators; elevator systems which can be converted to manual operation; smoke-free passages and exits; reserve water storage tanks for sprinkling and standpipes. All of these systems are monitored and controlled and furthermore there are some effective drills.

I would ask the Hon. Minister if we can have his assurance today that he will agree to prescribe for all B.C. government structures the measures that I've been talking about and, further, whether or not he will agree that all future B.C. government structures will fall within the provisions of the National Building Code.

Secondly, I would ask the Hon. Minister if he will accept as a policy and as a direction the need to make the National Building Code provisions a matter of province-wide jurisdiction and acceptance, particularly, Mr. Chairman, insofar as highrises are concerned. Because the National Building Code is no code today unless it happens to be accepted by a municipality, but by far they don't all follow it. It certainly doesn't catch the number of earlier constructed buildings.

Right now, safety-wise, Mr. Chairman, highrises in British Columbia have caught the enforcers of building standards with their trousers down. If there is really an existing, ever present danger situation, it's this. I'd like to see it cured and I certainly do not wish to see it aggravated.

What brought this to my attention was a personal situation not too long ago. In the fall of last year a couple of generators in the B.C. Hydro station at Nelson and Burrard went out, Mr. Chairman, with the net result that some of the major highrises in the vicinity of the Hotel Vancouver were without power. The moment they became without power, in some of them there was absolutely no light whatsoever for people to go downstairs. It's just a godsend that people were not injured and were not hurt. I think that we have a very dangerous and very perilous situation existing in the province. This surely can fall within the purview of this Minister — at least for policy direction if not for cure.

The third and last question: The Hon. Minister has been almost as silent as Smith as his predecessor (Mr. W.N. Chant) when it comes to talking about what's going to happen to that hopefully magnificent part of Vancouver which is to the south of the courthouse and bounded by Howe Street and Hornby Street. After about six years of questioning on my part to the former Minister, about the only conclusive answer that I was able to get out of him was that it was more likely to be built from the bottom up than from the top down. Now, I do hope that the present Minister can perhaps be a little more edifying and inform us if a policy has been formulated, inform us if plans are underway, inform us if contracts are prepared to be let, inform us if he has had total and complete consultation with the City of Vancouver — when I say "the City" I am referring to the elected

representatives in the city. Over and above that, has he requested any briefs or received any information and (it's now a very popular word over here) input from the members of the community of Vancouver as to the direction of that area?

Personally I hope that it would be moved, whatever it is, one block farther to the south, and that we have something that is interesting, something that is terraced, something where green space can continue to form a major part, and something that is today planned as a part of, as opposed to an impediment to, the future transit needs of the City of Vancouver.

I would most appreciate it if the Minister would let me have his answers to these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a few brief questions to the Minister.

I have been attempting to seek information from

[[Page 2070](#)]

the Minister from the opening of this session through the posing of written questions, oral questions, by discussing it during the budget debate and now we've reached the stage, I hope, in which we can get answers from that Minister on very important public affairs of his department.

He has given nothing but a series of facetious answers, Mr. Chairman ...

MR. GARDOM: He hasn't said a word.

MR. CHABOT: ... relative to ... I'm talking in the past.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, well we're talking in the present.

MR. CHABOT: You weren't in the House yesterday. Mr. Chairman, would you please excuse that Member? He wasn't in the House yesterday. He was looking after his law profession in Vancouver. He's here every other day only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Let's return to the estimates, Mr. Member.

MR. GARDOM: If I may, Mr. Chairman ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Does the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey have a point of order?

MR. GARDOM: Yes, indeed I do.

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

MR. GARDOM: My point of order is this: whatever I was looking after yesterday is my business and not the Hon. Member's. (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. Would the Hon. Member continue, please?

MR. CHABOT: I am rising to find out from the Minister of Public Works, for the third time, what price he paid for the Glenshiel Hotel. He had an elaborate press conference on December 15, telling everyone that this property had been acquired in order to control development in the precincts of the parliament buildings — I presume that's the reason. He hasn't really indicated what he intends for this building, whether the building is going to continue and, if so, whether it is going to continue as a hotel, whether it is going to be converted to a series of suites for cabinet Ministers, whether it is going to be torn down for additional parking space. You haven't really answered that question.

But I think the most important question is, and this information I have been attempting to secure from the Minister: what did the provincial government pay for that building? On December 15 you said it had been purchased. This is four months later. Certainly there must be some answers now.

Also, I've asked a series of questions relative to your department, Mr. Chairman, renting office space throughout the City of Victoria. I am wondering whether the Minister is willing to tell us just how much office space has been leased and under what conditions, what price and what services will be provided in those buildings which are being leased by the Department of Public Works, and where the location is of these buildings.

They are very simple questions. I don't think the Minister under the circumstances should have any difficulty in answering these questions.

HON. MR. BARRETT: They come from a pretty simple guy.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Chairman the Minister has had a number of opportunities to rise and shine this afternoon. He is apparently saving the best for last.

As I recall, Mr. Chairman, the sort of tradition of the Government is that Public Works in the past never used to get into any trouble unless he did something — which was fairly rare.

Nevertheless, the largest and most spectacular move that the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. W.N. Chant) was going to make was with the skyscraper in the City of Vancouver. It would have been the last and greatest of the former government's grotesqueries.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a somewhat larger question but perhaps along the same lines as those asked by the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot); that is, what are we doing regarding the development of a master plan for a government precinct here in Victoria? I think there has been nothing but regression since the days of Rattenbury, who gave the Parliament Buildings a grandeur. I am not sure the active politicians have added to that one little bit over the years.

Some dreadful buildings have been built. The Douglas building, Mr. Chairman, in my view is a monstrosity and should be torn down at the earliest opportunity. The museum and new buildings that have been built across the way are a little bit better, but they won't win any architectural prizes.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the Government is enlarging the bureaucracy here. It is going to require many more buildings to house all the

[[Page 2071](#)]

additional civil servants that are being hired and we are going to have big corporation offices before long with the insurance corporation and B.C. Cellulose Corporation and all the private enterprise moves that the Government is making. So there is going to be tremendous need for government office buildings.

With the expansion, some kind of a master architectural plan is required for this general area. I would just like to know whether the Government is giving any consideration to that. If they are, would they perhaps be prepared to open this up to architectural competition as was done originally for these Parliament Buildings, for Simon Fraser University, for UBC? I think our experience with these architectural competitions in the past has been a good one. Or are we going to continue to drift as we have done for two-thirds of a century with the odd building put up here or there as the demand arose, but with the disastrous cumulative results that have been the history for the past 40 or 50 years.

Now, I too, Mr. Chairman, would like to ask the Minister precisely what is intended for the City of Vancouver? I want to congratulate the Minister and the Government for canceling the rather grotesque plan that was devised by the former government for the downtown heart. It would have been extremely harmful to add the pressure of still another skyscraper to a system of city streets and parking and transportation that is totally inadequate for that kind of a building.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, the government is the landlord of a very slummy area in the heart of Vancouver. Even if there is no intention to move immediately to a building, the Government, in my view, is under some obligation to provide aesthetic qualities to the area over which it has jurisdiction. For the government for so many years to have held that key block in downtown Vancouver and left it in the disgraceful state it has been left in — just an ugly acre of blacktop ...

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Black acres.

MR. McGEER: Black acres. It isn't good enough. What we really should be doing with government property anywhere is providing a little bit of taste, even if it is only planting some flowers. Could the Minister give some hope to the City of Vancouver, not just for a satisfactory government building but to do something about the downtown ugliness?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to report to the assembly that I was very fortunate in inheriting a well-run department, a credit to the previous Minister. I think it is fair for me to say that he was one of the very few that was not defeated.

MR. McGEER: Will you know when to quit too? (Laughter).

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, I'll at least let you have your say, I was fortunate too, or the department was, in having the previous Deputy that I believe understood organization and the ability to have people work with and for him. Arnold Webb and the Hon. Mr. Chant, I refer to. Mr. Webb saw fit to resign — his resignation was on my desk when I walked in. He did carry on until we chose a successor and I would like to introduce Mr. George Giles, the Deputy, and Mr. Al Rhodes, the Comptroller.

Now, we have very definite ideas about public buildings, not just in block 61 in Vancouver — we have definite ideas there too — but throughout the province. We believe that public buildings should be designed to serve people and to serve the needs of people, not built as monuments to men or women.

In the designing of our buildings we hope to be able to build in and out and about as much open space as possible with care, as my friend the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) stated, to the aesthetic values of the community into which we are building. I think this is only right; I think the provincial government should attempt to set good standards and we should plan our buildings to serve people. After all, if we are an open government, which we are, then we should try and plan our buildings so that they will be open to serve the public. The public can come in and communicate.

Now, with regard to courthouses: where possible we would like to see them set off the beaten track, a little bit away from the hustle and bustle, the rat race, the business world so that they will be helping to create a proper climate for meditation, consideration, deep thought, with regard to the problems of the people coming before them. In this way, we will be doing our part to make it appear that justice is being done.

Now, maybe that is about as far as we can go. I'm speaking with regard to the physical aspects. If we are going to have judges that tell welfare recipients they can eat out of the garbage cans then that is a problem for this assembly and a problem for the Attorney General.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's going to take over the Attorney General's department.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes, well I say we have no control over such intemperate outbursts. We can do what we can to improve the architectural beauty and

[[Page 2072](#)]

we will.

Communications have become a major involvement of the Department of Public Works under the new

administration. We have met with the Ministers and representatives from the other provinces. As a matter of fact one of our first meetings was back in Quebec. It was rather interesting when Prime Minister Bourassa came forward and welcomed British Columbia. He said, "I am pleased to understand that British Columbia is now reconsidering joining confederation."

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Why don't you answer the question?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Certainly, we always answer the questions. You ask short questions and we will give short answers.

We will be meeting again with the provincial Ministers in communications and Gerard Pelletier, the federal Minister, has invited us to a federal-provincial conference on communications.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I suppose if I were to follow in true form, I would get up and give you a two-hour oration now on socialism as compared to the A plus B theory and that is all that would be expected or all that would be needed, but I made note of your questions and we would be more than pleased to answer them.

The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) asked about provincial buildings under construction — when, where and so on. We have three projects under construction in Abbotsford, one in Port Alberni, one in Barrier, one in Bella Coola; in Nanaimo we have Brannen Lake — two projects there; in Burnaby, three, six, nine, 12, 13, under construction; one in Burns Lake, one in Charlie Lake, one in Clinton, one in Cloverdale. There's a remand centre for Coquitlam and a project in Courtenay. We've purchased some property in Cranbrook with the idea of a building there. In Creston we have a wildlife management area centre.

Other projects are: one in Dawson Creek; one in Douglas; two in Duncan; one in Elkford; one in Enderby; one in Essondale. Twelve projects under construction in Riverview. In Valleyview - hospital alteration. Colony Farm — three projects. Fort Nelson two projects. Fort St. John — one project. Ganges one. Golden — the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) should be interested in this — four projects.

MR. CHABOT: That was started by the former government.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): They all were.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) asked to know what projects were under construction. I'm telling you.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Grand Forks — one; Haig — one; Haney — two, corrections institutes; Alouette River unit — two; Kamloops — seven; Kimberley — one; Nanaimo — three; Nelson — three; New Denver — two; New Haven — one; New Westminster — Woodlands, four projects, and an additional eight more.

North Vancouver — we've purchased some property. Penticton — we've purchased property; highway establishment under construction. Powell River — provincial building. Prince George — four projects under construction. Regional corrections centre — Prince George. Prince Rupert — court house heating system, new court facilities and roof repairs in the old court house. Quesnel — highways maintenance establishment. Revelstoke — court house renovations. Salmon Arm — highways maintenance establishment. Smithers — Department of Highways establishment and two other projects. Stewart — highways maintenance. Surrey — motor vehicle inspection. Terrace — Skeena View Hospital alterations and renovations. Tete Jaune Cache — highway maintenance. Trail — Tranquille: water supply and sewage disposal; 104-bed unit; fire alarm system; fire escapes; east pavilion alterations. Trout Lake — highways maintenance. Thousk - ferryman's accommodation. Vancouver — 800 Cassiar Street, Pearson TB hospital fire alarm system. Jericho Hill School

renovations — there's some 12 items here. Vernon — highways maintenance, court house elevator and alterations, provincial buildings, landscaping. Victoria: Vancouver Island unit Regional Corrections Centre renovations; Victoria area purchase of properties; alterations; Finance building; centre for microfilming; motor vehicle inspection station; mobile home for inspection services.

Purchase of property — Coquileetz: Department of Highways yard site — Saanichton. Williams Lake: court house; highways maintenance; B.C. Institute of technology; security buildings and six other items. B.C. vocational school, Burnaby — seven items. B.C. vocational school, Chilliwack — phase one, preloading. B.C. vocational school, Dawson Creek — welding shop. B.C. vocational school, Kamloops — stores building. B.C. vocational school, Kelowna —

[[Page 2073](#)]

classroom conversion to cafeteria. B.C. vocational school, Nanaimo — fire alarm system, steam distribution system, welding shed, workshop building. B.C. vocational school, Nelson — Kootenay School of Art, central receiving and stores depot. B.C. vocational school, Prince George — alterations. B.C. vocational school, Terrace — workshop buildings, dormitory and cafeteria. B.C. vocational school, Victoria — workshop and cafeteria buildings.

For a total of just under \$ 10 million.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: That was the weigh station.

Now, there were some questions with regard to the Parliament Buildings — public galleries, Press galleries. We have plans to rehabilitate the government into the main legislative building. I understand that this is what Mr. Rattenbury had in mind, that this was the home for the politicians. Over the years they have been displaced. We have plans for Ministers' suites throughout the building and for the MLAs.

There was a question asked further on, by the First Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) I believe, with regard to the precinct area. We had a preview of this plan last Friday. This is an overall plan, so that as we need and plan new buildings, they will be planned, designed and located in conjunction with our planning department and the City of Victoria planning department. We have met with the city. As a matter of fact, there's a meeting going on right now in the city hall. As a matter of fact, were it not for these estimates, I would be there.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the Hon. Members to keep their questions until the Minister is finished. Then if they wish to place their questions, do it in the proper way.

HON. MR.- HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate their excitement. It's the first time they've had an opportunity to get involved in Public Works like this. I'll answer their questions as they come up.

As I indicated, the precinct plan is not ready for release. We previewed it last week. We've asked for further information. We hope that by Easter it should be pretty well ready for you to have a look if you wish.

With regard to parking problems, we agree. Not only in the precinct plan but also in greater Vancouver, one of the factors that we are considering is modes of transportation. As you know, Arthur Erickson is drawing up a plan and design for Blocks 61, 51 and possibly 71. We've asked that this factor be worked into the plan.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, if the Second Member for Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) would cool it, I'm trying to tell him that we have before us a loop system of transportation so that all persons using these buildings can make use of public transit and leave their vehicle possibly at home or some piece out of town.

Mention was made of the national building code and some of the building standards in California in the United States. They're really highrise buildings. Now that the B.C. building is being considered on an entirely

different basis, we really do not have buildings of the stature that the Member for Point Grey was referring to. I believe our national building code compares with any building standards on the continent. We plan to national building code standards. As far as having this province-wide, I believe it's up to the municipalities that have their own inspection to also accept national building code standards.

A question was asked about the Glenshiel Hotel. There are other properties in negotiation that we're planning on acquiring in that area. In due course you'll be given the price. You can get it through Public Accounts if nowhere else. In due course it will be given. As I say, we are still negotiating on other properties.

With regard to the Glenshiel, the present residents will be allowed to live there so long as they desire. They will not be turned out. The Minister of Rehabilitation (Hon. Mr. Levi) and I met with them shortly after we purchased the building. We gave them assurance that that was their home so long as they needed it.

What is intended for the City of Vancouver? This was asked by the First Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer). I cannot answer that as yet. As you know, we have retained the architectural firm of Arthur Erickson to draw up a plan and design.

We're not committed to accepting this. We met with the former mayor and council. We have met with the new mayor. We'll be taking out all required city permits with regard to our development in blocks 61 and 51.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): What development have you contemplated?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes, well that's a fair question. I took it for granted. After all, we did have a meeting here in one of the committee rooms a month or two ago to which all parties were invited. Not too many attended. My Hon. friend attended and I appreciate his interest.

We are planning a public service and administra-

[[Page 2074](#)]

tion building for services that we feel must be available in North Vancouver or in Richmond or in New Westminister; that is where they will be. But services and administrative areas that can best serve in downtown Vancouver will be located in this public service building, along with court facilities.

Now, we hope to be able to combine an open design with as much open space as possible. I'm not trying to be evasive by not going into more detail, but I believe that when we have retained a firm of highly competent internationally-known architects, then we have to at least give them an opportunity to present a plan. When that plan is ready, we'll invite you all to give us further comment because, after all, this is a public building. It's your building, it's the people's building and we feel that you should all have some say.

MR. GARDOM: Those are the guidelines?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes, those are the broad guidelines I have given.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Hon. Members, I would point out there are two reasons why I would ask you to follow the rules of the House. One is that it is proper order, which I think we can reasonably expect. Also, I would ask that we give some consideration to *Hansard* because the *Hansard* staff are unable to properly record proceedings when the mikes are not on. Therefore I would ask that Members follow the rules. In that way we can be sure that *Hansard* can do their job.

MR. GARDOM: We subscribe to your ruling. I'd like to ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. GARDOM: I thought you had. You were looking at me, Mr. Chairman. (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT: In listening to the reply from the Minister, I have to conclude that the activities of the former government relative to the Department of Public Works were spread out throughout the entire province. There appeared to be a lot of activity in the various communities that the Minister has outlined. Many, many government projects were undertaken. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on how many contracts have been called since he has taken over the portfolio on September 15. Let's just see how much activity there has been since he has come into government.

Now, the Minister has failed to reply to my question, a very simple and straightforward question relative to the government's plans — what space they have rented in the City of Victoria, where these locations are, the square footage involved in office space ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The particular question you have asked is on the order paper and I would ask you not to ask it at this time.

MR. CHABOT: Is it on the order paper?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That particular question is on the order paper. It requests knowledge of the amount of square footage in the City of Victoria.

MR. CHABOT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I thought in view of the evasiveness of the Minister on previous written questions and previous oral questions that it was only fair that I have an opportunity at this particular time, during his estimates, to ask that question. But if you believe that he'll answer the question, I'll have to accept your wisdom and judgment in that matter, Mr. Chairman. Nevertheless, maybe the Minister, in view of the fact that I've made the point, will want to comment on it now.

I hope the Minister will never stand in his place again in this House or anywhere else and say that that Government is an open government, because that Government is not an open government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Will the Hon. Member please address the Chair and keep his comments to the estimates before us?

MR. CHABOT: I'm keeping my comments to the estimates, and if you'll look back in *Hansard* — just run the tape back, Mr. Chairman — you'll see that the Minister talked about open government. He talked about open government. If you're going to allow that kind of latitude to that Member, I should be allowed the same kind of treatment in this House.

Now, the Minister indicated very clearly that four months ago when he held that elaborate Press conference — he confirmed it today, that four months ago they purchased the Glenshiel Hotel. Yet he's unwilling to make this public information available to the Members of this assembly. And then you talk about open government, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman. I think you have a responsibility to tell the Members of this assembly what the purchase price of the Glenshiel Hotel is — what you paid for it. You've confirmed that you've bought it. Why don't you fulfill the pledge you've

[[Page 2075](#)]

made to the people of this province of being an open government, and tell us what you paid for the property called the Glenshiel Hotel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, my friend for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) is still playing his role as a representative of the real estate industry. If, in the best interests ...

MR. CHABOT: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Would you state your point of order? Would the Hon. Minister be seated?

MR. CHABOT: I don't want that Minister making accusations about my representing any real estate interests. I don't know any real estate people, and I wish he'd stop the nonsense and answer the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Hon. Member denies this connection that will be acceptable. Will the Hon. Minister proceed?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in our good judgment there are other properties that we are acquiring and we feel that at this time ...

MR. CHABOT: Nowhere!

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, in your opinion it doesn't happen, but in our opinion, it does. Now we've answered the questions with regard to Glenshiel Hotel — what the purpose is. We feel that we have to acquire various properties in the precinct area so that we can preserve this area for the original purpose, so that the main buildings here and the grounds will not be overshadowed by great highrise apartments and highrise office buildings. This is why we have been buying and will be buying other properties.

Now as far as open government is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the fact that this Government is designing buildings to meet people, so people can come in and ask questions which we will try and answer, the fact that we have a daily question period, opening the door of access from you to us ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. HARTLEY: Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the ex-Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) and the ex-Minister of Labour (Mr. Chabot) can lay on their couches in their offices and listen to what's going on here and now and then jump to their feet and come running in — this is open government.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Members to continue the discussion on the estimates. I recognize the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Chairman, the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) spoke about the precinct for the parliament buildings, for the centre of government here, and I really feel that the Minister should outline in a little more detail his thoughts with respect to the long-term future of the precinct. If I may make a point. Mr. Chairman, I really feel that there is a danger that the provincial government, regardless of what party may be in power, will, over the next decade or 15 years, tend to keep the precinct area too small.

Just what is the precinct in terms of boundary streets in the view of the present Minister, Mr. Chairman? Is there not some very real merit in considering the location of additional buildings some distance from where we are today? Elsewhere in the City of Victoria, possibly in Victoria West — I identify this as an area which would benefit greatly, Mr. Chairman, from the injection of ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CURTIS: No, not necessarily Saanich — I was hoping some Member would rise to that bait. I'm not speaking parochially, I am speaking about elsewhere in Victoria, Victoria West, possibly Esquimalt, perhaps even the Oak Bay area, so that we don't have this morning rush to a relatively small part of Victoria city and then extremely heavy traffic going home, much of it generated by the people who are in the civil service. How much better it would be to move some facilities to other areas which have not yet been considered, as far as we can determine, for government buildings in the urban part of Greater Victoria.

I would like the Minister to touch on that, Mr. Chairman, because we are so close to the Strait of Juan de Fuca at this location that we are really at the bottom of a funnel, or the bottom of a jar, if you will, with most people coming to the parliamentary precinct, whether it's two blocks wide or four blocks wide, having to fight their way through a great deal of residential and commercial development in order to get here. If this were the centre of the city in the true sense of the word, with residential areas to the south and to the west as well as to the north-east, then it would be much easier.

Hopefully the Minister will comment on this and hopefully his department will consider what I consider to be the importance of diversification, as

far as locating public buildings is concerned and moving them around in the urban part of this Greater Victoria capital city area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I think this is a very good question that the Member for Saanich and the Islands has raised. Of course this is the very purpose of our precinct plan. In this plan I think one of the factors that we have to consider is how one department can work with the other in interdepartmental relations and also government-city relations with the surrounding municipalities.

At this point in time I am not prepared to say that this precinct area would be bounded by this street or that street, but we do have holdings throughout the lower island — substantial holdings as large as a city block, where the public works warehouses are at Cloverdale Avenue. Our plan and study is so that we can decide where future buildings should go. For instance, if there is to be a separate building for car insurance, should that be located here or could it just as well be integrated with the business community uptown? The same applies to other buildings that we will be considering. Certainly if we can have them handy here, it's very well.

Also, I believe we have to be involved in a certain amount of construction, because this is the only way we can feel certain that a certain type of style of design would complement the present main building. If we do this and put buildings on the property that we own, this is the only way we can make certain that that is the way it will be. A future administration could come in and dispose of some of this property and sell it off for some purpose that might not complement the overall precinct area.

I think it's important that we do plan this, because I believe this is a major tourist attraction — people come from all parts of the world to view our Legislature and the City of Victoria. It's for this reason that we are attempting to sit down and work with the city planning and with the city mayor and any person, certainly such as the Member for Saanich and the Islands, who holds other responsible offices in this immediate area. We'd be pleased to have their input and their suggestions.

When the precinct plan is ready — and I hope it will be ready very shortly — we would welcome anyone who wishes to see it and has input.

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

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, I am most interested in this precinct area. I wonder if I could make one or two suggestions.

In any new buildings which are built in this area I think we should seriously consider the underground parking under each of them adequate to handle the number of employees who might be in that building.

For the time being I wonder if we couldn't seriously consider perhaps having a park-and-ride situation where employees could park their cars on property which is now already owned by the government — I am referring to the ex-Hudson's Bay warehouse area. There is ample parking in that area. We could use a commuter type bus to bring people in in the morning and take them back again at night.

One of the major problems in this city is the amount of traffic that originates in this area, traffic that goes through the core of the city and creates a rather serious traffic jam. I appreciate that it's not of long duration, but it can be most annoying for people in the centre of town. One or two of these new buses which we have acquired I think we could perhaps use on that type of run.

I also think that some of the buildings which are proposed for this area — I concur that a design contest of having someone give an overall design would be an excellent idea for this area. I wonder if he would care to comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I think we're in agreement certainly with the First Member for Victoria (Mr.

Morrison) that there are two problems. I think I did indicate that a loop transit system was being considered so that a person using the legislative buildings, for instance, if he had to nip uptown to the insurance office or to any other government facility, would find this handy. I just used that as an example.

One of the decisions that we will have to make very early whether is we should spend money in underground parking or~ parking as such about any building that we should plan, or whether we would be farther ahead to use those dollars in a modern improved transit system so that, as my friend from Victoria suggests, you could park your car somewhere on the outskirts and then get onto a quick bus and ride into the centre. I personally favour this.

Some planners say that Victoria really doesn't have that bad a traffic problem at this point in time. But I think we have to look ahead and try and plan so that that type of transit problem or that type of traffic congestion just doesn't build up in Victoria.

I believe there's a great deal to be said for pedestrian malls in and about the Empress Hotel and in the precinct area — at least some "people" spaces so that people could move about freely.

These are basic decisions and we are thinking of them. Mr. Member for Victoria, we'd certainly like to

[[Page 2077](#)]

have your input.

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

MR. GARDOM: On this same point, Mr. Chairman, we've aft got the most admirable respect for Mr. Erickson and his renowned capabilities. But I don't think we need the expertise of Mr. Erickson to reach the conclusion that it's totally unnecessary to have any parking whatsoever around this building and around the courthouse in Vancouver. You've just got to snap your fingers and they will go out. You should do it *tout de suite*. Because insofar as this building is concerned the parking is primarily for the benefit of cabinet and some deputy Ministers and so forth and so on.

I'm not knocking the cabinet or the deputy Ministers, but there's no need for it. This particular building provides one of the most distinctive and world-renowned views of British Columbia. Make no mistake of that. The cars should not be there. We're not advertising Detroit. Get the stupid putrefactions out of there, is my view.

Secondly, I was interested to hear of the Hon. Minister's desire for ethereal calm in the hearing of court cases. He talked a little bit about the contemplated new building in Vancouver. I would like to ask him whether it is contemplated — and this question was not answered by you — that the court facilities will totally go into the new structure. Or is it contemplated that the existing court facility will continue as a courthouse? Now that's a pretty simple question.

I would also ask the Minister to amplify certain remarks when he said that there were some changes, I think, planned for the Press gallery. Does this mean new quarters, more light, more air, a little bit of food under the door and that type of thing — Roman baths or saunas — "squash courts," says the Hon. Member from Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) — washrooms, other useful and needful facilities, or are they going to continue on in their sort of semi- but very historic and interesting dungeon?

The last question that I'd like to ask the Hon. Minister is to whether or not he agrees that in all public buildings access should be provided for handicapped people. I am not going to speak any more about that because, as the Minister knows, I have Bill No. 97 on the order paper dealing with that very aspect.

I would appreciate the Minister's answers to those four questions:

(1) will the cars be totally removed from the precincts of these legislative buildings and from the courthouse in the City of Vancouver? Get them out completely. Let's go back to the grass and the flowers.

(2) Will the court facilities only be in the newly contemplated building, or will the existing court facilities in Vancouver continue as the courthouse?

(3) Exactly what does the Minister intend to do with the Press gallery facilities?

(4) Will the Minister comment concerning access to public buildings for handicapped people?

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

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Further on this question of Victoria, I am not clear from the Minister's statements. I understood originally that we had a precinct plan and we were not thinking of moving buildings outside, in particular moving any buildings past Blanshard Street, which I understand to be the boundary line which has always been considered to be in existence for any government buildings.

I checked with the dictionary as to what "precinct" means and I am even more confused as to what's in the mind of the Minister. Are we having a precinct around this area which is going to house the government buildings or are we going to scatter them in the town? Or I guess you could have both — precincts immediately around this building and other government buildings scattered out.

At the moment I am not too sure from what the Minister has said this afternoon as to what is in his mind as far as this goes.

The parking and traffic questions around these buildings have always been a problem to Victorians. The question has been raised already, but the suggestion of staggering the hours has not, and this solves the problem completely. There is no problem as far as rush hour traffic for civil servants is concerned if the hours of leaving and arriving at work are staggered. I wonder whether the Minister would like to say how far he's progressing on this.

Before we get into such expensive and unnecessary things as underground parking and things of that nature, I think we should at least attempt to have a decent system of staggering hours. We legislators, of course, leave this place at about 11:00 at night or sometimes later and we don't confuse too many people or get in their way — unfortunately perhaps. But others could certainly leave at more reasonable hours during the day. I think this would solve many of the problems of underground parking, park-and-ride and the traffic terminals that we have been talking of.

As far as the main buildings themselves are concerned, I am glad that the Minister — and I quote his own words — is "interested in the rehabilitation of politicians." We think that's great. We're glad that it's under his department instead of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr.

[[Page 2078](#)]

Levi) sitting down the road.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: That comes later? Not too much later; if things carry on the way we are now we'll probably be under his charge, or that of the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) — I am not sure which.

In any event he mentioned suites for MLAs and cabinet Ministers. We'll certainly forgo the suites if we would occasionally get the odd office. At the moment the office space for MLAs is not adequate and I think the Minister is fully aware of this. He has certainly shown sympathy for my remarks in previous months.

I wonder whether he can give this House and the Members here more indication of how fast he intends to move on getting new office space, rearranging things so that, as he said, these buildings can be used by legislators.

I mention this because I understood in the fall session that the Liberal caucus would shortly get changes in their facilities. It so happened that nothing happened until two days before this new spring session. I trust the same experience will not befall us in the future. The actual alterations — and we appreciate the Minister's concern — unfortunately took place during the session and we had to send our secretaries home for some days while they took place. While the workmen worked very efficiently and effectively and the alterations were well

done, nevertheless it was of considerable inconvenience to our constituents and to ourselves.

So perhaps the Minister would like to tell us when we might expect these new parliament buildings devoted not to civil servants and, in particular, Ministerial aides, but devoted to MLAs and servicing their constituents. This is particularly important for myself, the Hon. First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) and the other local MLAs. We find that we have many visitors who want to come in. They sit in the galleries here and look down at the floor and then they come and tell us how terrible it is immediately afterwards in our offices. We would like to make sure they have at least some opportunity to sit and be comfortable during those discussions.

To sum up: could the Minister indicate what he is doing about the question of staggered hours? What precisely is the objective as far as the precinct is concerned and as far as other buildings are concerned? In particular, how about the so-called Blanshard Street boundary? Is that still in existence as a limit for any Government expansion? What is going to be done for legislators in this building to make sure we have adequate office facilities?

Finally, Mr. Minister, neither I nor the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) has seen the precinct plan. We appreciate your idea that we should provide suggestions here and now, but perhaps it might have been a little more useful had we been involved a little earlier. The only way I can find out what's happening in this regard is to get my own brother elected an alderman in Victoria and he tells me what's happening from city hall and that's great.

But it might be better, as we are the Members for this area, for us to be involved so that we have some idea before the final plan is unveiled so that we can have some input — and that's the very word that the Minister used. It's no good getting input too late.

We would like to know why we have been excluded in this process by this so-called "open" Government and what steps are going to be taken to rectify it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, you certainly haven't been excluded. As yet the cabinet hasn't seen the plans. We just really took a check on it last Friday to see how things were coming, and that's why I say it was a preview.

When there is a little more definition to the plan, we would be pleased to have you and any other Members who are interested look into it.

As far as a definitive line about the precinct area, as far as streets, I don't see that we can really say, "here, here and here." I believe we have to have some involvement certainly in the whole James Bay area so that we can get some direction into the whole style here. That's what we're trying to do.

There will be buildings uptown, possibly as far out as the old Hudson's Bay Company property on Cloverdale Avenue. We have certain facilities there now. It just may be a point where we should have a parking lot or a point where people could walk in and hop onto a loop-transit system or some form of public transit.

On the point of staggering hours, I think this has to be considered too. I think this can have quite a bearing. I notice when I drive in in the morning if you're here a few minutes earlier or a few minutes later it does make a fantastic difference in congestion. So I think this is a very good suggestion.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Would you give them to me again? Which were those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey, just to repeat the questions.

MR. GARDOM: Yes. I asked you four questions. I asked you the question whether you would definitely

favour the abolition of parking around the legislative buildings and around the courthouse in Vancouver. I am speaking of the respective blocks only.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: As of tomorrow.

MR. GARDOM: As of tomorrow. There's no need for it.

The second question was whether or not you will be phasing out the court facility in the existing courthouse in Vancouver and including it in the new structure which you have been talking about earlier today. That was the second question.

The third question: are you able to furnish details or at least let us know what the guidelines are of what you have in mind for the Press gallery? You just said the word "changes." That's rather an anomalous word — maybe — depending upon from where it's delivered, I suppose.

The fourth question was whether or not you are in favour of providing access to handicapped people to all government buildings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The last question is out of order.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: On the three questions, I am in favour of the removal of parking ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Do it!

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, of course as you say you can do it with a snap of your finger. But if it throws certain problems on the existing — or nonexistent — transportation system or if there are not adequate parking facilities to take up the gap, all right. But basically I agree that this is a beautiful building and having vehicles parked about it adds nothing to it.

With regard to the court facilities, we have asked Mr. Erickson to work this into his design — a new court facility for Vancouver.

When I referred to the Press gallery, I was referring not to this podium here but to their offices. We are planning certain changes in the building and there will be changes in the space that the Press is currently occupying as their offices. This is something, as you may or may not know, that was not planned in the original assembly. It was forgotten. The original architects forgot about the Press. So this had to be more or less superimposed. Because of that, it's ...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes. It's not easy to make too great a change. At the moment there is nothing planned with regard to the Press gallery in the assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Glenshiel Hotel, I am rather surprised that the Minister really refuses to release to the House ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Hon. Member has mentioned this question several times. I would point out that he may not demand an answer from a Minister. The Minister is under no obligation to give any other answer than that which he has already given.

MR. CHABOT: I've got 65 more times, the Member says here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore I would ask him to move to another subject.

MR. CHABOT: I don't intend moving to another subject, because I am going to pursue it in a different way, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister really in effect has refused to give the Members of this assembly what is in effect public

information. After four months of the purchase of a hotel he's unwilling to give us that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I just ruled the Hon. Member out of order.

MR. CHABOT: Upon pursuing the matter ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the Hon. Member not to pursue this subject further and to move to another subject. If he continues to pursue it I'll ask the Hon. Member to be seated.

MR. CHABOT: (Mike not on)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Is the Hon. Member going to pursue the subject? If so, I would ask him to sit down.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, you should be fair! You're denying me the right to stand in this assembly and speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've ordered under standing order No. 43 that you may not continue to pursue this subject because it's already been exhausted.

MR. CHABOT: The subject that I pursued in the original instance was the attempt to establish from the Minister the price they paid for that hotel. I'm no longer pursuing that matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon.

[[Page 2080](#)]

Member be seated?

MR. CHABOT: I'm no longer pursuing that matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member may continue his speech, providing that he moves to another subject. If he challenges my ruling, I would ask him to do it in the formal way rather than to argue with me. So would the Hon. Member continue on another subject?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Challenge him.

MR. CHABOT: I'm not going to challenge him because they have 38 Members over there.

I'm not pursuing the original question that I pursued before. I am talking on the same subject, the Glenshiel Hotel, but I'm not pursuing the question that I posed to the Minister — that he won't release public information. What I am going to say now is on the question of the Glenshiel Hotel on matters that I have not discussed previously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would so rule that the Hon. Member may proceed on this subject, providing it's some new matter concerning this ...

MR. CHABOT: Absolutely. That's the point I've been trying to make with you all along, Mr. Chairman.

Upon an examination of the title at land registry, we find that the Glenshiel Hotel is lot No. 1, section 6, plan 12078. The declared value was \$580,000. That's the information that comes from land registry. I'm wondering whether this sum has been paid by the department or a government department — the amount that has been declared. No doubt it has been.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I believe that the Hon. Member is posing the same question, which I asked him not to repeat. That is, he is asking the Hon. Minister whether or not a certain fixed sum of money was paid. The Hon. Member has already dealt with this question.

MR. CHABOT: No, the original question posed, Mr. Chairman, was just what price has been paid. Now I'm stating that the declared value at land registry was \$580,000. I'm wondering whether the Minister wants to

confirm that that is the figure that has been paid for the Glenshiel Hotel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member either be seated or move to a different subject entirely, other than dealing with the price of this place.

MR. CHABOT: In the original instance, Mr. Chairman, I was attempting to establish the price that was paid. Now I'm stating that land registry ... it's a completely different topic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, the matter still concerns something to do with the price of this place. I would ask you not to deal with that matter again but rather move to another subject. Otherwise, I'll ask you to be seated.

MR. CHABOT: Well, I wonder on what basis the \$580,000 declared value was established. On what basis did you establish the \$580,000 valuation for the building? Has the sum been paid to the owners of the hotel? I wonder if the Minister would want to comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River. Would the Hon. Member for Columbia River be seated, please?

MR. CHABOT: He's yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Hon Member for Columbia River will proceed onto another subject, then I'll recognize him. Otherwise, I'll recognize the Member for Saanich and the Islands.

MR. CHABOT: I want to discuss it further in a different vein. I haven't fully discussed the subject matter. I've discussed certain facets of the subject matter. The declared value of the property was \$580,000. I think we've established that. The Glenshiel Hotel....

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

MR. CHABOT: Why, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because I asked the Hon. Member not to discuss again anything concerning the price of this place, which has already been dealt with at length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It's an important matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. If the Hon. Member would like to challenge my ruling, he may do so, but I would ask him to be seated.

MR. CHABOT: No, it's information I'm discussing ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member be seated?

[[Page 2081](#)]

MR. CHABOT: I'm suggesting that there have been public funds squandered, Mr. Chairman. You're denying me the right to speak in this assembly, are you? What a shocking example of a chairman! We should have you removed from the chair, Mr. Chairman. You don't know what fair play is. You have no semblance of fair play. You don't understand the word. Will you be reasonable for a change?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Member be seated? I recognize the Hon. Member ...

MR. CHABOT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The next question I want to ask ...

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

MR. CHABOT: ... has to do with the squandering of public funds on the purchase of the Glenshiel Hotel. The squandering of public funds, Mr. Chairman — is that why you want to seat me down? Is that why you want me to sit down, because I'm raising a question of squandering the public funds? Is that what you're against?

Do you want to be partisan now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. PHILLIPS: They're hiding something.

MR. CHABOT: That's right. You'd better believe they're covering up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. CHABOT: Closure because they want to hide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member for Langley be seated. I would caution the Hon. Member for Columbia River that if he does not obey my ruling, I will be forced to take the necessary action under standing order 43.

MR. CHABOT: I was suggesting that the Glenshiel Hotel was for sale for some considerable time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member be seated, please?

MR. PHILLIPS: Why can't you bring up business of the Department of Public Works? What have you got to hide?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I have made a ruling.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I have made a ruling. If the Hon. Member does not agree with my ruling, he may challenge the ruling in the formal way. Otherwise, I will ask him to obey the Chair. I will recognize the Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You have sat the Member for Columbia River down on the basis of standing order No. 43. That would be a proper procedure provided the Member was engaging in tedious or repetitious debate. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing repetitious about the debate that was taking place in this House. We were trying to elicit answers from the Minister. What you're suggesting is that that Minister does not have to answer the questions ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. SMITH: He's perfectly entitled to bring that up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I made a ruling that the Hon. Member move to another subject. If anyone on the opposition side wishes to challenge my ruling, they may do so in the formal way. Otherwise I would ask them not to discuss the subject further. I recognize the Hon. Attorney General.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Just speaking to the point of order, it seems to me that the Minister is justified in refusing to answer this question on grounds of public policy.

MR. PHILLIPS: That's not a point of order. Are you on a point of order?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: But it seems to me that the Hon. Member opposite from Columbia River has the right to discuss whatever inferences he can draw from the fact that apparently in the land registry, the declared value at a certain date was stated to be \$580,000. Now, if he has a point to make in connection with that, I would think that he should be allowed to make it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I have ruled, and I will continue to rule unless somebody challenges my ruling, that he may not discuss further the price that the Department of Public Works has paid for this place. If he wishes to discuss something else to do with the value that was recorded in the land registry office, he may do so as long as he does not ask him whether this was the price. That is the part that I ruled out of order.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to thank the Attorney General as well for considering that fair play should take place in this assembly.

Now, the point that I'm going to make is the fact that the hotel has been for sale for some considerable time — for several months prior to the purchase by the provincial government — by National Trust Company Limited of Victoria. They issued a brochure that this building, the Glenshiel Hotel, was for sale "in evergreen Victoria; an 80-room hotel; unbeatable location in the heart of Victoria; close to CPR and Blackball ferries, airline terminal and bus depot, Beacon Hill Park, Parliament Buildings, Undersea Gardens, Wax Museum and other leading tourist attractions within two blocks." it's offered at \$470,000.

We've established the declared value as \$580,000. The Hotel was on the public block really, for sale to any taker at \$470,000. We find that it has been purchased by the provincial government at \$110,000 more than was originally offered to the public. I'm wondering why this hotel was bought at more than the advertised price. I have to suggest that it appears to me that there has been a squandering of public funds in the purchase of this hotel.

I think that there should be an investigation into the purchase of this hotel, in view of the discrepancy of the original sale price and the price paid for it by the provincial government. I think the investigation should look into the disposition of the funds that were given by the provincial government to the owners. I don't know.

On the original "for sale" sign there was a down payment of \$150,000. I am wondering whether the provincial government made a down payment or whether they paid the \$580,000 in full. There's a very serious discrepancy here. I think there should be a complete and thorough examination of what actually has taken place. I think there should be a full search of the disposition of the funds that were paid for the purchase of this hotel. Unless this investigation takes place, people will assume probably the wrong thing relative to the additional \$110,000.

It appears on the surface to be, in my opinion, a scandalous situation — an overpayment of \$110,000. I think we as Members of this Legislative Assembly should know just what the disposition of the \$580,000 was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject. If we're going to run it I think the accounts for that hotel for the last 12 months should be brought before the Public Accounts Committee. We should be told here this afternoon who's going to be responsible for running this hotel, because I don't think the Department of Public Works has been in the hotel business. We'd like to know how much insurance is going to be paid, who pays the taxes, who they're going to pay the taxes to and who's going to look after the hiring and firing? Where are the profits going to go? If there's a loss, who's going to make up the loss? How long a period of time do you intend to keep the hotel going? When you answer the other questions, would you answer those, Mr. Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver-Howe Sound): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm surprised that the Minister hasn't risen to his feet and responded to the very serious charge which the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) has laid before this committee.

The Minister earlier, Mr. Chairman, suggested that he couldn't answer the questions because there were negotiations going on for the acquisition of other properties in the immediate area. As I listened to that answer, I considered it to be responsible on the part of the Minister. But, here apparently it's a matter of public record in the Land Registry Office as to what the declared value of the property is — \$580,000. It's also a matter of record available to anyone who would seek the answers that the property was listed for \$110,000 less than that. That discrepancy is one that the Minister cannot allow to pass unnoticed.

If this is the way negotiations are being carried on for the acquisition of other properties within these precincts, then I would think the owners of these properties, recognizing what has happened at the Glenshiel Hotel, would very quickly be recalculating any prices that they were discussing with the Minister of Public Works. To leave this unanswered is very serious.

The Member has talked about "squandering money". He says it's a "scandalous situation". Is the Minister going to allow this to remain unanswered?

I had some other questions that I wanted to pose in another area, but in the circumstances I'll give the Minister the chance to rise on this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me assure you no public funds have been squandered. The statement that I made ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

[[Page 2083](#)]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: ... there are other negotiations going on and this will be laid as public information in due course. We are the Government and I believe we are responsible. As for my friend from Columbia River attempting to work up a tempest in a teapot — well, he's good at that.

We feel because of certain other interests at this point, it's just not in the overall interest to give that information. It will be public information.

As far as management — these are fair questions. They were certainly looked into and have been looked after. For the former government Members, this isn't the only operation of this type that we are managing. We have been operating others for some time.

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

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman: I find the answer a little bit strange. I am sure that anyone who is negotiating for the purchase of other buildings in that area ... that the owners of those buildings have done precisely what the Member for Columbia River has done, and that is checked Land Registry to see what the property has been valued at. Any prudent individuals would have done precisely that to see what the area had gone for.

One other question which I would like to ask: since the Government is in the hotel business, does the City of Victoria receive the taxes in the same manner as they previously did from the former owner, or are they paid now on a 15 mill basis as other government buildings would be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. WILLIAMS: One supplemental question, dealing with this question, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister's concern about other negotiations is so great — can he tell us, simply, was he aware that the Glenshiel Hotel had been offered for sale through one of the real estate agents in this province at the price of \$470,000 and did he have this information in his possession at the time that he concluded negotiations for the Glenshiel Hotel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I wasn't aware of this advertisement that the Member has been reading. We were aware that it was for sale, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT: Thank you. It's a fairly large brochure that's been circulated all over the country no doubt — by National Trust: "For sale, 80 room hotel. Price \$470,000." What I really can't understand is the serious discrepancy between what the provincial government has paid for the hotel and what it was originally for sale for.

Really, what has happened to the additional \$110,000? I think that unless the Minister clears that up on

the floor of this House, I think we should have a public inquiry into the disposition of the funds that were paid for that hotel. It's a very simple question. I know that the Minister of Highways has just given you the answer. I hope it's a reasonable answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: On the same subject, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if before purchasing this hotel, since it's been purchased as a going concern — there's bed linen — I presume that it's going to remain a going concern and all of the assets and all of the liabilities of this hotel would be purchased — was there an independent appraisal done of this operation? You can hire independent appraisals for insurance purposes and you can also, if you're buying a going concern, have an independent appraisal firm come in and appraise all the assets of the building, appraise what their future value is going to be in 5, 10 and 20 years. You can appraise what the profit or loss of that operation will be, based on past financial statements. Was this done?

Have the other properties that you are considering purchasing — the apartment building and I presume the motel on the corner — have independent appraisals been run on these? If you buy them are they going to continue to be run as a motel and as an apartment building? Are you planning on having independent appraisals made?

After all, you're spending the public's money on these enterprises and you may have some going at the present time, but not here in the City of Victoria. You're not in the motel business as such and you're not in the hotel business as such and you're not in the apartment block business as such. Would the Minister answer those questions, please?

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

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, again I find it a bit surprising that they were not aware that this building had been for sale. It was certainly very common knowledge in the business community in the

[[Page 2084](#)]

City of Victoria that the Glenshiel Hotel was for sale and the price was certainly very widely spread. It seems rather surprising that the Minister was not aware that this building had been on the market for some time and what the price was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Of course we were aware that the hotel was for sale. If we weren't aware, we wouldn't have put in a bid to buy it. We are also aware that it has been sold several times over the years.

Now, before we made any serious offer in negotiations, we had the firm that has done appraisals for the former government for several years, we had them appraise it. And then we had an independent appraisal. And I can tell you that we paid something in the neighbourhood of \$50,000 less than the appraisal made by the appraiser of the former government.

MR. CHABOT: And \$110,000 more than the offered price.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: No, we got it for considerably less than the offered price.

There were two appraisals. We haven't a thing to hide. We're an open government. But we also know something about doing business. You people are just trying to blow it ...

MR. PHILLIPS: Blow it?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: ... for mischievous advantage.

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

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, again, if that is correct, then why does the Land Registry ...

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): What do you mean, "if that's correct"?

MR. MORRISON: I'm not saying it isn't. I'm saying that if that is correct, why does the Land Registry not then record the correct price and why is it listed in Land Registry today at \$580,000?

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

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, just one quick question to the Minister of Public Works. I would like to comment that some of the Ministers should learn that off-the-cuff statements can perhaps be very damaging to the community in which we live. We have heard a number of them dealing with everything from takeover of British Columbia Telephone to takeover of Transmission Pipelines and everything else.

I would just like to suggest that these kinds of off-the-cuff remarks are often taken seriously, particularly among the business community. It has a rather disastrous effect on the economy and I would like to suggest that the Minister not indulge in these off-the-cuff remarks such as his comments about the takeover — if that is what they were about — of the telecommunication systems in British Columbia recently and further remarks in the Press about the takeover of telephone systems in the province.

I think it is time this House got a clearly-defined statement from the Minister, first of all, telling us whether he was enunciating Government policy when he was talking about the takeover of these kinds of communication systems; whether or not the Government policy is to continue or to begin to intrude upon, first of all the telephone system, that part of the system over which the provincial government has some control.

To what extent, if any, does the Government intend to control or operate community-based antenna systems? If they don't intend to infringe on the currently operating community-based antenna systems, do they have plans for community-based antenna systems operated by the provincial government on a channel applied for by the provincial government? To what extent, if any, is the Government seeking to intrude into the area of local community radio stations, if any? And does the Minister have any idea of what kind of capital commitments are necessary for the operation of these kinds of systems?

Most important, Mr. Chairman, I think we need some kind of a definitive statement from the Minister to carry over from his statements in the Press with regard to these community antenna systems and telephone systems particularly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, at no time have I stated that we would take over any of the

[[Page 2085](#)]

Communication systems in this province — at no time as Minister.

I did issue a statement last Friday with regard to regulations — the need for provincial regulation and control. As I mentioned in my preliminary statement, Gerard Pelletier has invited the various representatives of communications from all the 10 provinces to meet with him. Mr. Pelletier has indicated that they are prepared to discuss and enter into agreements with the provinces so that the provinces will have more say and control.

With regard to our telephone system and with regard to communications we find, in our studies across Canada, the provinces whose communications systems are under federal control have the highest rates and poorest services. The provinces that have provincial control and regulation have the lowest rates and highest quality service. At no time did I say that we would be taking over this sector or that sector; but I believe that if we are going to be masters of our own house, we do have to have some control and regulation over communications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A supplementary by the Member for Langley providing it is relevant to the same ...

MR. McCLELLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister then if he could elaborate a little further. We got the distinct impression that the Minister was anxious to get into the communications business. If the Minister, Mr. Chairman, isn't interested in taking over, then is the Government

interested in trying to get a channel of its own for either radio or a community-based antenna system?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, of course, it is very easy for some people to get impressions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria. I would ask the Hon. Members, if they are continuing to pursue this subject, if they would relate it to the Minister's estimates, not merely the statements the Minister may make — and to his areas of responsibility under this department.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister issues statements which are described as Government policy statements, I would think — and perhaps you will correct me if I am wrong — that it would somehow come under his jurisdiction and responsibility. I noticed he has shown no hesitation in replying to this. We on the opposition side appreciate his acknowledged paternity of that document that came out last Friday. Surely we can question him on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out, if the Hon. Minister is willing to answer the questions as they are put, yes, but he may not be pressed to answer the questions inasmuch as they don't apply to this particular department. I would oppose the question.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order: whether the Minister is willing or not is really irrelevant. The Government put him on an interprovincial committee to deal with this type of thing and surely Members of this House should have an opportunity to question him on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, in that case, it is up to the Minister as to whether he will answer.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Right. I asked the Minister some questions in the House, I believe on Monday, on this very subject, regarding the policy statement that he made. He stated at that time that we would be getting a later policy statement. We were told that it might or might not be in the House and I just wonder when we are going to get it, if not perhaps under this discussion we are having now.

I asked that question, Mr. Chairman, because a great deal of concern was generated by the same type of off-hand remarks the Hon. Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) mentioned by the Hon. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) in his speech, I believe, at Harrison. He was talking to broadcasters and he stated that the Press was not doing a very good job in publicizing Government Press releases.

The people at that time were concerned that there was an indication of Government displeasure which tied in with the statement made last Friday. It might indicate we are entering into an era of communications control and control of not only community television but other forms by the state as well, which might well be very adverse to the open and free Press and other media in this province.

We are particularly concerned that this statement has been made and yet has not been elaborated on further. It is a very curious and sketchy statement.

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I can't quote your own Press release but I see your assistant beside you putting it on your desk, Mr. Minister, and perhaps ...

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Perhaps you were kind

[[Page 2086](#)]

enough to send a copy around to me but I didn't receive it in my office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would recognize ...

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman; these people are admitting now that they don't

know what they are talking about. I am asking them what statement they are referring to; to make a direct quote from it and they say that if I will send them a copy of my statement of last Friday, they will comment.

Now, they have been making a lot of comment and apparently they do not know what they are talking about. My statement was merely with relation to the regulation and control ...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Second Member for Victoria be seated please. Would the Hon. Minister ...

HON. MR. HARTLEY: ... with regard to provincial or federal regulation and control. We have had provincial Ministers' meetings; we will be having another provincial Ministers' meeting and we hope to accept the Hon. Gerard Pelletier, the federal Minister of Communication's, invitation to meet with the federal government. Now, my statement was merely stating our position that we favoured provincial regulations and control. I made no statement whatsoever with regard to the provincial acquisition of any of our communications institutions in this province.

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

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: We appreciate the Minister's remarks. However, statements were made, for example, referring to excess profits and no definition of that was given. That is the type of thing we are a little alarmed about. As I said, when read in conjunction with the statement of another Minister the week before, which again may have been off-the-cuff remarks, I am concerned that the Press, the media in this province, might well be leaned on by a combination of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Works.

Turning to the earlier question, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask on: if we are getting such a fine price for the hotel, it strikes me as very, very curious, that we wouldn't want to make it public so that the other people with whom you are dealing know what a shrewd businessman you are, Mr. Minister. I can see a good reason for concealing the price if you think you had to pay a little more or if you think there was something special about this deal which didn't apply to the others but the others would pretend that it did.

If, in fact, we got a hell of a good deal, please brag about it because, so far, your Hon. friends further down the row, especially the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams), have been quite happy to brag about the great deals they are getting.

They are getting a \$70 million debt for nothing. If you are getting something equally as good, please let us know what it is. Our caucus has decided it is the type of Government that would rush to purchase shares in the Titanic shortly after it struck the iceberg. We want to know whether the Glenshiel Hotel was another of these "failing" problems or whether indeed it might be a good purchase.

If it was a good purchase, as the Minister has said, surely he would like to tell the world about it so that the other people who are dealing with him know full well that the reason for concealing the information was not because the price was too high, but because it was substantially low. If it is the case that it was substantially low, as you indicated, Mr. Minister, then surely releasing this information will speed up the negotiations and will result in the government getting the other properties at a better price.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question on the same subject, going back to another conference on communications with the other Ministers in charge of communications for the other provinces.

Certainly at these conferences, cable television is point B" on his Press release when he comes back. So it is very important that the Minister is talking about cable television — even to the point where there was a resolution passed at this convention, with regard to cable television, and it's dated November 21, 1972 — "Conference Interprovincial de Ministres des Communications, Resolution on cable television:

"The Ministers agree that an ad hoc committee of provincial communications officials be established to discuss the

very important cultural, economic and legal issues surrounding cable television, which are central to the future development of communications in the provinces."

Now that is what the Minister said last November. So then when he makes this statement in Harrison Hot Springs that he is unhappy with the way the present media are delivering the message from his great government to the people of this province — he is unsatisfied — this brings up the very question that

[[Page 2087](#)]

we are pursuing this afternoon.

I'd like the Minister to explain his position on cable television, because the resolution states that officials exchange views and seek agreement on a set of principles governing provincial action on cable television, and that the committee report back to the next conference of the Ministers.

Well, the Minister just stood on his feet a few moments ago, and he said this next conference is going to be in April. Yes, he said this month; and I asked him across the floor, "What day in April?" But that is not the significant part, Mr. Chairman, and I want the Minister to answer this question. When he arrived at the interprovincial conference of communications Ministers last November, he brought greetings from the Premier and the new Government of British Columbia. And he said:

"May I take this opportunity to say thank you, Monsieur l'Orateur, for the very warm hospitality that has been extended to us during this visit to Quebec City and La Belle Province. In British Columbia, Columbia Britannique, we do not have a department of communications as such, but the Premier has requested that I attend this conference and report to him on our deliberations. Our role in this conference will be mainly to listen and gain a fuller knowledge of the problems and potentialities of modern communications in our province."

Now just what does he mean by the potentialities? Is he going to go out and buy all the existing cable communications systems in this province? I want an answer, Mr. Chairman. I want him to stand up and answer, because here is the significant part of this, Mr. Chairman; that the Minister of Public Works says, "Because of the monopolistic nature of communications, we feel there is need for government involvement in this field."

Now I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister of Public Works, in view of this statement he made at Harrison, going to set up cable television in this province as a propaganda machine for his Government? That is the question that is here today.

He has already said, Mr. Chairman, that he is unhappy with what is presently happening, and he has already expressed views that he would like to get into the cable television business. And he has already said here that there is a need for government involvement in this field. I ask the Minister of Public Works, is he going to set up his own propaganda machine, because that is about the first step in communist takeover.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

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

MR. CHABOT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Minister said a few moments ago that he was aware that the Glenshiel Hotel was for sale, that they had two appraisals of the property to justify the sale price. The for sale price was \$470,000. If the appraisal indicated that it was worth more, I want to know why you are willing to pay \$110,000 more than the for sale price. I want to know, even though the Minister of Highways has given you information as to the answers you should give me, Mr. Chairman, I want to know the disposition of that \$110,000 overpayment.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much was that?

MR. CHABOT: What has been the disposition of that \$110,000? I think it is a very serious question, and I think that we need an investigation. Unless the Minister is willing to give us clearcut answers on the question of the overpayment of \$110,000 for the Glenshiel Hotel, we should have an investigation, a public enquiry to see where those funds have gone.

Has the NDP received any of those funds? Unless you are willing to answer that, one has to assume that a

certain portion of those funds went to your campaign headquarters, or whatever you want to call it. Because there has been an overpayment, a very serious overpayment here ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Member to withdraw that statement, that inference — a very clear inference — of wrongdoing, right now. Right now! Withdraw that inference.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, please, there was no inference of wrongdoing. All I'm suggesting here is that the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member be seated for a moment and give the Chair a chance to speak. I would ask the Hon. Member if he would withdraw the imputation of wrongdoing on the part of the Minister, or on the part of the Government.

MR. CHABOT: I never suggested that there was any wrongdoing on the part of ...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. CHABOT: Never at any time did I suggest that. The point that I am making, Mr. Chairman, is this ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I asked the Hon.

[[Page 2088](#)]

Member to withdraw the imputation that there was misappropriation of funds in any way or wrongdoing on the part of the Minister or the Government.

MR. CHABOT: I didn't suggest there was any misappropriation of funds.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the remarks he may have made.

MR. CHABOT: May have made! I withdraw anything I may have made! (Laughter). If you insist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The remarks that he made that implied that money was diverted into purposes other than that properly authorized. I would ask him to withdraw that imputation, unconditionally.

MR. CHABOT: Oh, I've withdrawn, several times. Do you want me to withdraw again and spend the whole of the rest of the afternoon withdrawing? But I am saying here that there is \$110,000 of taxpayers' money wasted, squandered in overpayment for this building. What has happened to that \$110,000 and why does the Government allow this overexpenditure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The suggestion that the Hon. Minister is making is, in fact, an imputation of wrongdoing on the part of the spending of these funds. Also, the Minister has never answered the question as to the amount of money that was paid for the Glenshiel Hotel and is not required to do so, and has stated that it is not a matter of public policy to do so. Therefore I would ask the Hon. Member not to pursue that particular point.

MR. CHABOT: He refuses to do so, but the declared price must have some significance with the purchase price. I am sure that the government department responsible for the registering of the title in Land Registry would certainly not put in a fictitious figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, the point that I am making is this: the Hon. Member may suggest it as a rhetorical idea, but he may not draw the inference that it is a fact, and that money was misappropriated, and

impute to the government through the Minister that fact. Therefore I would ask the Minister to discuss the matter in a reasonable way.

MR. CHABOT: I am saying that the hotel was for sale, Mr. Chairman, for \$470,000, and the Minister has admitted it was for sale. Why didn't he buy it at \$470,000? Why did he pay \$580,000, which is the declared value in Land Registry — which is an overexpenditure, a wasting of \$110,000 of taxpayers' money?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works, on a point of order.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: The Member for Columbia is just making many assumptions. I answered his question. I told him that we had an appraisal made by the firm of appraisers that his government had used for many years. Being as we were a new government we had a second appraisal made independently and privately. The second appraisal was considerably lower than the first appraisal, and we paid considerably less than the appraised value for the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River. However, I would caution him that any further discussion on this particular point I will rule as tedious and repetitious, and I would ask him therefore to raise a new matter dealing with the Glenshiel Hotel.

MR. CHABOT: I'll raise a new matter. If an appraiser had gone in there and suggested it was worth \$1 million — that the appraised value should be \$1 million — and if the hotel is for sale for \$470,000, is that any justification for the government spending \$1 million?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: The government did not spend \$1 million, and if the hotel was for sale for 95 cents it would still be good business to send an appraiser in to check that, and that is what you do. We have had two appraisals, and we were able to purchase the hotel for considerably less than the appraised value.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order, please.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: No, for less than the "for sale" price. Now, you can carry on building castles and sawdust men and straw men. You're used to that. We will hide nothing from the public. We are an open government.

We felt that it was in the best interests of the proper development of the precinct area that this property was purchased. As I told you earlier, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) and I met with the senior citizens there, just for their peace of mind so that they knew contrary to fallacious rumours that were generated by some, they would not be turned out into the street.

[[Page 2089](#)]

But had we not purchased that property, if some private enterprises had bought it and chosen to build a highrise, those senior citizens could well have been turned out on the street. We are guaranteeing them security of tenure by this action. We are also helping to, I hope, preserve greater grace and dignity for this precinct area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Chairman, I've just tried to take an intelligent interest in this debate on the Glenshiel Hotel. The Minister just made the statement that we in fact, or we the government, bought it for less than the sale price. Did I hear correctly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Member that the question has been asked of the Minister as to what the price of this place was and various methods have been used to try and extract this information from the Minister. He's under no obligation to answer. If this is a ...

MR. WALLACE: I'm not asking that, Mr. Chairman, with respect. If the House would listen, I was simply trying to verify his last sentence when he said, and correct me if I'm wrong, that we did in fact, as the government, "bought it for less than the listed price" which was \$470,000. Did you, Mr. Minister, or did you not

make that statement two minutes ago?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I stated that we had two appraisals. One of the appraisers was the ...

MR. WALLACE: That's not what we were talking about.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: ... that we purchased the property for less than the appraised price. I haven't named the price as far as sale price. Well if I said "sale" — I haven't quoted a sale price. These advertisements my friend is holding up — I do not know of them. I don't know the date. This property has been sold several times.

AN HON. MEMBER: This year.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: What is the date? This property has been sold several times. We had it properly appraised and we paid less than the appraised value. Those documents could be made available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. WALLACE: Just to get the record straight, Mr. Chairman, can I just ask then that if *Hansard* shows that a few minutes ago the Minister said "less than the sale price" that that was a slip of the tongue, and he meant that it was less than the appraised price, not the list.

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

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, to confirm a statement made; I believe the Minister said that all senior citizens in this hotel would be granted a security of tenure. He implied that it would be more or less for life. In the interests of the government, I think that it should be clear that perhaps at some future time they might be treated in some different way.

Many of the senior citizens in Victoria live hale and healthy lives at a hundred or more. I trust that we are not in a situation where you are binding the government to leaving the hotel standing as a hotel for 40, 50 or 60 years. The reason I say this is that senior citizens are upset enough, thanks to the blue forms of your colleague. I think that while we want to put their minds at rest certainly, wherever we can, I just don't think you should bind the government to a commitment of security of tenure for life unless you really do mean those words, Mr. Minister. I wonder again whether we could have a clarification on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: We assured them all security of tenure — those who were living there at the time we acquired the hotel. Now these are senior citizens. New persons who come in will come in on a month-to-month, or a year-to-year basis.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: So no person living there at the moment will be ever asked to leave.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Persons who were living there at the time that we acquired the property. There are new people, as I say, who have come in since. They are coming in on a different basis. They are coming in on a month-to-month basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Will the Minister do me the courtesy of answering my question with regard to ...

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

[[Page 2090](#)]

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, through you the Minister if he will give me an answer with regard to my queries pertaining to cable television in the province.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I answered that, that my statement was with regard to the control — regulation

rates — that should be paid for communications by consumers in this province. I've made no statement with regard to government acquisition of either telephone or cablevision or other forms of communication.

We do feel that we would be far further ahead if we had provincial regulation instead of federal regulation. We do have problems in this area in that the most lucrative areas have been serviced. Areas like up in the Cariboo, or up island — the rural parts of the province — do not have cable TV service and if we can work out some method whereby they can have a good cablevision service, we certainly will. We are concerned.

Now, in other provinces where you have a province network they have what they call cross-subsidization. The rate that is paid in a densely populated area helps subsidize the more sparsely populated areas. But we haven't a comprehensive development. We have not had a comprehensive development in British Columbia and this is most unfortunate. It's something — one of the many problems that we inherited from the previous government. We're doing our best to solve it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I understand by that then there is a possibility that the Minister plans on going into the cable television area. Is that what I'm to understand?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works is having a conference now with the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan). However, there have been statements made by other Members of the Government, Mr. Chairman, that they feel that the Government should go into cable television. If you're going to go into cable television, is it going to be run by your department, and how are you going to buy out the existing setup?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that we were going into the field of anything. I said that we were concerned, and we believed that provincial control over rates and regulations was better than federal control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Hon. Member if he has new subject matter — otherwise would he remain seated?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'll pass on, Mr. Chairman, from the subject of cable television, but I still have an awfully big question mark in my mind as to what the Government plans to do. I would hate to see them go into the cable television and set it up as a propaganda machine for this Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Hon. Minister has answered the question. I ask the Hon. Member to move on to a new subject.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'll move on. Just taking a look at the Minister's estimates. I find that in his office estimates there is an increase of \$24,663 from the \$34,313 spent last year by this department, an increase to \$58,976. Mr. Chairman, that's an increase of 41.22 per cent. An increase in the Minister's office estimates, his budget, of 41.22 per cent. That is highly inflationable. Very highly inflationable. The entire budget only shows an increase of \$4,780,996 from last year's expenditure of \$37,737,611 to \$42,508,607. That's only an increase, Mr. Chairman, of 11.24 per cent. So the whole department only goes up 11.24 per cent, while the Minister's office goes up pretty near four times that amount percentage-wise — to 41.22 per cent. There is no relation in the percentage of increase.

[Ms. Young in the chair]

Now, the biggest cost in this Minister's office, Madam Chairman, is the cost of his executive assistant, which is \$16,020. I would like the Minister to justify that expense because he told us at the beginning of his estimates this afternoon that he took over a department that was very well run. Very well run indeed, in that the estimates were there and the background was done. Madam Chairman, that department was indeed a very well run department.

So if the department was a very well run department and there is only an 11 per cent increase in the expenditures of the entire department, why does the Minister of Public Works require an executive assistant? Would the Minister of Public Works outline the duties of this executive assistant, tell me what he's going to do and what he plans to use this executive assistant for?

Madam Chairman, there is certainly no increase in the budget for the construction of provincial buildings. It remains the same at \$18 million. This proves to me — by the very nature of inflation and by increased costs of wages and so forth — that there are going to be fewer people employed in the construction of new buildings this year than there were last year. Why, Madam Chairman, does the Minister of Public Works need a \$16,000 executive

[[Page 2091](#)]

assistant? Is this man going to be a propaganda machine for the Minister? Would the Minister please answer?

AN HON. MEMBER: He's a property appraiser.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver–Little Mountain): I have a question that I'd like to address to the Minister, Madam Chairman. In this real estate deal in Victoria — the Glenshiel Hotel — were the former owners represented by a real estate firm? The reason I ask this question is because I'd like to know whether there was an asking price.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. SMITH: While the Minister is pondering the answer to the question asked by one of the Members from his own side of the House, I'll address a few remarks to the Hon. Minister, through you Madam Chairman.

Earlier in the debate this afternoon the Minister indicated to the House that renovations would take place in the parliament building — as I understand it, the main building — to accommodate more of the cabinet Ministers within the immediate precincts. I presume that this is in line with recommendations from the department and policy decision within the cabinet. You're going to move more of your cabinet Members into onQ building, rather than have them scattered around in a number of buildings.

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Minister, through you Madam Chairman, is the fact that some renovations did take place in this building earlier this year. Because the work was termed to be of an emergency nature, it was performed for the government by a firm of contractors called H.E. Fowler & Sons Limited. There was no contract or specifications drawn up as I understand it. The work was let without contract. Some \$95,000 worth of work was done to a series of office suites within this immediate area on a cost-plus basis.

When the Minister is considering further work and renovations, including renovations of the facilities for the Press and for Ministers or their assistants, is it his intention to again allow that work to be done without the benefit of a contract being called, so that everyone in the contracting business can bid on the job on a proper tender basis. Do you intend, Mr. Minister, to use the same process of a cost-plus basis in any renovations that you have in mind?

I think all of us in the Opposition have a genuine concern about the position of the Department of Public Works and their purchase of Glenshiel Hotel.

That is why it was canvassed so thoroughly this afternoon, Mr. Minister. If we look at other purchases of the provincial government in the last few weeks, we have reason to question the wisdom of some of the moves that have manifested themselves in the last few days involving public funds.

The Hon. Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) referred to it in sort of a joking manner. He suggested that in his opinion, the Government would run out to buy shares in the Titanic after it had hit the iceberg. That might be justified by the present Government by saying, "Well, O.K. We took out insurance with our new Crown corporation. The insurance will be able to pay it off and therefore it won't cost the taxpayers of the province anything."

This is the type of financial manipulation that we see manifested in some of the deals that are taking place. We have a right to question the purchase of the Glenshiel Hotel and the manner in which it was purchased by the provincial government.

I would like to comment on another couple of matters, Madam Chairman. Earlier this afternoon, the Minister reeled off a number of projects that had either been completed or called to tender. As I listened to him, I recognized the fact that a number of the projects on that list have been completed for some time. As a matter of fact, it would be interesting to know if all the contracts he referred to this afternoon were called for and tender let after the new Government took office.

It reminded me somewhat of a practice of town and city councils. They turn out a year-end report. One of the things they always like to do is refer to the value of new building construction. In order to make the report look impressive, they refer to new building construction that actually took place in the previous year and anything that was in the process of being completed this year. Then they project that onto the following year. Collectively, it gives a very impressive picture. But in actual net increase in assessment to the municipalities, it really doesn't mean that much in terms of dollars and cents.

I do appreciate the Minister's remarks concerning the location of new buildings, site preparation, and the fact that in calling for contracts for new buildings, thought should be given to the architectural beauty — as you said — not only of the building but of the area itself.

I would like to bring to the Minister's attention a very beautiful piece of property that they have in Fort St. John. The only thing that's missing is the new court house. It's an area that will do justice to the Department of Public Works and to the new court house. It will certainly be a building that the Minister can be proud of when it's completed. I'd just like to know when it will be called to tender, so that the people who have every faith that the contract will be called will have an indication as to exactly when. If it

[[Page 2092](#)]

to be called in the immediate future, I'd certainly appreciate that information this afternoon.

If the Minister would care to comment on those particular matters, I'd be quite willing to take my place. Thank you.

MS. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Cariboo.

MR. FRASER: I asked the Minister a few questions earlier in the afternoon. He hasn't done very well answering quite a few questions. One that he didn't answer was the one regarding offices for MLAs in their ridings.

Now that this Government is making us full-time MLAs, I think we're entitled to offices in our ridings. I'd like to have that question answered here today. What is the Government's thinking along this line?

The other thing I'd like to ask about, Madam Chairman to the Minister, is the 15 mill grant that is made to a municipality in which there is provincial property. Are you considering at all increasing that? Do you realize that the average general mill rate — this is not school or hospital mill rates, but the average general mill rate for municipal purposes in B.C. — is about 40 mills today? I think we should be fair and take a look at this in view of inflation.

I would also like to know what is the department's policy regarding payment of the utility charges of the municipalities? I have knowledge of the fact that the department is refusing to pay the going rates of a municipal utility.

I have one in my riding that is still trying to recover rights from about three years ago. I refer to the town of Williams Lake. I can't understand what's going on. I'd like to know the policy ruling on it.

Just a couple of small items in the riding: I appreciate the long list of buildings that the Minister gave earlier, Madam Chairman, but one that I noted was not in that list, if you would make a note of it, is the highway maintenance building for a place called Bridge Lake in my riding of Cariboo. I have been given to understand that they are going to build one this year. If you haven't got it on your list there's a possibility that it is not going to be built.

The other thing is that there are some problems, Madam Chairman to the Minister, about a dwelling for

the government agent at Williams Lake that's been kicked around for quite a while. I'd like some comment on that. Are you going to build a dwelling for the government agent there or not in this fiscal year? Thank you.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for Omineca.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): Thank you, Madam Chairman. I was listening to the Hon. Minister read out a list of prospective construction for this fiscal year. I notice that in one particular case there were remarks made towards Burns Lake and a new court house being built there.

I am anxious, Madam Chairman, that the actual town that is really in need of a court house in Omineca is Fort St. James; that in fact there is a court house already in Burns Lake. It might be several years old but it is in very good condition. I think that it was only a bit of a political move on behalf of the former administration to start a new court house in Burns Lake when in fact here we have a very large area, such as Fort St. James and the area that it services — and although I had heard this year that there was to be a small building built for the public works, a form of building to cover the welfare and maybe a courtroom — that was all that was planned. Although I have had discussions with the Minister, I don't think I heard anything to date concerning any building for Fort St. James.

Now if anyone could see a map and look at the area that it services, they would understand why there is a great need for a full court house in Fort St. James. They service literally tens of thousands of square miles. The country is opening up. In fact just recently there were remarks made concerning townsites in the Takla Lake area; that they service areas as far as almost 200 miles to the north; that we do have almost 7,000 people in the area and that they're not getting the services that they need.

Our welfare people, for example, have to come in from Vanderhoof. If the probation man comes from Vanderhoof ... and it just seems to be that everything is being centralized in the Vanderhoof area. We need these things now in Fort St. James. I am anxious to have the Minister tell me what there is on the schedule for Fort St. James for this year. Thank you.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have just a couple of short questions that I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, as soon as he gets through his conference. Is the Minister of Public Works, Madam Chairman, planning on putting all the employees in his department on a 30-hour week? If you do that with the department of Public Works, of course you'll have to do that with all government employees.

Last year the Hon. Minister of Public Works stated that he "recognized to give full employment that we must move ahead to a 30-hour week, and that we have to consider earlier retirement. Surely it is better for everyone to be free to work 30 hours than having half our work force working 40 hours or 48 hours and a great percentage unemployed and on welfare."

Now is this the Minister's policy or was this just some more hot air that he was spouting last year? I'd

[[Page 2093](#)]

like an answer from the Minister with regard to his intentions, because if he puts his department on that as being what he truly believes, Madam Chairman, it's going to involve other departments. It's going to involve private industry. It's going to involve heavy industry. It's going to involve the service industry. So maybe the Minister would ... is he working with the Department of Labour in this regard?

Now the other thing I'd like to ask, Madam Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister how much money has been spent renovating this particular building we're in, the main parliament building here. Every time you turn around you see another office, Madam Chairman, being renovated. I was working quite late last night and I just walked down past your caucus. A couple of your Members were working — and here's a whole ceiling being torn out — and everywhere you turn around ...

I would like the Minister of Public Works to advise me how much money has been spent on making renovations in this particular building.

Another small question, Madam Chairman. I had a phone call last summer asking if I would like to have an office down in my constituency. I said no, that I was quite happy now but that maybe when the new provincial building was finished there would be allowance for that. How many of the MLAs now, Madam Chairman, do have offices in their constituencies? Are they supplied with telephones? Are they supplied with the office 365 days a year? Is there any provision, Madam Speaker, to provide the MLAs with secretaries in these offices?

Another question, Madam Chairman: I'd like to ask the Minister of Public Works what plans he has to get rid of these horrible lights that were put up there so that we could have TV. I think they are a disgrace in this chamber and I think that they should be taken out forthwith.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MS. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, that is a subject of the Select Committee on Television Broadcasting of the House, so I believe.

MR. PHILLIPS: But, Madam Chairman, it's got to come under the Department of Public Works. All that I am going to suggest to the department, Madam Chairman, is that if we are going to have television here, that we get rid of those horrible things up there. It's too beautiful a sight up there — the art and the effort that was put into this building — to have those ugly things there. The windows are half open and some of them have got cellophane stuck in them. I think that we should get rid of that and take these fights and somehow fit them into the landscape.

MS. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, this is all under consideration by this committee.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'm asking the Minister of Public Works because this building comes under him. I don't care what your committee does, Madam Chairman. This building and these chambers are under the Department of Public Works, and you're going to have to ask the Minister of Public Works if you can put lights in and take them out. That's got nothing to do with the chairman of the committee.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The committee reports to the Speaker and the Speaker and the House will determine what activities will take place in this area, and they will so instruct the Minister of Public Works.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I thank you for that information, Madam Chairman, and I hope that when the Public Works Minister gets his instructions that he'll look kindly on hiding those lights somewhere — into the landscape so we don't have to see it.

Now I'd like to ask, Madam Chairman, the Minister of Public Works if, prior to moving the judiciary into the Toronto Dominion Bank tower in Vancouver — this is the space that was rented from this tower once it was opened, temporary space until the new building becomes available — were there any rugs or carpets changed in that office after they were laid down because the colour was unsuitable to the judiciary who were moving into these offices. And, Madam Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, when they were changed, what the cost of changing them was to the Department?

The other thing, Madam Chairman, that I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works is, what is happening to the contract with the Montreal management firm that now holds the contract for overseeing the construction of the new provincial building in Vancouver? This is a fairly costly contract that we have with those people. It's a cost-plus contract and since there is no building going ahead, what's happening to the contract? If there's no construction, well then they can't be paid. They're still retained. We're paying for office space over there. What is happening to this management team?

Thank you, Madam Chairman. If the Minister would answer those few questions.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I'll answer in reverse order, Madam Chairman.

With regard to Concordia, they were hired by the former government. They are under contract. They are still working towards the building that will eventually be built.

With regard to rugs, yes, Chief Justice Brahan

[[Page 2094](#)]

made certain requests. We are able to use the rugs that were in his office elsewhere. He was given rugs to his suiting.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I guess that and other reasons.

With regard to my statement about moving away from the 8-hour day: British Columbia adopted the 8-hour day 50 years ago. We are now out of Social Credit and I hope we do move towards a shorter working day.

There were some questions from the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) with regard to services in Burns Lake and Fort St. James. We build on the basis of recommendations made to us, or requests from other departments. If you feel — and this goes for all Members — that certain services provided by the provincial government in certain communities are not adequate, then, if you can get those departments to upgrade the service and if we need provincial government space, we would be pleased to work with the respective departments planning additional space.

In Williams Lake we do own a house that I believe was acquired for a government agent. Whether he is living in it now or not, I don't know, but I would be pleased to check that out further.

As for Bridge Lake highways maintenance, I don't know of anything planned but I would be pleased to pursue that with the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) if he feels there is a need.

The 15-mill grant is a grant to provide certain services. But we pay for water and some other public utilities services in addition to our 15 mill grant.

Now, the matter of services to MLAs: this whole matter is under review as far as offices, et cetera.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: The question came from a rural area so I was answering to a rural area. This whole building is being reorganized, so this would apply here, too. I didn't know, when I saw my friend looking up, whether he wished to have those beautiful busts covered too or not. I agree it is a very beautiful building and we should do all that we can to preserve the decor.

With regard to projects being let without contracts: some time ago I sent out a memo to all staff heads stating that no contracts were to be let without a competition so that there would be one or more prices to judge from. There was a job right within the buildings that had been requested of a contractor. I didn't know a thing about it. The moment I heard about it, I looked into it and asked that the work not be proceeded with when a contract had not been let. We did this work with our own staff. I think the Members in the Liberal Party can bear this out, if necessary.

Our policy is that there should be competition for all public works and public projects done in this department, and we will attempt to pursue that. If this isn't possible then we will try and do it with people we have on staff.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: In view of the fact that His Honour the judge was allowed to have this carpet changed because of colour, is this a new precedent that we are setting? Are other judges in other areas, Madam Chairman, going to be allowed to change the colour of their rugs if they request it, or was this a special favour to this particular judge? It is very important because the Minister didn't tell me how much money was involved here. It is a fairly large office, I would imagine, and a fair amount of money. What is the policy? Because there has been a precedent set here.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

MS. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

HON. MR. BARRETT: I would ask the Member to withdraw any suggestion that it favours the judges by any government. I ask the Member to withdraw that.

MR. PHILLIPS: I did not imply — I merely asked, Madam Chairman, if this is a precedent.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Point of order, Madam Chairman. The Member said, "Is this a special favour to ... the judge." That is exactly what I heard and I ask the Member to withdraw it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'll withdraw it. I certainly had no intention of implying this. I would like to know, though, if this is a precedent set or if this was maybe in a particular isolated instance — this is what I meant, Madam Chairman.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. WILLIAMS: Madam Chairman, a couple of suggestions for the Minister:

(1) Has Mr. Arthur Erickson been given a deadline for the presentation of his plan for the government building complex in downtown Vancouver?

(2) Is the department going to replace this year the awns and flower gardens which were removed from the court-house area at Robson and Howe Streets in

[[Page 2095](#)]

anticipation of the construction programme which obviously now is shelved? The sod and grass was all removed from that area and it is just dirt and should be replaced, because I am sure it will be some months, if not years, before any construction work takes place.

(3) Has Mr. Erickson been directed in the presentation of his plan for the government building complex in downtown Vancouver to work with the Department of Municipal Affairs and with Mr. Parker who has under consideration the matter of public transit facilities for the greater Vancouver area? Specifically, are we going to make use of the subterranean areas for the parking and moving of vehicles in and about the government complex so that the cars can go underground and the people can walk on the surface, which is a reversal of the trend which unfortunately the City of Vancouver has allowed to grow up in that central core of the City of Vancouver?

I would think that, while I have made these suggestions to the Minister before privately, it would serve as a real beacon if this Government would advise the City of Vancouver that, so far as they are concerned, their construction in the City of Vancouver is going to put people on top and cars underneath.

In that same area we have two blocks — the block which is occupied by the existing court house and the block of land immediately south of that block. I would ask the Minister if the government complex is going to be situated on those two blocks. Or are they indeed going to utilize the next block south as well? So there will be a three-block area which can be devoted to the government buildings plus the open spaces that are to accompany that new design.

Lastly, Madam Chairman, since we are having such great concern about the amenities of the downtown core: since the City of Vancouver has given such little consideration to this important aesthetic consideration, is the Minister of Public Works prepared to take a leaf from the book of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams), considering what the Minister of Lands has done at Ocean Falls in taking a town that was about to be phased out of existence and bringing it back to life, and do the same thing with regard to Christ Church Cathedral at the corner of Georgia and Burrard? I think this would be a great opportunity if this Minister would really move strongly in this area and preserve Christ Church Cathedral and surrounding amenity areas so that we don't have a repetition of what has happened on the other three corners of that important intersection.

If there is one thing about the selection of Mr. Erickson as the design consultant to the government complex that gives me reason to pause, it is to consider that he was the one who designed the proposed development for Christ Church Cathedral Based upon his calculations, what he has done there is to cover the whole site with structure and tell us when he is finished that we really have 60 per cent of the site as open space. Based upon that kind of calculation, I assume he can do the same thing in three blocks and even end up with more than 100 per cent of open space, if it's carefully designed. I just don't believe that is the case.

I think the Minister of Public Works could have a bill brought before this House to create a Crown corporation which would preserve the structure and the aesthetic amenities which surround Christ Church Cathedral. The Minister, Madam Chairman, would go down in history as the saviour of that important and overcrowded intersection In the City of Vancouver and at the same time provide the opportunity for people who are passing that corner each day to look with admiration at the green grass and the odd flower and so on.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: With regard to the terms of reference, if the Member would like to have a copy I would be pleased to let him see these. Item No. 2 on terms of reference is asking the firm of architects to plan on the basis of blocks 51, 61 and 71 — a three-block complex.

Other items: construction of provincial court facilities, government offices; a maximum of publicly accessible open space; provision for connections to future rapid transit systems, underground and otherwise; parking facilities to meet the requirements of the development as required by the city following further discussions; preservation of the ethnic character of Robson Street and its integration as much as possible in the total development; internal development to be scaled to produce the low-density, low-rise, public-oriented grouping of buildings and space.

Now with regard to Christ Church Cathedral ...

MR. WILLIAMS: Time? Is there a time for the completion of this work?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Well, there isn't a definite date. When he was given these directions he was asked to proceed forthwith and to give us his report just as soon as possible.

Now with regard to Christ Church Cathedral; as yet the congregation as such has not come to us with any singular request. I think first of all they have to decide what they want to do. When this is decided we'll certainly cooperate with them as we will with any other similar group.

MR. WILLIAMS: Are you going to put the grass back with the court house?

[[Page 2096](#)]

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes, this can be done. This was torn up with the previous construction in mind, and this could be put back. We did take the fences down to open things up and this grass could be re-sown. It hasn't been done because we had hoped to get moving just as quickly as possible on the new construction. When this is underway I imagine the standard fences will go up to protect the public, and I hope excavation will start and we will move ahead just as quickly as possible.

MR. WILLIAMS: There is no fence there now.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: No.

MR. WILLIAMS: Grass there. Put the grass back.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: The grass can be put back.

MR. PHILLIPS: Perhaps the Minister of Finance would like to hold this vote, so give the Minister of Public Works a chance to get some answers. He seems to be having a little difficulty here.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: What's that? You want to deal with some other vote while the Minister has a chance to go out and do some research, Mr. Premier? Well, I still don't know how much it cost to change the rug. I still don't know how much money has been spent on this building on renovations.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: On the renovations, the total cost to date is \$230,498. This is everything that has been done to date.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I'm sorry, I haven't the price. But I'll be pleased to get that price for the Member. If you put a question on the order paper it will be answered as all other questions are.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: There is one more question that I would like to ask. It is very interesting, as a matter of fact. The Minister of Public Works had a very interesting suggestion when he was being interviewed by the Vancouver *Province* back in October of last year. I would like to have his sincere thoughts on this, because he says, "Waste can be recycled to produce power and heat," and goes on to say that we are a very wasteful society. Making use of garbage is something we should be doing more of, Madam Chairman.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are you putting a price on my debate here, Mr. Minister of Finance? (Laughter). You could have saved this province about \$45,000 if you would have pulled Bill 42.

Madam Chairman, I would like to have the Minister comment on this, because I think he has got a fantastic idea here — recycling this waste material. He says here, Madam Chairman, "The planners," he says, "have ways to use garbage to heat water to steam. Paper," — and heaven knows, there is enough of it around here — "Paper will be baled, metal melted down, and waste used to produce heat and power." I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to advise the House if he has any definite plans or is this just hot steam?

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I hope it is at least steam, not hot air.

First, I was asked a question by the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) with regard to the building in Fort St. John. Tenders will be called very shortly. We hope that the ads will go out.

Now with regard to refuse disposal and conversion to heat; our engineering staff is studying this and we hope that before too long this method will be practical for heating some of our public buildings. We hope to be able to collect garbage, refuse, and convert it to hot water or steam and use it for heating public buildings.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MS. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Shall vote 216 pass?

Vote 216 approved.

Vote 217: general administration, \$518,268.

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

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to speak under general administration about the court house in Vernon, which is under the Minister's jurisdiction. In case he forgets, I'll send this over to him. I admire his taste in the selection of the cover of his annual report. I would hold it up for the Hon. Members to see because it was an innovative programme which I

wish to speak to the Minister about.

He mentioned earlier the need to not only appear honest, but be honest. While I am very pleased to have this government park in front of the Vernon court house, this historic building on the front of the cover, I noticed that in explaining Justice Court, as it was named by a student in our area, he took the words directly from the programme that was used at the opening. There was only one point missing and that was the role of the MLA in the area. While I really don't mind, I just hope that the Minister will not preach integrity and justice to us and then practice this sort of action on his annual report.

In the meantime, Mr. Minister, the purpose of this park was several-fold. One was that this court house, as I am sure he is aware, is a very historic building in British Columbia. It was worthy of preservation through its foundation but certainly in need of renovation in its internal structure. The park itself provided a sound barrier; in other words, a much more peaceful environment for those working in the building. But also in advocating this park, it was my hope that our government which was then in a position of authority would adopt, and it is my hope that your government will adopt, a policy whereby any community which has a major building of substantial historical value. Whether it is necessarily provincial or not doesn't matter as long as it is important to the area, is worthy of restoration and preservation. Where they wish to preserve the lands around it for practical purposes such as soundproofing, exposure for greater appreciation and enhancement of their communities — the provincial government would pay one-third of the capital costs for such a programme and, should the necessity arise and they do not have their own design facilities, the public works design people might well be made available to them. This would not only allow more exercise for his excellent staff, of which I am sure they have enough, but it would also allow a factor of cost control.

This is a policy, Mr. Minister, that would do much for many communities in British Columbia.

And in just speaking of the annual report as it relates to the Vernon court house, I would like to say that having had the opportunity of visiting nearly all the public works buildings that have been designed and constructed by the now Minister's department, I think that there is not anyone in British Columbia could praise them high enough, not only for their creative ability but for their ability to combine creativity with practicality, which is not always well-known among the architectural profession.

The Minister has an excellent staff. They have undertaken what in my opinion is government's role in putting public buildings into communities to serve as a stimulation to that community to adopt the highest standard for their own buildings with a degree of imagination and practicality that isn't always evident in many of our communities.

And I hope, while there certainly is a need for outside designs, that in the majority the Minister will continue to use his own designing and architectural staff and that he will give them the degree of latitude that they have had in the past.

I think this park is a marvelous example of a combination of an individual's idea, an MLA's pressure, and the freedom that the architectural staff had and the enthusiasm with which they tackled the project, because we had a concept in mind which they grasped far more than I could ever explain to them. They have designed and developed a most unique preservation site and park in British Columbia, which will depict an era as it contrasts with the past.

Just speaking of the court house, Mr. Minister, and its administration, the programme was of a stage development. The idea was to tie in the park with the building, not architecturally, but through landscaping. The next stage to be developed is the landscaping around the building and the parking area. I would hope that this would be in the Minister's estimates for this year. I again caution him to move very carefully in order that the bank that's in front of the court house not be completely destroyed, because that is the best rolling bank in the whole of British Columbia. While we would like to see the building tied in and the added effects of the deadening of the noise through this type of landscaping, we don't want this rolling bank dismissed.

Now, the renovations that took place in the basement were very well equipped, but the whole building is in need of new wiring, air conditioning, new window frames — in the wintertime they have to run around and shove newspaper into the windows. I'd ask that, instead of it being done on a maintenance and repair basis, the whole building be put in the hands of the design department with a view to very definitely preserving the old

character and the marble and the beautiful woodwork in the court house upstairs, and that the new court facilities and the new building all be done on a basis of an overall design plan, even if it's in a stage basis. We can well appreciate, or I certainly can, that this can't be done all at once.

I'd also ask that future government offices in the North Okanagan area be housed in the building through an extension which again should be designed very carefully in order to be in keeping with the historical value of the building by your department. So essentially what I'm asking the Minister is:

(1) Is there any opportunity and will you contemplate with your pal, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), a province-wide programme of sharing one-third of the capital costs for this type of practical and aesthetic preservation around government buildings or public buildings in a community of a

[[Page 2098](#)]

historical nature?

(2) Will the second stage of landscaping commence this year?

(3) Will the ongoing renovations of the building be done through an overall plan in the design department?

(4) Would the Minister have his department examine the feasibility of an expansion of the building that could be architecturally and aesthetically acceptable?

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. BENNETT: I want to compliment the Minister on his appointment as Minister of this department and the very fine statement that he issued when accepting the portfolio, after inspecting his department, to say that the previous government had left the department in good shape. I think that that's the kind of statement that's good for public life in the province and I want to compliment him on that.

I've only got one question, and that is this: in the proposed new great City of Kelowna, what plans has the Minister for enlarging buildings there or building new buildings in this great and large new City of Kelowna?

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I would like to thank the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) for her remarks. There is an ongoing plan to complete the work that you suggested in the vote with regard to the court houses.

As far as the third, this is something that is a worthwhile suggestion. Of course, the project that you're referring to is wholly a provincial government project, so I think that the suggestion is very good, very valid. If we can have a hand in improving the direction and the quality of environment in any community, we should.

Now with regard to the City of Kelowna, we are making a study with regard to space requirements. When this study of space requirements from the various departments is completed, then in all probability a building will be planned to adequately house these needs.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Regarding the continuation of the alterations, will it be done in such a manner — I think I'm correct in suggesting that it be in your design department — that as they progress it will be an overall programme for wiring and air conditioning rather than just a piecemeal programme?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes, that is correct for the proper completion of the entire project.

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

MR. McGEER: Madam Chairman, I enjoyed the Leader of the Opposition's (Hon. Mr. Bennett's) complimentary remarks to the Member, because I don't recall him having lavished praise on him when he was in

the Opposition. I also think it's a shame that the Leader of the Opposition wasn't able to prepare well enough for the future in the good City of Kelowna, and I hope that the Minister is going to make up for that in the future.

Madam Chairman, I would like to toss a little bouquet out at the Minister's department this afternoon. That's because of the excellent way over the years — and it's not just this year, but over a long period of time — that the grounds have been kept in front of the parliament buildings. I don't think anybody has ever got up to thank the department and, really, the civil service for the impeccable condition of our parliament buildings grounds throughout the year. I think that they deserve a little bit of praise from this House.

Madam Chairman, I would hope that from the exemplary job that has been done in beautifying these buildings through the gardens, some little inspiration might come so that we could develop as a general policy wherever there are government buildings this same attention to the grounds, to the garden area, the business of planting flowers and tending them. Because one of the things that sets Victoria off as a city almost unique in North America is this devotion that people have to planting and to flowers. If there's one thing that the City of Vancouver desperately needs in its downtown area, it's a little bit of grass and some flowers. I did mention it earlier, but parking lots we don't need; flowers it would be nice to have. So it could be all through British Columbia.

Whatever might come in the future certainly the people who have tended the grounds here have done an excellent job in the past and through to the present.

[Mr. Dent in the chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Vote 217 pass?

Vote 217 approved.

Vote 218: government buildings, maintenance, \$17,518,400 — approved.

On vote 219: construction of provincial buildings, \$18,000,000.

[[Page 2099](#)]

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

MRS. JORDAN: I wonder if I might ask the Minister if his department has been instructed to draw up plans for the replacement of Dellview Hospital in Vernon.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Not as yet.

MRS. JORDAN: I appreciate that "as yet."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall vote 219 pass?

Vote 219 approved.

Vote 220: rentals, \$4,430,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I note that under the rentals, that for the Department of the Attorney General we have gone up from \$674,000 last year to \$1,159,000 in the forthcoming fiscal year. I wonder if the Minister will indicate where the \$500,000 is being spent. With respect to the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, they've gone up about \$300,000 from \$282,000 to \$569,000. Would he please tell me what that expenditure is for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: The major addition this year was with regard to the Block 51 development. We had to make space available for the judges and so on in the Pacific Centre and something in excess of \$300,000 a

year is there in rentals.

MR. WILLIAMS: What about the \$300,000 extra being spent there in Rehabilitation? From \$282,000 to \$569,000 for rental accommodation.

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Under Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, they're spread out all the way from Agassiz, Cache Creek, Castlegar, Chetwynd, Dawson Creek, Fernie — many of them are for smaller amounts. A small improvement in Merritt, \$240; MacKenzie, \$6,000; Lytton, \$2,400; Kitimat, \$1,700; Houston, \$3,000. It comes to a total of \$70,000, with nothing over \$15,000 — except in Prince Rupert it was \$15,700. But in some 20 or more different centres.

MR. WILLIAMS: Surely that doesn't account for an increase, Madam Chairman, of almost \$300,000. Let me ask this specific question: what is happening to the Belmont building over here? It is being renovated — how much is that costing this Government? Who is going to occupy it? What rent is being paid and how much space are we getting?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I think that question has been answered on the order paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chairman, it is just going through my mind — is this a policy to go on renting rather than building buildings? We have unemployment in the province — the sum of money for construction is the same as last year and yet the total for rentals is up by 50 per cent. Is this just some temporary direction, or is this the policy of the department to go on renting buildings rather than building their own buildings?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: I think that is a fair question, Mr. Chairman. I think you can appreciate that when the decision was made to try and make it possible for this main legislative building to be that — a building for the legislators, then we had to find space and rent space for the various departments that would be moved out. I think it is really a temporary measure. I do hope that next year at this time we will have some announcements on some major public buildings underway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall vote 220 pass?

Vote 220 approved.

On vote 2 21: safety inspection division, \$1,983,026.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one quick question to the Hon. Minister. I don't know any other vote I would be able to take this up under. I hope the Minister would have someone in the engineering division, which comes under his jurisdiction, see what they can do about the light fixtures that we have above the public galleries.

I have noticed, not only this afternoon but in previous days, that anyone of more than average height who comes from the Speaker's gallery and around through the public gallery hits their head on that first light fixture on their way by. Then they are ducking all the way down to try to get out of the public gallery. I would hope we could replace them with something that wouldn't prove to be a traffic hazard to the people who are up in the galleries.

[[Page 2100](#)]

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

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

MRS. JORDAN: I would just interject here, with all due respect to my colleague. I hope the Minister will find some other avenue of alleviating the head problem than removing those lights. They are very much part of the history of this Legislature. I think perhaps a tasteful sign ... I think the attendants themselves, who

appreciate the history of these buildings, would be willing to remind people. You might even, on the back of the railings, have a big sign that wouldn't show from here — "watch your head as you leave" or something. But in all due respect to my colleague, I implore the Minister, please do not remove those beautiful historic lamps.

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

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): It is not often, Mr. Chairman, that I get an opportunity to agree with the Member for North Okanagan so I don't think I should let it pass. I hope we will never do anything to those light fixtures. They are very beautiful and I think we should save them. Cut off their heads if necessary, but save the light fixtures. (Laughter).

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

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): I think we could solve this dilemma, Mr. Chairman, if we simply restricted entrance to the gallery to people under 4 ft. 6 in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, if we didn't have these interminable debates maybe people wouldn't be so anxious to leave the gallery.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall vote 221 pass?

Vote 221 approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

MR. GARDOM: What about equal time for the people from the galleries? (Laughter).

HON. MR. BARRETT: Something tells me there will be no money forthcoming for changing those fixtures.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT

On vote 238: Minister's office, \$72,484.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT: ... withdraw the vote rather than bring it back at a later time, maybe tomorrow, maybe later tonight.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of brotherly love, I move the committee rise, report resolution and ask leave to sit again.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House, Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

