

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)

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1974

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 3773](#)]

CONTENTS

Afternoon sitting

Routine proceedings

An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Act (Bill 156). Mr. Kelly.
Introduction and first reading — [3773](#)

Point of privilege

Accusation outside House by Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3773](#)
Mr. Bennett — [3774](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3774](#)

Routine proceedings

Oral Questions

Increase in ICBC auto claims. Mr. Fraser — [3775](#)
Manitoba withdrawal of mineral royalties bill. Mr. Gibson — [3775](#)
NDP policy talks on wage and price controls. Mr. Wallace — [3775](#)
Hay stockpiling in Fraser Valley against possible flooding. Mr.
McClelland — [3776](#)
ICBC option on Burrard Street property. Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3776](#)
Rise in cost of heating oil. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [3776](#)
Provincial assistance to Saanich with Glanford property. Mr. Curtis — [3776](#)
Preferential treatment for veterans' land. Mr. Bennett — [3777](#)

Transfer of Steve Dziaduk. Mr. Gardom — [3777](#)
Summer female staff for Human Rights Commission. Mr. Chabot — [3777](#)
Comfort allowance for Pearson Hospital. Mr. McClelland — [3777](#)
Negotiations with Gottesman-Central. Mr. Gibson — [3777](#)
Status of Indians on community resource boards. Mr. Wallace — [3777](#)
Posters advising motorists of insurance contributions. Mr. D.A.
Anderson — [3778](#)
Involvement of Hart Kurn in political campaign. Hon. Mr. Nimsick — [3778](#)
Report on Highways conflict-of-interest case. Mr. Wallace — [3778](#)
Debtor Assistance Act (Bill 77).
Report and third reading — [3778](#)
Succession Duty Amendment Act, 1974 (Bill 12).
Committee, report and third reading — [3778](#)
Department of Economic Development Act (Bill 71). Committee stage.
On section 4.
 Mr. Gibson — [3779](#)
 Hon. Mr. Lauk — [3779](#)
On section 5.
 Mr. Chabot — [3779](#)
 Mr. Gibson — [3780](#)
On section 8.
 Mr. Gibson — [3780](#)
 Hon. Mr. Lauk — [3780](#)
Report and third reading — [3780](#)
Development Corporation of British Columbia Amendment Act, 1974
(Bill 146).
Committee, report and third reading — [3780](#)
British Columbia Harbours Board Amendment Act, 1974 (Bill 17).
Committee, report and third reading — [3781](#)
Public Works Fair Employment Amendment Act, 1974 (Bill 87).
Committee stage.
Amendment to section 2.
 Hon. Mr. King — [3781](#)
On section 2 as amended.
 Mr. Gibson — [3781](#)
 Hon. Mr. King — [3781](#)
Amendment to section 3.
 Hon. Mr. King — [3781](#)
On section 3 as amended.
 Mr. Wallace — [3781](#)
Amendment to section 5.
 Hon. Mr. King — [3781](#)

Report stage — [3781](#)

British Columbia-Alberta Boundary Act (Bill 30).

Committee, report and third reading — [3782](#)

Human Resources Facilities Development Act (Bill 82). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Levi — [3782](#)

Mr. Wallace — [3782](#)

Community Resources Act (Bill 84). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Levi — [3782](#)

Mr. Schroeder — [3784](#)

Ms. Sanford — [3787](#)

Mr. Gardom — [3788](#)

Mr. Wallace — [3789](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [3792](#)

Mr. McGeer — [3795](#)

Mrs. Webster — [3796](#)

Mr. Chabot — [3797](#)

Mr. McClelland — [3797](#)

Mr. Fraser — [3799](#)

Mr. L.A. Williams — [3800](#)

Mr. Gibson — [3801](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [3802](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [3802](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — [3805](#)

Division on second reading — [3806](#)

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1974

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I have guests from the great riding of Cariboo, but today I have my sister-in-law, Mrs. Watt, in the Members' gallery, as well as director McCrea of the Cariboo Regional District, director Spalton of the Cariboo Regional District, director Jones of the Cariboo Regional District, Alderman Johnson from the town of Quesnel, and Alderman Lon Godfrey from the town of Quesnel. I would like the House to welcome them here. And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will behave myself today.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought the Member always did.

MR. A.A. NUNWEILER (Fort George): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome some guests from a long way out of this part of the province, from the community of Valemount. From the extreme central east part of the province we have 45 students from the Junior Secondary School of Valemount. With them is their teacher, Orville Brown, accompanied by Harold Maxwell, Mr. and Mrs. Gwyn Walters and Gene Osadchuk. Also, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to introduce to the House Mayor Doug Taggart of McBride. I would ask the House to welcome all these people.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): I have the pleasure today of introducing Mr. Lorne Dennison who is the mayor of Granisle located on Babine Lake. Along with him is Mr. Gordon Berdan, his village clerk. I would ask the House to make them welcome.

MR. F.A. CALDER (Atlin): Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today are 14 students from the Lower Post Elementary School. Lower Post is located in the very northeast corner of the large constituency of Atlin. To be more specific, it's at Mile 620 on the Alaska Highway. With the students are the staff members, principal William Stocks

and his wife, Mrs. Stocks, who is also a teacher at Lower Post, and Mr. English, who taught at Lower Post last year. I ask the Members to join with me in welcoming them.

HON. L. NICOLSON (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to introduce Mrs. Esther Jones who's in the Speaker's gallery. She is a faithful reader of *Hansard* and she's here for the first time to have a visual presentation.

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join me in welcoming two citizens from sunny Spences Bridge. Not too many of you may have stopped over there, but I'm sure you've driven through. I'd like to thank Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Lewis for bringing such a fine, sunny day down to Victoria.

I'd also like to welcome one of Mr. Nunweiler's constituents, Miss Cathy Sanssom, a former neighbour of ours. Welcome.

HON. MR. NICOLSON: Mr. Speaker, also I'm aware that Dr. Kaller of the University of Notre Dame in Nelson is with us here today and I believe some students are here along with him. I hope everyone would welcome them.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): I just wonder if we missed anyone, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter.) I think we should bid welcome to those who have not yet had welcome expressed to them.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

On a motion by Mr. Kelly, Bill 156, An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Act, introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. In this morning's *Province*, there is a story and a headline that says: "Bennett Claims Proof House Misled by Strachan." I'll read the pertinent paragraphs:

"Opposition Leader Bill Bennett said Wednesday he has documented evidence that Transportation Minister Bob Strachan has misled the Legislature.

"Bennett said in an interview that Strachan claimed recently in the Legislature that the government's insurance corporation (ICBC) was prompt in its payments to body shop firms.

"Bennett says he now has evidence that at least one firm in the central Interior has not been paid for either April or May."

The words are not quoted directly that I had misled the Legislature, and it's my understanding that the electronic media used words and indicated that the Member had used words stronger than that. Now Mr. Speaker....

Interjection.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Yes, later on it says: "Strachan, Bennett said, should resign because

[[Page 3774](#)]

he has failed in his responsibility to tell the truth...."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Member's office half an hour or so ago and asked him if he was going to raise the matter in the House, because the Member for Victoria at least raised the matter in the House face to face where I could answer it. He indicated to me he was not going to raise it in the House. I then informed him that I was

going to raise it if he didn't.

Mr. Speaker, I think the facts are these: The Member has said this outside the House, making these accusations. I asked him if he was going to say them in the House. He didn't.

The facts are these: of the three body shops in Houston, there is only a problem with one; there's no problem with the other. I have checked out the matter thoroughly. I find, and I could go into the details of the claims, that the claims he is referring to contain substantial items which are unsubstantiated: some of them contain errors; some of them have no claim numbers; some of them have been returned; and some of them have been submitted as of June 3.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should have said that all proper accounts have been paid. I expect that all Members, especially someone with a business background, would agree that no bill should be paid that is in question, that is improperly submitted, that is incomplete and that contains unsubstantiated amounts or errors. That is good business practice. I thought everyone would understand that. To the best of my knowledge, every properly substantiated bill has been paid.

Mr. Speaker, the Member did not follow the normal procedure of even checking with me or ICBC; to the best of my knowledge, he didn't check with them to find whether or not the story that has been told is true. I think that the Member should apologize to me right now.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Minister's point of privilege I would point out that I didn't try to stop him as being out of order — as it was quoted from a newspaper article mentioned outside this House — because I don't mind him raising this point on the floor of the House. But I wish he would get what I said correctly, and that he wouldn't respond as if I spoke about a specific auto body shop in Houston.

I was quoted as saying that I had documentation from auto body shops while travelling in the central Interior, and I have. I didn't say that the auto body shop was in Houston. Yet I heard on the electronic media that the Minister quotes a specific attack on an auto body shop in Houston, and that it was his knowledge that this man happened to be a Socred.

I never thought that the government or ICBC wanted to know anyone's political affiliation before they discussed whether they had a claim or not.

I am prepared, when I make statements outside this House, to answer outside this House. And at such a time...

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order!

MR. BENNETT: ...during this session — because I've just returned — as I am prepared to present this to the House, I will. At such a time I will be accountable inside the House and I am prepared to do so. Right now the Minister knows full well that he has the opportunity of dealing outside the House with statements made outside the House. I assured him — as I told him in my office in a conversation that he didn't say he was going to quote, but now I feel free to do so — that I would be presenting it later. I had no intention of bringing it up today, that's all.

Mr. Speaker, the information I have is fact that I discussed in a speech in Houston. I found great concern about the actions of this Minister with the people up there.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, the question is set out on page 134 of *May* which deals with what are alleged breaches of privilege or contempts committed against the House or the precincts of the House. It also deals with newspaper articles that attack or libel Members. I have raised to the House before that a Member can send the article to the Clerk-at-the-table if he has a complaint about something in the paper. The purpose of listening to both parties is to allow them to delineate where they stand in terms of their complaints.

I don't know yet, from what has been said, whether the article in the paper is a correct version and whether the Hon. Member who is complained against is the one to whom attribution is laid as to any deliberate misleading by another Member of the House. All I can say is that the newspaper article from which the Hon. Member, the Minister, read should be presented to the table, which is the requirement of page 134.

As to what should go from here, it requires a motion. If no motion is made, we proceed to other business. Each Member has put his position to the House. Unless someone puts a motion, I can't proceed any further on the matter. It's now been heard.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, each Member has not put his position. The allegation is that the Leader of the opposition has accused an Hon. Member of this House of (1) misleading the House, and (2) of not telling the truth to the House. This is a breach of the privileges of all of the Members of the House. The

[[Page 3775](#)]

question that the Hon. Member simply didn't answer is: is he maintaining that position? Is he accusing this Minister of misleading the House and of not telling the truth to the House, or not?

We as Members — and it affects all of our privileges — should know. Are you maintaining that position?

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my position was made perfectly clear. I said that the speech I made was made with fact. Those who were there to hear it can testify to it that.... I have the documentation to back up anything I said in the speech. I stand by that. If I have a matter to raise in this House, Mr. Speaker, I will raise it before the session ends.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out to Hon. Members that in this House and in every House in the Commonwealth it is a tradition that it keeps the system from deteriorating into a slander match that we accept the word of Hon. Members and that we do not...?

MR. J.R. CHABOT: (Columbia River): That has nothing to do with what happens in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Whether you do it outside or inside, it matters not in terms of being a Member of this House.

Interjections.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): You call him a liar outside but you won't do it here in the House. Is that it?

Interjections.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Face to face. Come on. Are you accusing him or not?

MR. BENNETT: I stand by....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: I will be presenting in the course of this House....

Interjections.

HON. MR. BARRETT: If you call him a liar outside call him a liar in here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: Usually, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says to say it outside the House.

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. MR STRACHAN: I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday at noon, when the Member was questioned about this matter at a meeting in Houston, he dodged it and wouldn't repeat it.

MR. SPEAKER: In the absence of a motion we proceed to orders of the day. I think the matter has been stated on both sides.

Oral questions.

REASON FOR INCREASE OF ICBC AUTO CLAIMS IN FIRST TWO MONTHS

MR. FRASER: Since we are discussing some ICBC business I have some questions for the Minister of Transport and Communications. I understand that there are 8,000 more claims in the first two months of operation of ICBC than there were in the same two months last year. Is that correct, and what is the cause of it?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Of course, we weren't in operation last year. But as I recollect the records, there are more claims coming into ICBC than was the case with the private industry. I might say that this is not unexpected. Under the private industry operation many people used to pay their smaller bills themselves because they knew that if they were involved in an accident, even if it wasn't their fault, very often their rates went up substantially.

They know that we are fair, reasonable and just and that they can safely put in a claim for \$100, or \$150 and have it paid without their rates going up. That's the reason for that.

MANITOBA WITHDRAWAL OF MINERAL ROYALTIES BILL

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): I have a question for the Premier and House Leader. I was wondering if he had noticed the wise decision of the Government of Manitoba to withdraw their version of Bill 31 for further study, and if he would take any lesson from that on behalf of the people of British Columbia.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of policy, but I don't mind answering. My responsibilities are to the people of British Columbia, and we intend to proceed with Bill 31 on behalf of the people of this province.

POSSIBLE NDP POLICY TALKS ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

[[Page 3776](#)]

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Regarding statements outside the House in the press made by Premier Schreyer that to control inflation we need a system of selected control of both prices and incomes, and in light of the fact that it is a national and provincial problem, I'm wondering if the Premier has this on his agenda for his meeting with David Lewis during his publicized meeting of the coming weekend.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Yesterday the federal election was brought, for the first time, into the question period, and I gave my answer. Considering the second question, I am now reconsidering whether or not I will purchase that underwear.

HAY STOCKPILING IN FRASER VALLEY AGAINST POSSIBLE FLOODS

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): To the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that the government is buying up large quantities of hay in the Fraser Valley area to stockpile for flood purposes. Is this department making any provision to ensure that private farmers and ranchers in that area have adequate access to hay supplies as well? I understand that there isn't very much available for them since the government is buying it all up at fairly high prices.

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the government is buying limited supplies to have ready for emergency measures. We are being careful not to upset the normal market.

The farmers know that we're doing this and I think they appreciate our efforts to be ready for any emergency that we hope we won't have to meet. But in the meantime, they are competing with us in the purchase of hay, that's true.

MR. McCLELLAND: Could the Minister tell us what price the department is paying and whether it's a different price than was being paid, say, a month ago for hay?

HON. MR. STUPICH: The price of hay has been rising since last September in the province. The price we're paying depends on the product we're buying. We're buying different kinds of hay; we're even buying pellets. We're simply laying in an emergency supply. I'm surprised the Member opposite seems to think there's something wrong with this.

MR. McCLELLAND: The thing that is wrong with it is that I've had complaints from ranchers who can't buy hay. They want to know what they're going to feed their horses and cattle.

HON. MR. STUPICH: If the Member has such names, I'd be pleased to have these. I'd like to enter into some kind of direct communication. All I've had so far is acceptance of this idea and praise that the government is taking this action now rather than waiting for the emergency to fall on us.

ICBC OPTION ON BURRARD STREET PROPERTY

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the other day I was asked a question on June 5. I can't remember who it was. "Has ICBC bought or negotiated property from Daon Development Corporation at the northeast end of the Burrard Street Bridge?"

For \$1, Daon Development Corporation granted the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia an exclusive option through A.E. LePage-Western Limited, its real estate agent, to purchase a parcel of land at the foot of Burrard Street. That option was for a period of 12 days, with the option expiring on June 7, 1974. The corporation does not intend to exercise that option.

RISE IN COST OF HEATING OIL

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): That will explain why the Tory signs are on it now.

To the Minister of Finance and Premier. In view of the fact that there are 250 million-odd gallons of farm and home-heating oil sold in B.C. and in view of the fact the price has gone up approximately 20 per cent up to 36.5 cents on the average per gallon, may I ask him whether he is planning to put in proposals to reduce the tax on this oil or whether he is going to devise a scheme whereby the homeowners can have their fire insurance reduced to make up for the increase in heating oil price? (Laughter.)

HON. MR. BARRETT: I'm glad the Member is back, Mr. Speaker. I want to inform him that these matters

are being discussed in front of the energy board daily.

PROVINCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SAANICH WITH GLANFORD PROPERTY

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister has asked his department or if he has reviewed the history of some seven acres of Crown land lying between the Patricia Bay Highway and Glanford Avenue, just a few miles north of here, to determine if there is not some provincial responsibility in assisting the municipality of Saanich in overcoming unsafe and, to a lesser extent, unsightly conditions in the vicinity of that area I've

[[Page 3777](#)]

described.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice.

MR. CURTIS: While he is taking it as notice, Mr. Speaker, I'd just also ask if he is aware that reconstruction of the provincial highway some time ago, the Patricia Bay Highway, in fact contributed to this situation which has been termed by residents of the area as "an ugly death trap."

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS' LAND

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. On May 22 he took as notice a question I asked and I would repeat it. Has the provincial government made any policy changes with respect to preferential treatment to veterans under the provisions of the agreement signed by B.C. and Canada on July 1, 1946? If so, what is the present policy on veterans applying for land under this agreement?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): I'll review that further with my staff, Mr. Speaker, and reply at a later date.

TRANSFER OF STEVE DZIADUK

MR. GARDOM: To the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Would the Hon. Minister kindly inform the House whether it is true or not that a Mr. Steve Dziaduk, whom I gather was the manager of the Terrace office, has been transferred to Vernon? If so, what was the reason for the transfer?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I would have to take that one as notice. How do you spell that name again?

MR. GARDOM: Dziaduk.

SUMMER FEMALE STAFF FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

MR. CHABOT: A question for the Minister of Labour. I understand that Ms. Kathleen Ruff, the director of the Human Rights Act has hired 20 students under a summer job opportunities programme. Can the Minister advise why all the students engaged are female? (Laughter.)

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker. I have no way of knowing at the moment. (Laughter.)

COMFORT ALLOWANCE

FOR PEARSON HOSPITAL

MR. McCLELLAND: A question to the Minister of Human Resources. Regarding the new comfort allowance figures, could you tell me whether or not Pearson Hospital has been getting a different comfort allowance rate in the past than other hospitals in the province?

HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Human Resources): Not that I'm aware. I understood it was \$28.50, but everybody will be receiving the \$25 as of the first of July. I will look into that matter for the Member.

MR. McCLELLAND: Under the terms of a comfort allowance, I understand that it calls for a qualifying institution. Is there any question about Pearson being a qualifying institution? Will they qualify without any doubt?

HON. MR. LEVI: There isn't any question in my mind about it qualifying.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH GOTTESMAN-CENTRAL

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, during the estimates of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, he advised the House that the contract between Ocean Falls and Gottesman-Central was under negotiation. I wonder if he could tell the House if those negotiations are now completed.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: They are proceeding, Mr. Speaker.

INDIAN RUNNING FOR COMMUNITY RESOURCE BOARD

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Human Resources. Yesterday I asked him and sent him further information as to whether a native Indian could run for office on the community resource boards. I wonder if he has the answer?

HON. MR. LEVI: In respect to the case which you mentioned to me, the person involved lives on a reserve outside of the area covered by the West Point Grey–Dunbar Community Resources Board and therefore would not be eligible on the grounds of residence. That's all, because that is not included in the area for that resource board.

MR. WALLACE: It's my understanding that that same person did, however, run for office on the school board in that same area. Would the Minister care to comment on the apparent discrepancy that

[[Page 3778](#)]

they can seek school board office but not community resource board office?

HON. MR. LEVI: Well, first of all, the boundaries are different. My understanding is that the reserve opted out of being involved in the resource board in that area.

POSTERS ADVISING MOTORISTS OF INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: To the Minister of Consumer Services, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that all British Columbians and non-residents who fill up their gasoline tanks in the province are now contributing approximately 85 cents to 90 cents per time they pull in to fill up the tank to next year's insurance costs, will she take steps to make sure that the public is informed by way of posters so that they know full well what they're buying during the remainder of the year when they buy gasoline?

MS. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services): We will take that under advisement.

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

INVOLVEMENT OF HART HORN IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was asked the question the other day by the Member for Boundary-Similkameen (Mr. Richter) in regard to a newspaper report that Hart Horn was a campaign manager for a certain individual in this city. I was surprised at the question because it is tantamount to suggesting that a public servant should be in a second-class category and not be given the same privileges as other people in making use of their own time.

In this case, from the information I have received, the report was not correct and Mr. Horn is not a member of the campaign committee.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: (mike not on) ... the obvious incompetence that prevails in the Mines department, could I please ask the Minister to insist that he get on the campaign so that that candidate doesn't do so well as he might otherwise do?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think that is an insulting remark that really....

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I withdraw it, in that case.

Interjections.

REPORT ON HIGHWAYS CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST CASE

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Attorney-General if he could tell the House the conclusion he reached on the study of the possible conflict of interest between the senior Highways department engineer in the Alta Lake-Whistler area? He did say he would report back to the House.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, it is in the hands of one of the officers of my department, Mr. Gerry Cross. I was expecting him to make a report to me. He hasn't done so as yet. I'll ask him about it today.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to seek your permission to distribute a document before we got into question period but another matter intervened. It's a statement on the Hog Income Assurance Programme. With your permission I'd ask....

Leave granted.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): I move we proceed to public bills and orders.

Motion approved.

MR. SPEAKER: The House has already dealt with the motion, and it wasn't brought to my attention.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Did you say no?

MR. SPEAKER: We've already passed the motion.

I have a difficulty here, Hon. Members. I don't want anyone to think that I don't listen, but I'm afraid I didn't hear anyone object to the motion.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Let's go — go ahead.

Report on Bill 77, Mr. Speaker.

DEBTOR ASSISTANCE ACT

Bill 77 read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 12, Mr. Speaker.

SUCCESSION DUTY AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 12; Mr. Dent in

[[Page 3779](#)]

the chair.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive approved.

Title approved.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 12, *Succession Duty Amendment Act, 1974*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 71, Mr. Speaker.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House on committee on Bill 71; Mr. Dent in the chair.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive approved.

On section 4.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): I appreciate that we are getting more and more vague definitions of the duties of departments, Mr. Chairman, but I'm a little bothered that the enunciated duties of the Minister and his department under this section make no particular mention of the statistical function which is such an important and indispensable portion of his department right now. I would just like the Minister's assurance that there is not thereby intended any downgrading of that function under the newly named department.

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Hon. Member's inquiry and I can assure him that not only is there not going to be a downgrading but a vast improvement in the Statistics Branch.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LAUK: We are taking on new staff. We are going to do more of our original surveys....

AN HON. MEMBER: When are you going to have a nice little report?

HON. MR. LAUK: Can you keep Your Comrade in Order?

Interjection.

HON. MR. LAUK: That's right!

The statistical function, therefore, will have original data upon which to advise the government and private industry.

Section 4 approved.

On section 5.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): I notice this one deals with the Minister's responsibility to file an annual statement with the Legislative Assembly. We found it extremely difficult with the Minister's approach and the Minister's attitude and the Minister's sense of responsibility just last session in tabling his annual report so that we could intelligently assess the type of department he administered in the previous year....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! We are not considering the administrative responsibility of the Minister, but rather....

MR. CHABOT: Oh, but we are as far as the submission....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

HON. MR. LAUK: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce on a point of order.

HON. MR. LAUK: If filing an annual report, Mr. Chairman, will ensure intelligent criticism on that side, I will do so immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order, but speaking to the Hon. Member for Columbia River on my point of order — you must speak to the section rather than discussing the administrative responsibility of the Minister.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, you are not listening very closely because I'm discussing the Minister's responsibility as far as the tabling of an annual report in the House, and that's what this section is all about. I suggested, prior to the facetious interruption by that little Minister over there, that he had a responsibility to table an annual report. All I'm

[[Page 3780](#)]

asking at this time, in discussing this section, is that that Minister face up to his responsibilities as far as the annual report is concerned...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. CHABOT: ...and to ensure that the annual report is tabled in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I would point out to the Hon. Member for Columbia River that we are dealing with section 5 of Bill 71, not with the actions of the Minister. Would the Hon. Member continue with this section?

MR. CHABOT: Why should I continue when you don't understand?

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly share the sentiment that I hope that the report of this department is, in the future, more speedy than in the past. I think that is essential to the proper functioning of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's a problem to get them put together.

MR. GIBSON: And I would make a representation to the Minister — I was going to move an amendment, but I will leave it as a representation at the moment — that this report should set a model for other government departments. It should set a model of the fullest disclosure of the use of public funds in the sensitive area in which he is operating, namely, assistance to the private sector through the B.C. Development Corporation and other matters under his department. Where such complete disclosure cannot be made because of commercial confidentiality, at least the matters involved should be disclosed if not the exact amounts.

Section 5 approved.

Sections 6 and 7 approved.

On section 8.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Chairman, section 8 repeals the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce Act, chapter 104, statutes of 1960. A large part of that Act relates to the confidentiality of statistics provided by persons and businesses in this province to the Minister's department in the pursuance of their statistical reporting function. Confidentiality of this kind is, of course, very important and I would ask the Minister how he proposes that it should continue to be guaranteed now that the statutory provisions therefore are apparently removed from the instructions and official responsibilities of his department.

HON. MR. LAUK: It is my impression, that with respect to the previous section there was some suggestion that there be a compellability on the part of people to provide information to the Department of Industrial Development; therefore there would have to be a certain statutory commitment to confidentiality. In my view there has been no problem with the industry with respect to providing information to the department. The members of that department are of the highest character, and there will be every commitment given and I'll give my commitment publicly that the confidential nature of information gathered for the purposes of statistical analysis will be held completely and utterly confidential by the government and by this department.

Section 8 approved.

Title approved.

HON. MR. LAUK: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 71, *Department of Economic Development Act*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 146, Mr. Speaker.

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF BRITISH
COLUMBIA AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 146; Mr. Dent in the chair.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive approved.

Title approved.

HON. MR. LAUK: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 146, *Development Corporation of British*

[[Page 3781](#)]

Columbia Amendment Act, 1974, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 17.

BRITISH COLUMBIA HARBOURS BOARD
AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 17; Mr. Dent in the chair.

Section 1 approved.

Title approved.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 17, *British Columbia Harbours Board Amendment Act, 1974*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 87.

PUBLIC WORKS FAIR EMPLOYMENT
AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 87; Mr. Dent in the chair.

Section 1 approved.

On section 2.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): I move the amendment standing in my name on the order paper.

(See appendix.)

Amendment approved.

On section 2 as amended.

MR. GIBSON: Section 2 (b) in the second line refers to the municipality and the person who is to do work. I am just asking the Minister's interpretation of this. Does a "person" include a Corporation or is a "person" simply an unincorporated business or an individual? How does he define that word, exactly?

HON. MR. KING: It is my understanding that that includes a corporation.

Section 2 as amended approved.

On section 3.

HON. MR. KING: I move the amendment standing in my name on the order paper. (See appendix.)

Amendment approved.

On section 3 as amended.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I make particular reference to section 3 (2) (b). Yesterday we had an exchange of ideas. I think the Minister misinterpreted what I said. I certainly strongly believe in collective bargaining. That's not what I was saying yesterday.

What I said — and what I said poorly — was that in subsection (2) (b), I in fact interpret it as what amounts to power in the hands of the Minister which infringes the agreement nature of collective bargaining. It says: "The Minister, by order, can prescribe manpower requirements and conditions in respect of the contract."

I know the Minister gave me his personal assurance that there would be, of course, consultation and that he was really aiming at employing minority groups and fair play for Indian labour and Indians seeking work.

We feel in our party that this is a degree of authority and power to the Minister which is wide open to abuse. This is why we oppose it.

Section 3 as amended approved.

Section 4 approved.

On section 5.

HON. MR. KING: I move the amendment standing in my name on the order paper. (See appendix.)

Amendment approved.

Section 5 as amended approved.

Title approved.

HON. MR. KING: I move the committee rise and report the bill complete with amendments.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 87, *Public Works Fair Employment Amendment Act, 1974*, reported complete with amendments to be

considered at the next sitting of the House after today.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill 30.

[[Page 3782](#)]

BRITISH COLUMBIA—ALBERTA BOUNDARY ACT

The House in committee on Bill 30; Mr. Dent in the chair.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive approved.

Title approved.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 30, *British Columbia—Alberta Boundary Act*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Second reading of Bill 82.

HUMAN RESOURCES FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Human Resources): This bill is intended to broaden the scope of the *Treatment Resources Act*, which will be repealed on the passing of this Act. It enables us to develop facilities for a range of people — not just young children — by giving grants to municipalities, societies and boards, very much in the way we have been doing under the general grant programme of the department.

I don't think there is very much more I need to say. I move second reading.

MR. WALLACE: We would like to speak in favour of the bill. As the Minister has pointed out, it enlarges the scope and the mechanism whereby the Minister of Human Resources can provide grants to a municipality or an incorporated society, in particular with reference to the kind of services listed in section 1.

I wonder if the Minister, in closing the debate, could give a clearer description of how it is related to the community resource boards and the *Community Resources Act*. Does this legislation tie in closely with Bill 84, or is this a separate goal of the department which they are trying to follow in giving a wider and more flexible degree of assistance to the municipalities and the societies?

There is one question which is a little bit in my mind. It's very difficult to debate this bill without touching on the community resource board bill, but perhaps the Minister could explain the little bit of a contradiction between this bill going out and giving grants to municipalities and incorporated societies when the community resource board bill is supposed to prevent fragmentation and to have a coordinated, cohesive programme which all community resources, in a social services sense, shall function through that board.

This bill in one sense puzzles me a little bit since it appears to contradict the thrust of another piece of legislation we'll be debating shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister closes the debate.

HON. MR. LEVI: In reply to the Member for Oak Bay, the Act was introduced primarily to broaden the scope that was in the *Treatment Resources Act*.

The mention of community resource boards is in there because there will naturally be a transition period where we will be using the mechanism of private societies, municipalities and one or two, or whatever number we have going, of the community resource boards. So this is all-encompassing, that's all. It was put in there.

Bill 82, *Human Resources Facilities Development Act*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, second reading of Bill 84.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES ACT

HON. MR. LEVI: Mr. Speaker, my remarks in relation to this bill will not be quite as brief as the previous one.

I would just like to relate how we came to the general development of this principle. The Members will remember that one of the first acts the government did when it came into power was to announce that there would be the closing down of the Willingdon Girls School. At that time I said that it would be essential for communities to become involved in developing alternate facilities, and that the function of the government was to provide the assistance, staff wise, and to make the money available so that these facilities could be developed.

There was a reaction from the community that suddenly some services in the community were going to have to become very visible, particularly those in respect to children. As we developed alternative facilities to deal with young women who ordinarily would have gone through the institutional system, we then began to zero in on a number of broad problems that existed with other children and with other people in the community.

[[Page 3783](#)]

As a result of that we developed a programme called the Special Services For Children. This programme is available through the department and through a range of other departments in the government in relation to delivering service to children in their community, in their home or in their school, or in whatever facility is available where children are being dealt with. That programme has been a very successful one.

We've also in the past 20 months been involved in the quadrupling of the day-care system — again which has involved a great deal of community involvement and community visibility.

I think that the primary function of the community resource board is to give visibility to social services that has never previously been there. At the present time we have a large number of private societies that elect boards, but are in fact somewhat private because they do not involve large numbers of the community in the decision-making. But I will say this: they do involve a large number of people in the voluntary aspect of delivering service. But in terms of the decision making, decisions are not generally made by what I characterize as a representative group of people from the community.

One of the problems I think we've had with the delivery of social services in this province is that we have spent large amounts of money, and yet the government has not really had a complete handle on some of the policy making. I think that perhaps the best example is in the Vancouver area.

In the Vancouver area there's an average of \$9 million a month going into social services there, including the social-assistance programme. Prior to January 7 of this year the social welfare system was administered by Vancouver City. The administration dealing with services to children, protection, adoption and that kind of thing were being administered by the Children's Aid Society and the Catholic Children's Aid Society; and also a large range of other services were being administered by private societies, primarily relying on heavy subsidization by the government.

Yesterday I was looking at the figures in relation, for instance, to the United Community Services programmes that are funded in the greater Vancouver area. There are some \$22 million worth of programmes being delivered, of which the voluntary sector provides \$4 million and the government sector \$15 million. All of this money and all of the decisions were being made without an integrated reference to the aims of the government, particularly of the department.

So since January 1 we have moved gradually towards an integration process of dissolving the children's aid societies, and also taking over the administration of social assistance. Now that we have a management group, it has been in a position now to integrate the system — even at this stage it's just started — and to also look at the problems of delivering services where they are needed in a much more organized way without that tremendous overlap and with a territorial imperative that goes with the continuing operation of different systems. That always happens and always creates problems.

In the Vancouver area we will have to be involved in both the delivery of statutory services — those services that we are required to give by law — and non-statutory services. Those are services that are given or have been given by way of grants to private agencies and other groups who have been delivering service.

Beyond the City of Vancouver we do not envision in the first instance that resource boards will be involved in the delivery of statutory services. One of the reasons for this is that we've had a great amount of correspondence from almost 50 communities in the province. Some of those communities have no services at all except for the statutory services.

There's a need in some of these communities for day-care centres, for activity centres for seniors, for special-need centres for handicapped children, and that whole range of programmes that are available in the more developed areas.

Consequently, the greatest interest that's been evinced in the province has been in those areas where they have a few services or where they have none and they are interested in getting access to them — and also interested in making decisions about what services they should start with first.

The question of the participation of the government in this process really goes to the balance of what a government can, in fact, give up in terms of its power to boards like this and what it must retain. As the Minister I am responsible to this Legislature for the delivery of a range of services to the people in the province. In the final analysis I will have to answer for what goes on on the floor of this House. Therefore, we have retained that amount of control that is necessary to enable me to carry out my function and to be able to be responsible and to answer questions in this House.

There have been suggestions that it is a fourth or a fifth level of government. Really what it is is to make a visibility to the services that we all have talked about for many years — to have people involved, not only because they want somehow to be involved in decision making, but because the only real way that you can deliver services to whoever needs them is to have the community involved.

I've said many times in this House that we are never going to be able to afford all of the services done by the voluntary sector, and that is true. But what we have to do is to be able to make use of the money that we have and deliver the best service that we have. We are not looking to save any money;

[[Page 3784](#)]

that's not possible in developing services to people. But what you have to do is to make the best use of the money that you have. You cannot do that where you have jurisdiction or areas in this province, particularly the greater Vancouver area which has literally hundreds of private agencies involved in delivering service, each one somehow developing its own kind of programme.

What we're attempting to do is to integrate the decision making as well as the delivery of service. That can only come, I think, if we involve the community and people. People have to be involved in these things. After all,

they are the taxpayers.

All too often we get a lot of criticism from people who only know about one-tenth of what is going on; but they are listening to a lot of the generalized kind of criticism that goes on about the delivery of service. So as they are involved, they will have a much better understanding of this.

I'm very happy to see that the police in Vancouver are extremely interested in this process and have designed a project in the south Vancouver area that will fit in with the kind of operation we are developing down there. It gives them visibility and enables them to be part of the system. All too often the people who are involved in the very first instance in any problems that exist in our communities are the police. We need this tremendous cooperation.

I met with the chief of police in Vancouver. He is certainly a man who shows all the evidence of being able to deliver great leadership, the kind of leadership that we've needed, particularly in going into a new style of integrated service to people.

That includes police services as well. They have picked up on the kinds of things that we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the Members that I have available, certainly over the last 16 months... because we have discussed the principle of this bill for about 16 months in the community. We have talked about community resource boards and community involvement, and we have collected a large amount of news clippings about what has been going on in the community. It is really quite remarkable that it was picked up. It has enabled us, in terms of the services that we deliver, to improve and develop them even at this stage. For the first time the large majority of people in communities have become aware of why we need social services and programmes, and that they can also be involved in the decision-making about these. That's what is essential.

It is absolutely impossible for this government or my department to make decisions about communities in this province, as I have to do every day in terms of the granting mechanism. That is just not possible. Every day we are being approached for grants for different programmes and we cannot continue to go this way. The function of the government is to set the priorities in terms of the general service parameters. One of the things we wanted to be developing now — and I have indicated this — is services in the area for senior citizens, for children and for the handicapped. Those are the three basic thrusts of the department.

As we will be discussing with the communities, we would like to see that at least they give attention to those three basic areas in the development of programmes.

The other function of the government is to see that money is made available so that these programmes can be developed.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): I have a few questions that I would like to ask regarding the principle of the bill. The questions are related to perhaps three different general areas. One of them is the creation of the boards; secondly, the operation of the boards; and finally, if time permits, the financing of the boards.

It is understood that the local community boards are going to be set up by local groups. Basically, in the original intention of the establishing of these boards, it was to be done by election. There is one of these boards already in existence, as the House well knows, in South Vancouver. The voter turnout for the creation of this particular board was less than 10 per cent.

I'm wondering if the Minister is going to establish some route whereby a greater turnout — a greater expression of the local people — is going to be heard via the election so that a greater percentage than 10 per cent will be heard from.

I also understand that only one of the 13 groups that are planned for Vancouver is now in existence although some other ones are presently being created.

Since the bill is not yet in effect, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering under what authority these boards are being created and what assurance the House has that they have been created in keeping with the provisions of the bill.

One of the things that gives me some concern is the boundary of each of these community resource boards — that is, the boundary of their area of responsibility. I understand that the boundaries are to be determined by the local group in conjunction with the civic or municipal officials. My concern is that we must guarantee absolute coverage of the province by these community resource boards. If we allow the areas to be determined by a local group it would be very easy for a group to say that they will take all responsibilities for certain prescribed boundaries. There may be an area that is undesirable which may be left out not only by that community resource board but by the neighbouring community resource board which has already determined its own boundaries and would leave out some of these areas.

[[Page 3785](#)]

An example of that, Mr. Speaker, would be one that came up during question period today in which a lady who wished to run for one of the community resource boards was not eligible to run because she happened to reside in an area outside the responsibility of the community resource board.

I can see the possibility of there being several areas uncovered in the province. The problem then would be that these areas would not have the advantage of the supervision of services by the community resource boards.

I think that we need to be very sure, Mr. Speaker, that these areas that are undesirable in the opinion of the local boards not be overlooked. I think we need to be sure that boundaries for community resource boards are common and adjacent, making sure that every square mile of the province eventually be covered by a community resource board.

Another area that causes some concern among the people with whom I have discussed this bill is the suggestion that half of the board should be composed of community service recipients. I believe this to be a bit idealistic. It would be nice if we could guarantee that these very same people — the same one half of the board that is service recipient — have the expertise to carry out the responsibilities that will be required of them on these community resource boards.

I would question the logic of having one half of the board being recipient. If you followed the same logic you would have to say that one half of, say, the board of school trustees should be students. I'm not saying that that is good or bad but that this same logic could run you into some difficulties if it was followed through in other areas.

I think that perhaps the primary concern should be that these community resource boards be composed of people who are well respected in the community resource board area. Whether or not they be recipients should not necessarily be made a prerequisite to their election.

There is a further problem. How can recipients be guaranteed positions on these boards if these boards are to be created by democratic election? Do we make it a prerequisite of a candidate that he first be a recipient before he can even be elected by the local people? There seems to be a clumsy situation there. I am wondering how the Minister plans to deal with it.

The next question in the creation of these boards is what correlation there is in the creation of these boards with federal agencies who are also offering certain services. The most difficult groups this correlation would be with would be, I think, groups like the OFY and LIP which, although maybe some are continuing and some are discontinuing, we have no knowledge of what is going to happen in the future regarding these as far as the federal mind is concerned. I would like to know what correlation there is between the services rendered by these groups. There are others — for instance, student manpower. Is it to be correlated with the community resource boards and on what basis?

There is another concern in the discussion of the principle of this bill. That is the concept of the umbrella boards. The umbrella boards, it is said, will not override the decisions made by the local community resource boards.

Yet the question comes even from among candidates for the boards and from among the members of the already existing boards of what is going to be the pecking order. What is going to be the chain of command in these areas? Whose decision is final?

According to indications by the Minister, Mr. Speaker, the local community resource board has the right for final decision. However, there is an umbrella board over him. Then there is the regional board above them. And then there is the department above all of that. At its head, I believe, should be the Minister of Human Resources. There is some misunderstanding out there in the organization as to what the chain of command really is going to be. Will they be given any further assurance that the decisions at the local board will not be overridden by higher boards?

By the way, there is a great public aversion to appointments to these boards. I think the bill, as it is set up, provides that if candidates are not forthcoming — that is if they don't offer themselves for election — then it becomes the responsibility of the department and eventually the cabinet to appoint people to these boards. There is wariness among the general public and an aversion, to be quite frank with you, toward the appointments to these boards.

Together with the fact that many consider the community resource board — even though they can see the advantage of there being someone close to the need — as someone who can scrutinize the need and perhaps report that need to the powers that be, there is a fear that the fourth or fifth level of government will add to the bureaucracy. I appreciated your remarks in your opening statement regarding this, but the bureaucratic confusion they are anticipating is one again which causes them to ask questions.

Secondly, the area of question in the field of the operation of these boards. It's not spelled out clearly enough. As a matter of fact, there is confusion in the boards that already exist as to what their frame of reference really is. They need to know why they exist. There is concern expressed that direction is not coming from the department head — namely, from the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Direction is not forthcoming as to what their area of responsibility shall be and in what way they are expected to operate.

As the Minister well knows, if this attitude continues to prevail, these resource boards in their

[[Page 3786](#)]

operation will be short-circuited; because how do you operate when you don't know which way to run? Therefore, a concern that was expressed to me was one of clarification of the frame of reference — not only the pecking order, but the areas of responsibility of these local community resource boards.

They don't know whether they are to provide the services or whether they are to suggest services to be provided. They don't know whether they are supposed to be looking after the funding. They understand that they cannot determine how much money is to be distributed to what particular services. They are supposed, sort of, to act as an appeal board; they are supposed to act as a sort of an input department.

Nonetheless, they want to know who gets the services. They want to know who determines how much service or how much money will be provided in individual cases. These are areas of concern with these community resource boards at the operation level.

How much authority will the community resource boards have regarding matters on education and day care? It was spelled out in one of the communications from the Minister's office that matters pertaining to preschool, for instance, were going to fall under the responsibility of the Minister of Education just like kindergartens. Yet there is a provision in the bill in certain aspects, certain educational aspects, which would normally fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, are going to be taken over by the parameter of this bill.

The questions out there are: what part of education, what part of day care, what part of preschool is going to fall under the scrutiny or the jurisdiction of the community resource boards? Will they have responsibilities in these areas?

They understand that the board or the members of the board are not supposed to be responsible for case-by-case decisions. That's to be made by legislation and certainly by regulation of that legislation. They're not to be making decisions on a case-by-case basis, yet they are to provide as many services as possible; and they are finding this frustrating.

[Mr. Liden in the chair.]

They also want to know in what capacity they will be acting as an appeal board. It has been suggested that one of their responsibilities will be to be close not only to the need of the service, but to be close enough to act as an appeal board between the various levels of these community resource boards and the actual service recipient.

There is one other area that is a little confusing — that should actually come under the financial area — and it is that the boards are to be volunteers. In their operation they are to be volunteer members, although they are elected, and out-of-pocket expenses, I understand, are to be paid for them. Nonetheless, they are to be unsalaried. However, they have the authority to hire their own staff as such.

There is a problem. They don't really know how much authority or power they are really going to have, being volunteers; yet they have placed in their hands the authority to determine their own staff, to hire their own staff and, supposedly, although it has never been said, to fire that staff should it not be operating to their satisfaction.

My question to the Minister is: will the board be primarily responsible for the provision of facilities and salaries for board employees, rather than the actual social assistance? I hope I've got that clear.

If this is the way it is to operate, there will be some frustration on it. Here we've got community resource boards right near to the need; and someone appeals to them for a need. They can see, being right close at hand, that the recipient must be cared for. Yet they have to wait for some other provision, for some other authority, for that assistance to come. I can see an area of frustration over and above the areas that I've already mentioned.

Another question I have for the Minister is: how wide a responsibility will the members of these CRBs have in the capacity of advisory...? Will they become advisers, for instance, in family court matters? Or will they just strictly be there to lend an ear and perhaps act as reporters? These questions are very real, particularly in the people's minds who are thinking about running for these community resource boards as members.

Another question I have is how the other benevolent societies will operate after these boards take over. For instance, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind — the services that they are offering: how will they be correlated with the services supervised by the CRBs? What about the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society, or maybe United Good Neighbour?

I've just selected a couple so that you understand what I mean. These are what we call independent benevolent societies, who raise their own funds, who operate many times on grants, some of them sponsored by the provincial government. How will this be correlated? Will they still receive grants from the provincial government, or will they be, as you might say, swallowed up by the community resource boards?

Their job description — the job description of the CRBs — goes something like this: they are supposed to make decisions and they are supposed to receive funds — that is funds designated to them by the department; they are to allocate funds, but it has not been spelled out to them what category of funds they are to allocate. Some of them still believe that they will be allocating actual assistance funds.

[[Page 3787](#)]

A further point under their job description is that they are to be advocates or go-betweens, intermediaries. But it doesn't say intermediary between what point. What is point A and what is point C or point Z? Whose advocates are they to be?

They are supposed to evaluate progress, which is very good, but under F— "F" under job description — they

are to hold open meetings. I find it's rather strange that the meetings held so far by these community resource boards have been closed meetings, secret meetings almost. I'm wondering what the Minister has to say about when these open meetings are to be held and whether they are needed to be secret meetings. Why were there secret meetings in south Vancouver when particularly the job description clearly spells out that the meetings are to be open?

Another question — of course, naturally, for these community resource boards in their function — is what security they have. What continuity or independence do they have? Does their effectiveness depend on whether they have good dialogue? Being elected members, they are worried about how soon they can be replaced and what kind of tenure they enjoy. Does it depend on good dialogue that they may have with their neighboring CRBs? Does it depend on good dialogue with the municipalities? They want to know what kind of continuity can be assured them.

Under the area of finance, again I'm concerned about the approach that we've seen in the Education department, that we've seen in the Finance department, and here again it crops up in the CRB establishment. It's a tin-cup approach again for funding. The community resource boards establish their needs and they go begging to the regional resource boards.

The regional resources boards sort of collate what the needs are for the region and they go begging to the umbrella board; the umbrella board goes begging to the provincial government. Here again at various levels, the tin-cup approach. I'm wondering whether or not they shouldn't be given a budget upon which to operate, which the provincial government has the responsibility to prescribe for them, to operate within that budget if possible, and make recommendations beyond that kind of funding.

The way it is established now, the community resource boards state the need, ask for the money, have no assurance and can give no assurance to the recipient that that need will be provided. But they have to go through the long, bureaucratic begging process, and I'm wondering whether the Minister couldn't come up with a better format for financing.

The costs of meetings are to be provided for on these regional boards, but all the other boards are strictly voluntary. And I see a problem here because half of these community resource boards are going to be recipients, community service recipients. Some of them are going to be receiving what in the olden days we called welfare payments, yet those people receiving welfare payments, living on a bare minimum budget, are going to have to pay some of their own expenses. I understand this was in answer to a question asked by one of the organizers who was out in the Surrey area. He suggested that the costs of meetings would be provided for regional boards, but that all other boards would be strictly voluntary and that people who were recipients of community services and living on a bare-bones budget would be left to pay their own expense of meeting.

I think that, likely, is not fair. I don't think that it is practical, and I'm sure that this is not what the Minister intends. Likely, even in closing the debate on the bill he can clarify this, because I am sure that we have the wrong answer.

There are other questions we may wish to ask during third reading, but basically those are the areas, not only of my concern, but those of people with whom I've discussed the bill. Thank you very much.

MS. K. SANFORD (Comox): Although I have congratulated the Minister before on the concept of the community resource boards, I am pleased to do so again because in Comox riding we have one of the earliest community resource boards established, in Campbell River.

The Minister is right — the community resource board concept is one which is involving people, which is creating a great deal of interest in the services that have been provided in the past to the people of a given area, and also has served to point out that this bill is very much needed. There has been such a duplication of services, overlapping, and lack of communication between the various groups that were attempting to do a good job in providing services for people in various communities, but the problem is that there just was no communication and there was too much duplication.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Is this going to solve it?

MS. SANFORD: I think it is going to solve it, Mr. Member. The question was asked whether or not this was going to solve the problem of the duplication and the overlapping of services.

I attended one of the meetings of the community resource board in Campbell River at which time representations were made to the board. I was impressed by the way the board handled the request for these particular services. They asked to meet with other representatives from the two groups which were there that evening. They asked how they could work together. The groups were reluctant to share facilities, they were reluctant to be tied together in name, but

[[Page 3788](#)]

they were willing to work together in order to ensure that the overlapping didn't take place. Those two groups are now housed in the new facility in Campbell River, which has been rented by the board, and they are sharing a phone and they are sharing a supervisor, and it is working.

Now that does not mean that it's been easy, I think that the problems which community resource boards are facing, and will be facing, are going to be extremely difficult. It's not easy to determine who should be providing which service or where the overlapping should take place. It's not easy to try and get people to communicate and work together, and I think you would realize that too, Mr. Member.

But I think also that through perseverance these community resource boards are going to solve the problems of avoiding duplication of services and providing the best possible service to people for the money that is available.

I would also like to inform the Minister that an interest has been expressed in Courtenay, and a steering committee was established there in order to set up the first community resource board in the City of Courtenay.

While the steering committee was drawing up a constitution and was preparing for the public meeting which would elect the first community resource board there, other meetings were held to discuss the bill, to discuss how the community resource board in Courtenay might work. I would like to point out that representatives were at those meetings from the low-income group which has been organized in the Courtenay area. There was a representative from the non-status Indian group there. We found a great deal of interest in the legislation, and contrary to the suggestion made by the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder), we didn't find any aversion to appointments to the overall board that he was talking about.

They did ask a question, though. I passed this question on to the Minister on a previous occasion, and I would like him to comment on it today in the House. One of the points that the people at the meeting raised had to do with an appeal procedure. They felt that even though the community resource board would be elected from the community, they would like to see some sort of an appeal procedure, which again adds to the bureaucracy, I know. I would like the Minister, when he is summing up, to make some comments because I understand that others have also made requests similar to that.

Finally, the City of Courtenay, last night, at a meeting which was attended by some 100 people, I understand, chose its first community resource board. I congratulate them, and I am very hopeful that they too, will be successful. Thank you.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): A couple of comments, Mr. Speaker.

On the face value, this would appear to be a very well-meaning statute, but one has to question very intensely as to whether or not it can perform, or is it just an experiment that would have been better arrived at by agreement as opposed to statutory compulsion.

Once again we find within the bill extremely wide powers and very large discretions. It is rather a classic example, I'd say, of committee philosophy which we find so prevalent in the socialistic ideology — to make a pod, then just hopefully see if all the peas will fit into it.

I see that the bill certainly stresses community representation but not necessarily community expertise, nor, for that matter, fiscal responsibility. In the past, there is no question that there have been difficulties with the — what will I say — the competition between agencies for the human resource dollar, and in many instances those produced rather intensified degrees of efficiency, and in some instances they did not. It could be looked at from both points of view.

But one thing is very certain: under the specific approach to the matter, the specific-interest people certainly intensified their efforts and their activities. They honed and they emphasized all their specialties into one central end.

You will find different people in life who are prepared to go ahead and put in enormous amounts of effort for a specific project because it interests them, and you do not find those people who are prepared to go ahead and look at the problem in the general sense. This, to me, is one of the largest criticisms of the bill, I have to ask whether de-structuring is, in fact, that good because specialty does produce expertise, and even though it may be in a narrow field, they are willing, they are prepared to do their work, they are prepared to volunteer all of their intelligence and efforts to a good and productive end.

There is assurance that those same people will be prepared to do this within the generalities that can be afforded them within the embodiment of this statute.

The Minister talked a little bit about statutory and non-statutory services. One section which really and truly affects the spirit of the whole of the bill — therefore, I'm going to refer to it, Mr. Speaker — is section 2. Under section 2 I would certainly wish to ask the Minister as to which agencies today this statute would not apply.

It says: "Notwithstanding any other Act, except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act applies to every agency" — save those that are excepted. And you only except three, one of which is: "to benevolent activities principally supported by public subscription."

[[Page 3789](#)]

So I suppose that if we have a benevolent activity that receives 51 per cent of its dollars from a provincial source, a municipal source — and when I say source I'm referring to government — or a federal source, it would come within this statute. Otherwise, the only sources that will come without the statute are those who receive 51 per cent of their funds from private subscription.

Now does that include the Red Cross, Salvation Army, Central City Mission, the Boys' Clubs of Canada, to name a few? Are they going to fall within the ambit of this Act or are they going to be outside of it? I would like the Hon. Minister to comment on those three exceptions that are covered within section 2.

Another fear that has been expressed is the tremendous amount of control that we find under section 7, whereby the director can just put his thumb down immediately and cut off grants if he reaches a conclusion that the programme and quality of services provided by an agency is not satisfactory. Essentially this is a Sword of Damocles hanging over the head of every agency at any particular given point of time.

It is hoped that the director would exercise his discretion in an intelligent and proper manner. But then again, that may only be a wishful hope.

The fear has been expressed in the community, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Hon. Minister, that the boards could become a political instrument. This is a very valid fear in the province of B.C. today because this government is, without any question of a doubt, building the biggest in-House political base that has ever existed in this province. Make no mistake of that fact. And since the provisions that we find within this bill have not been able to be incorporated by agreement, but have to be brought about by statutory compulsion, one can perhaps only assume that these fears have some very valid foundation.

It's also been stated, Mr. Speaker, that it could serve to erode the interests and the activities and the powers and, certainly, the fiscal responsibilities of so many people who have devoted their time and their efforts and indeed

their intelligence to this area of help to his or her fellow man, woman or child.

I'm afraid that with the incorporation of this statute we're not going to find the same flood of volunteer effort that we've had in the past. I'm afraid that they are going to not fall into line with the bureaucratic guidelines that are set forth in here. I think it's going to be most interesting, but I question as to whether or not it's going to be a workable experiment.

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, I think there's little doubt, from our committee travels last summer, that social services and indeed health services in the province and around the province require a greater degree of integration and coordination. I don't think that's in dispute at all.

Since this seems to be — in fact, not seems to be but is — the thrust of the bill, then that is good. But the way in which the matter has been handled from that point onwards is, I regret to say, in our opinion in this party, very much a mess. There has been a sorry mess.

HON. MR. LEVI: What sort of mess?

MR. WALLACE: Mess. M-e-s-s.

MR. McGEER: S-o-r-r-y. (Laughter.)

MR. WALLACE: I say this not facetiously but with some regret, because I know that we've discussed many areas.... I have discussed this subject with the Minister different times off and on and I know how well-motivated he is with this bill. But it really is a mess.

I don't want to repeat other Members' statements, but, first of all, I really would like to echo the question of the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) as to why the provisions of this bill started to be implemented in a completely haphazard, ill-organized fashion here and there in the province before we had even had time to debate the bill and possibly amend it to make it a better bill.

Certainly the first election which took place in Vancouver South to create the community resource board was indeed a scene of great confusion in regard to who qualified for a candidacy and exactly what the function of the community resource would be and many other very important facts.

Indeed, we've received a fair amount of correspondence from different parts of the province which showed clearly that the individual citizen who was following this issue as best he or she could was in a great degree of confusion as to the exact purpose of the boards and how they were to be set up and the very manner of their functioning.

Just as an interesting example of that, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote from quite a sizeable headline that appeared in *The Province* on April 11. It's entitled "Voter Qualifications Reduced for Resource Board Election." I think the Minister perhaps can clarify this, but I'm only trying to demonstrate a very serious degree of confusion which exists.

Here we have the setting up of boards which will have a very considerable amount of power to spend public money, and they will have a considerable degree of authority over the lives and interests of individuals and institutions. So in qualifying people to hold office on such a board, I think we should be very clear as to what the qualifications are. This

[[Page 3790](#)]

clipping from *The Province* of April 11 starts off this way — and I hope the Minister can clarify this:

"Voters in elections for community resource boards in Vancouver need not be Canadians, the Vancouver Resource Board confirmed Wednesday. The only qualifications to vote or become a candidate should be that individuals must be 19 or older, the board decided in, setting guidelines for elections proposed on June 20."

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

MR. WALLACE: Now the Premier interjects that it's not true. This is the point I was raising, because in section 40 it makes it very plain that every person of the age of majority who is a Canadian citizen or a British subject qualifies to be elected to the board.

The Premier interjects that the clipping I've quoted from is not true, but the fact is that this apparently is the information being propagated by the Vancouver Resource Board after inquiry. Where they were inquiring or where they were getting their information, I don't know. All I'm trying to say, Mr. Premier through you, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a great deal of confusion even to the basic fact as to how you qualify to become a candidate.

I've quoted the bill and I agree with the Premier that they're wrong. All I'm saying is: why are we having elections amid confusion when we haven't even put the bill through the House?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, that's what Stanfield's trying to get into office with: the confusion that....

MR. WALLACE: Don't distract us from the subject, Mr. Premier. What Mr. Stanfield does in his campaign is something very unrelated with what we're dealing with in Bill 84. I think the Premier's showing his edginess and his real concern that this is not a good example of good government.

When the Premier starts chirping and interjecting and trying to smokescreen with federal election campaign issues, we know that under these circumstances he's trying to divert the attention of this House from the issue.

I think that that's the first point that is worth being made on this particular bill. If the Premier feels that all the mistakes lie with the citizens who can't understand the bill, that is not surprising since it hasn't had the public exposure that it gains when you debate it in this House.

It was always my impression that before public money was spent it had to be authorized, particularly if the money is being spent under the aegis of a bill or under the powers of a bill brought into this House. The Premier can shrug his shoulders all he likes, but the fact is that this seems to me a very unusual precedent being followed in relation to the setting up of community resource boards.

Whether or not the boards themselves are a good idea or whether it is being done well or badly, I just don't quite follow why this haphazard initial setting up of boards here and there should have been embarked upon before the bill was passed through the House, possibly with amendments to make it a better bill.

As far as we in this party are concerned, it unquestionably is another level of government.

Interjection.

MR. WALLACE: It is another level of government; it has to be. You have elections of citizens who have the power to spend public money. If that is not an authority and a control and a degree of power, and if that doesn't define another level of government, I don't know what does.

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: It may be participatory democracy, but the point that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) is missing is that we in this party would be happier in Canada and in British Columbia if there was less government — not more government. We just don't accept the premise that the only way in which these services could have been coordinated is by this particular further level of government. Obviously we have an honest difference of opinion. The Minister of Labour is obviously very happy with this bill. He is smiling. He seems, in fact, a great deal more contented than the Premier about the whole thing.

HON. MR. KING: If you want less government, tell Stanfield to withdraw.

MR. WALLACE: He's got more seats than David Lewis, so maybe David Lewis should withdraw. The

weaker ones usually go to the wall first.

Interjection.

MR. WALLACE: Good point. Why do you think I do so much talking in here? (Laughter.)

Interjection.

MR. WALLACE: Right. I'm trying, Mr. Minister. In fact, it shows a measure of interest in this bill, Mr. Speaker — it is the first day this week that we have had such a substantial attendance of the cabinet benches. That is to be commended.

The whole election process by which these boards

[[Page 3791](#)]

are to be set up is certainly a matter of confusion. The publicity that was given to that first election suggested that certain persons were in a very easy position to vote more than once and that the supervisory aspect of the voting, in general the whole atmosphere of uncertainty and confusion which existed, really takes away from the credibility and kind of confidence which taxpayers would, I think, naturally have in such a poorly and badly organized new level of government.

We've talked about ministerial power in many bills. I think the Minister was being very honest with the House today — when he introduced the bill and said that he was certainly retaining a fair measure of power because he was responsible to this House for the spending of public money. Nevertheless, he does, indeed, have a great deal of power. I notice one section gives him power to set aside this election. If the elections are as badly managed in the future as they have been to this point, I think the Minister is going to be using section 12 quite often. And maybe with good reason. I maybe have to reconsider the question of ministerial power as far as section 12 is concerned — maybe it is a good idea when things are in such a mess out there in the ridings. I shouldn't use the word "ridings;" I should use the "the areas designated as boundaries for community resource boards under the Act."

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: We have welfare in Oak Bay, Mr. Premier. That's not a matter for you. We have a lot of the people who are on welfare in Oak Bay.

I think that the powers and duties of the officers and the boards, generally speaking, are vague and not very clear. The outline of the duties and functions is very general. There again, it would seem to me that if more time had been taken to implement the bill, and postponement of the setting up of the community resource boards, we would have had a more specific direction and the people of the province would have a much better idea of exactly what the function and thrust of these boards is to be.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, it is a little difficult to criticize the principle of the bill without, at least in passing, referring to sections. We are most uneasy about section 55 which very clearly further dilutes the power of local government.

The thrust of that part of the bill is that any one Minister of the cabinet can delegate responsibilities in certain areas of service, including education, to be carried out by the regional or the community resource board.

This part of the bill appears to contain provision for the transfer of authority to these boards for certain services or actions which presently now are clearly under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. There is similar mention of public health, social services, mental health service, correctional services, manpower and employment Services, public education and community recreation.

Mr. Chairman, that covers a very wide swath of territory. I think it is important that we at least place on record that the B.C. School Trustees Association is very concerned about this particular principle in the bill. It is

quite true that each school board will have a representative, under the terms of the Act, on the regional board. Nevertheless when we are criticizing the bill on the basis of ministerial power, I think section 55 certainly has to be the very clear example of the fact that local government, particularly in its relation to public education, is left wondering just how much or how little the Minister, in his position of power, might choose to delegate to the regional and community resource boards.

As far as the Vancouver resources board is concerned, I would like to make a comment or two and ask the Minister to clarify one or two points. As I read the bill there is only provision for out-of-pocket expenses for members, but it is my information that, for example, the member from the federated anti-poverty group, whose name I believe is Mr. Mel Macdonald, has put forward to the Vancouver resources board the motion that members be paid \$600 a month. It is my information that this has not been approved by the Vancouver resources board as yet, but I think the motion was tabled at the time and was to be given further discussion.

I wonder if the Minister would make note of that and comment on it because there again, as I have tried to point out, is the confusion that exists between the understanding by the public as to the candidacy for election and the fact that the bill says something else very clearly. Here we have the bill saying very clearly that the members can only have out-of-pocket expenses, yet we have what will be one of the most important regional boards, namely the Vancouver resources board, coming up with motions that the members be paid \$600 a month. If this is to become a policy, I think we should know about it at this time. Again, it may be simply an action by that particular board that is certainly quite wrong in relation to the legislation.

One of the feelings that has been expressed to me, and again I would like the Minister to comment, is that there is a real danger that these resource boards could become dominated by the vocal militant minority — to use a popular phrase that we have in our society today, some very vocal minorities who can be extremely militant and the degree to which this....

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: I'm referring to certain citizens

[[Page 3792](#)]

who, I think, participate in this area perhaps with good motives. I'm thinking particularly of one example recently where a community action group in the guidance of an advocate.... I don't know if we should go to the trouble of defining advocates and asking the Minister to describe the method by which they're chosen.

In this general area of social need and social services I had a case the other day where a mother, in the breaking up of the home, certainly had her civil rights seriously transgressed as a result of the action of one advocate. One swallow doesn't make a summer; I'm not suggesting this is a general tone of behaviour of these people. Nevertheless, these are examples where an individual or a small group of individuals with a very strong and militant approach to this kind of problem could readily dominate this kind of well-motivated arm of social services. I wonder to what degree that tendency will impair the good will of volunteers or citizens who might otherwise wish to become involved in the community resource board organization.

To return for a moment to the first election that occurred in Vancouver South, I think there is a real danger that these resource boards could become the political tool of this or any other government. When we're talking about community social services, I just happen to believe that whole area should be devoid as far as possible of political involvement. We try to keep municipal government reasonably neutral because of its particular function at the local level. This particular community resources bill, I think, is something of the same kind of level of government.

I think it would be disastrous if any one political party attempted to run a slate of officers, as was attempted in the Vancouver South election. Certainly, the results of that election suggest that the public are a little smarter than we probably give them credit for. They really clobbered all the NDP candidates in that election and I was delighted — not because they were NDP candidates, but because there were any kind of political candidates. I think, when you're providing this kind of service to people and social need of one kind or another, the last thing these people

need is to have their help or their assistance or their advice tainted in any way by political motivation by the person providing the service, whether the person be a citizen, a social worker or otherwise.

These are some of the general points, Mr. Speaker. I think there will be other questions as we go into committee. I wonder if the Minister would care to respond.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on this bill, More as a social worker and as a MLA rather than as a cabinet Minister.

For some years in North America there has been growing concern with the pattern of the development of social services — that is, between the private agencies and the public agencies. For the most part, the public agencies had been doing the pioneering work, although there was a myth around that the private agencies had been extending the services and doing the experimenting. But for the most part in North America the pattern was over the last 15 years that the public agencies would do the pioneering work while the private agencies became more and more entrenched in past patterns.

My friend, the Member from Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace), will find parallel situations in the medical field where certain medical private agencies, to raise funds for certain particular illnesses, became entrenched with those illnesses. The illnesses disappeared but the bureaucracy didn't, nor did the fund. You have a case of continuing bureaucracy not adjusting to a new situation.

A case in point of one which has attempted to adjust is the tuberculosis fund, which at one time was an important ingredient in North American health care. Its role has been altered by two factors: (1) the extension of public services; (2) the control of the disease of tuberculosis. That society has moved into the field of emphysema and focuses on other special health problems.

It takes a while to respond and to adjust that bureaucracy. I'm sure through your medical experience you would agree that there are some medical funds in North America, particularly in the United States, which perhaps have long outlived their usefulness but still exist because there are jobs involved, there are commitments and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, a certain amount of social status. In North American society there is a social status attached to, "doing charity work." It's just as prevalent today as it was at the turn of the century although its form takes different roles in different cities.

In the City of St. Louis, they have a ball every year where all the hoi polloi of the community go who will be identified once a year with charity and charity needs. As a matter of fact, it's a great social thing to be listed on a number of charitable things. Many people do it with great intent and with great service, and their efforts are more than welcome. But, in some instances, the actual purpose of the agency has become less and less one of serving the community and more and more one of social structure and social acceptance.

Now, those agencies that were needed to continue, that became absolutely necessary, couldn't over the years be funded out of private funds. You have the anomalous situation of an agency perhaps like the Children's Aid Society of Vancouver which at the turn of the century was the only agency in the field involved in direct care with children. There was the

[[Page 3793](#)]

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and there was the society for the prevention of cruelty to children. A cynic may say on occasion that the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals had more influence than the society for the prevention of cruelty to children. Certainly in North America there's enough evidence to indicate that may be the case. I'm not saying in British Columbia.

In the British Columbia case we have the Children's Aid Society as an example. As the province's social services grew, it became obvious that there was no private agency that could possibly function outside of the lower mainland on a private basis to provide child care. Under the last, unlamented coalition government and, preceding that, a Liberal administration in this province, there were some outstanding Ministers of health care and welfare

administration who did pioneering work in the health and welfare fields. We almost had Medicare in 1936 under a Liberal administration, but it was almost like all other Liberal promises: why ruin a good promise by doing something about it? As a matter of fact, the legislation was actually introduced in this House, passed, but never proclaimed.

Nonetheless, there were a number of people in the Liberal cabinets and in the coalition cabinets who set an atmosphere of progress in the child welfare and social welfare field. One of the persons who carried over from the former coalition government into the Social Credit administration was one, Ruby McKay, an internationally-recognized expert in child welfare. Her role in attempting to update child welfare in British Columbia was met with a dismissal by the Social Credit government.

Those of you who were in the House at that time will recall that the former Minister of Highways, who then became the Minister of Welfare, one P.A. Gaglardi, that self-proclaimed expert on social services, decided that Ruby McKay was giving a professional opinion. So Ruby McKay was fired.

We have no real progress in the social services in terms of establishing patterns between private and public agencies under the last five years of Social Credit; none whatsoever. We inherit what was once, under Liberal and coalition administrations, some of the most progressive social welfare legislation in North America. We inherited a department that had been allowed to wither. As a result, the private agencies, because of their presence and because of the vacuum, were forced to fill a service.

While child welfare services were built up all through the province, the private agencies were asked to continue doing the direct child-care work in the City of Vancouver. This is the kind of situation we had: 99 per cent of the budget of the Children's Aid Society of Vancouver was paid for out of the public purse — this Legislature — but it was controlled by a private board. Now, Mr. Member, when you talk about public representation and the need for this Legislature to be involved, I don't think you can justify having an anomalous situation in one particular area, and in many other cases, of the Children's Aid Society of Vancouver, a private agency, receiving 99 per cent of its funding from the provincial government and yet their policies determined by the board....

MR. WALLACE: I wasn't talking about that.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, this is what is leading to this legislation. I'm trying to get across to you the necessity of this kind of legislation and the experiments that are part of the history of this province.

What this Minister is doing is really an extension of experiments started in the 1930s and the late 1940s and died in the late '50s and mid-'60s. Until the advent of that administration, British Columbia had been recognized as the leader in social welfare services.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Huh!

HON. MR. BARRETT: You say huh. You're the people who fired Ruby McKay. You're the ones who led the department....

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Okay. We have a difference of opinion. I happen to express my opinion — one that fortunately, after all these years, I am able to express from this side of the House because we have Pharmacare now, we have Mincome now. These are things that would never have come out of that outfit — never. The handicapped, the blind and the crippled have a guaranteed minimum income. And why shouldn't they? But it never came from that outfit.

The purpose of this bill is to allow the community itself to have some say in what kind of resources are developed. While the arguments are going abroad that this government is taking away people's rights and eroding freedom, in actual fact in this particular bill what we are asking is that community become more and more and more involved in their own neighbourhood lifestyle and their own community problems.

Far too often we have adopted the attitude in social services of "let the private charities worry about that problem" when the problems are essentially community problems. There is ignorance, a lack of information, a lack of awareness, and a lack of participation in other human beings' problems in our multi-complex society.

You can go into some of the suburban areas of

[[Page 3794](#)]

large urban areas and talk to one person in the house, and the person next door — they may live beside each other for five years and have no more communication other than saying hello or good-bye in the evening or in the morning.

The whole purpose of this bill is to get the community itself involved in its own lifestyle. To continue a pattern of private agencies being financed 99 per cent by public funds when the board of directors of that agency never reflected the clients of the agency.... They were wonderful people; they were well motivated people, and I don't intend to criticize them for their very sincere efforts. But what about the people who are receiving the service? What was the direct access of the foster child, the unwed mother, or the father of a broken family, with placing a child in care? What was their access to the board and the policies? None. And vice versa, what responsibilities did the board have to the government, other than their good moral commitment? Those board members could have flown off in a million directions. Most of them didn't; most of these people who served on these boards have done an outstanding job.

But in the meantime, while our old pattern continued to grow, a whole new awareness and a whole new series of demands arose in our societies. The poor wanted to be heard. We had the rising of welfare rights committees throughout all of North America. In the United States the phenomenon was essentially associated with the black community who were at first involved in citizens' rights organizations. This spilled over, as all other groups spill over, into the Canadian pattern. We had it in Ontario and Quebec, on the Prairies and in British Columbia.

If we wish to preserve the kind of social structure and political society that we have, then we should allow more and more people to participate. I happen to believe in parliamentary democracy. I believe that more and more people should participate. The way of getting more awareness and more participation is to give access to decision-making to as many people as possible for those things that affect their lives.

If I am on welfare or a Mincome recipient, I don't want the idea of somebody making the absolute decision in Victoria or city hall without my having my input with some degree of authority. These boards that the Minister is proposing to set up have been advocated by research for the last 15 years in all of North America. It is an experiment really, but it is an extension of all of the research that we have been able to put together from common experiences in North America.

There are bound to be problems. With anything that is brand new there are bound to be problems. But I just can't understand the reasoning in terms of the kind of blanket condemnation of anything new that the government does as wrong, as inadequate, as fumbling, as taking away liberty and as destroying democracy, when the opposite is the case.

No one knows how successful these boards are going to be because no one has tried them. But that shouldn't be the reason for us not to try them. Surely to goodness, if any of you are ever in a condition where you would need social assistance, you would want to have access other than to your politician, your MLA, or someone else, or the Minister. God help us, we may get one back like the one we had before, and to appeal to him as your last answer.... Surely you would want some part in your own community.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I won't attack you either. You weren't responsible; you had no more power than he did. You had less power than he did in the cabinet.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Some of the Socreds disassociated themselves....

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: If you endorse Mr. Gaglardi's policies, go right ahead. The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) disassociated himself just in time to get himself re-elected.

The point I am trying to make is that this bill allows people who are on welfare, who are in need of social services, who are part and parcel of communities, to have direct involvement in decision-making in the communities. One of the problems in our urban society is the fluidity and the anonymity that exists in our urban centres. One of the ways of bringing people together is through a board like this. It's not going to be perfect, but to label it as a political device or an insidious political machine to gain control in certain regions of cities is sheer nonsense. Sheer nonsense.

Do you know something? I know constituencies that have political organizations in them established for one purpose — to gain power so they can elect MLAs. What about that! If you want to talk about political power, there are MLAs in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, who have organizations in their own ridings whose only purpose is to get them re-elected so they can have power. You talk about politics! That's political politics.

Interjections.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Name names? I have a political organization in my riding; I think the

[[Page 3795](#)]

Liberals have a political organization. As a matter of fact, in every election campaign every party says they are the best organized and they are going to win the most seats. Talk about ones being paid — what about old Gracey running around last year getting the leadership for young Bill? (Laughter.) We paid for that out of this House, Mr. Speaker, and that was political politics of the worst kind — seeking power.

I know how difficult it is for the Tory party to get a meeting together in a phone booth, but nonetheless, if that is what you want, there is no question that that is what you want to do.

MR. WALLACE: You're twisting my words.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I'm not twisting your....

Oh, you see, Mr. Speaker, now he is interrupting me and accusing me of interrupting his words, when I was casually trying to interrupt him and he misinterpreted my interruptions. (Laughter.)

MR. WALLACE: That should thoroughly confuse everything, which is the real skill. Would you repeat that, Mr. Premier?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Yes, I will.

We are dealing with some of the arguments that have been raised in criticizing this bill. One of the arguments raised is the labelling that this could be a political device. The political devices that exist by these Members are already out there in the community; you don't suspect everybody's motives because they are a Tory; you don't suspect everybody's motives because they are Liberal. You try not to suspect everybody's motives because they are Social Credits. It's not a question of the person's political label; it is a question of interest in the community. The same way as municipal office.

This is a vehicle to allow an experiment to take place to permit those people who rely on these services all their lives to have some small say in the development of those services. If it is good enough for a university, if it is good enough for a Legislature, surely it is good enough for a community to have a say in the development of those services.

This bill has excited the interest of the welfare community of all of North America. I want to commend the Minister for the way he has handled it up to this date.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): I won't take more than a minute or two of the time of the House to raise a point or two about this bill. First of all, I want to wish the Minister well in his experiment. It is something new and it is in the nature of an experiment. I agree with the Premier that this deserves to be tried.

At the same time, I think a word or two of caution offered in the sincerest way might be in order. The Premier, though he claimed the boards of private agencies like the Children's Aid Society were really very fine people, was subtly condemning them.

HON. MR. BARRETT: No way.

MR. McGEER: You were, Mr. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: It's the system.

MR. McGEER: Well, whether you're condemning the system or not, the point I'm trying to make is that the New Democratic Party is always finding some fault with society, taking what exists for granted and assuming that by introducing their new system they will not harm anything that now exists.

What I've found as a result of this bill is dismay on the part of many agencies that are functioning well and are making an important contribution that we cannot afford to be without.

On the other hand, the attempts of the Minister to establish community resource boards have met with indifference. There is no reason at all to believe at this stage that we're replacing the people who are performing now in our community with people who are either more interested or more competent. Mr. Speaker, no matter what system you may introduce, performance depends upon ability and commitment.

I'm worried, about the effect this bill is having right now on agencies that are critical to bringing effective social services to the people of B.C. I am not one bit encouraged by the results the Minister has obtained to date in attempting to get his new system started. It may be ultimately that he can replace what we now have with something better. I would be the first one to say to that Minister that on paper what he has looks better. But sometimes, what looks good on paper isn't very good in practice.

HON. MR. LEVI: Like Trudeau's housing?

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): There's a perfect example.

MR. McGEER: I agree with you. I think it is a perfect example and I want to mention one or two other examples. One is OFY and another is LIP. There were some good things about those, but the capability of the federal government to administer them was so dismal that the advantages outweighed the advantages.

Perhaps in criticizing my own party and some of the schemes they had which looked good on paper, it might be the best way of suggesting some way that the Minister can have his programme move only at the speed that people can usefully accept. While you're working towards bringing this along, if it

[[Page 3796](#)]

works well, bring it along fast. If it works badly, let it have a peaceful death. But don't try and take what works now and break it down.

That's the only reservation I have. Perhaps the Minister, in closing the debate, can give us a little bit of reassurance.

I certainly think the system we have had, for all its faults, has brought forward a great deal of professional

capability and dedication. If boards like those of the Children's Aid Society are to pass in power and influence, it won't go unnoticed by me that they have done an extremely fine job. Anyone who attempts to take their place has their work cut out for them.

I disagree with the Premier that these boards have somehow represented a faulty system or have been derelict in taking into account the wishes and needs of their clients. I think it was unfair of the Premier, in promoting his new scheme, to leave that assertion. I disagree with that.

Having said that if the Minister, in his capacity as being responsible for these services, and the Premier, as a social worker and now No. 1 man in the province, can conceive of a better way and prove to those agencies that now exist that it is a better way, by all means replace them. But let them work in competition for the moment and see which does the better job.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): I feel I must get into this debate for a few minutes. I think one of the problems with probably all of us, not only here in this assembly but throughout the community, is that we fear change. It reminds me of Alfred, Lord Tennyson's poem in which he says:

The old order changes, yielding place to new;
And God fulfils himself in many ways
Lest one good custom should corrupt this world.

I think that is as true as it was at the time when the poet wrote those words. Every once in a while a system that was working very well becomes so institutionalized that, even though the people might not have been corrupt, the system corrupts itself because of its ageing tendencies. We have reached this stage now. These things have to change.

Right now we live in an era where people are expecting participation. That has become the slogan of today: "people participation." We have seen it in very many other phases. For instance, in Vancouver, at the time when Marathon Realty started on Arbutus Village, they realized the importance of people participation because a great number of other subdivisions that had been created had been created badly because they didn't fit into the neighbourhoods. So Marathon went back to the people in the community and showed them the plans they had. They went back to them six or seven times until the area around was satisfied with the type of development that was going to be put in.

The same thing happened in the Champlain Heights area. When the first Champlain Heights development started, the Killarney-Fraserview area formed a council of volunteers; it wasn't a council of professional or paid people. Anyone who wanted could come to that and have input. As a result, they were able to develop some things that were satisfying to the surrounding neighbourhood. They were able to cut the density down and were able to put in such improvements as a shopping mall that wasn't an eyesore and have the kind of schools and churches and other amenities — small, pathway parks and things of that sort — that they wanted developed in it.

We're trying to do exactly the same with community resource boards in that we want people to be able to participate and to be able to do it in such a way that it is satisfying to all.

Of the people who were elected to the community resource board in the Vancouver South area, here is a quote from one of those members:

"Most people have not had anything to do with social services so they're not interested."

With the community resource board, more people will become interested. People are already asking, "What can the CRB do?"

Here is another quote:

"I am terribly disappointed that there are no consumers of services on this board."

We are so used to electing people whom we feel have high qualifications. Sometimes these qualifications aren't the sort of thing that really are the important things. Maybe it is communication with people that is more important.

Here is another:

"I am not concerned about consumer representation on the board. We can always get ad hoc advice from them. So they've realized that they must go out to the community, to the people who are going to be getting those services, to say: 'Now, what is it you want and what is it you need?'"

That is the idea behind these resource boards. I think, with this type of experiment right now in Vancouver South and Vancouver Killarney-Fraserview area, this is a pilot project. We have to say to ourselves: "Let's see what's happening here."

There are information centres set up in relation to them. I understand they are working very well and they are delighted with what is happening in the community.

I highly approve of this and I am very happy this bill has come before the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[[Page 3797](#)]

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Just a few words about this legislation. I'm not going to heap as much praises on the legislation as the Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) because I find the legislation to be bureaucracy in full bloom. As if we don't have enough bureaucracy in British Columbia now after 18 months of a socialist government where we have 8,000 new civil servants. We find the Minister introducing the *Community Resources Act*, the most bureaucratic piece of legislation to be introduced this session. He's going to have political hacks in every community of this province.

Interjection.

MR. CHABOT: How many? How many will you have? What are your projections for this legislation, Mr. Minister, as far as the hiring of people and phony elections throughout the Province of British Columbia? When one looks at the results of Vancouver South and what took place there, it's an absolute sham. A phony election. A slate of NDP candidates who were completely wiped out. Who were those independents who were elected? They are all NDPers. It was a sham. The majority of them were NDP and you know it, Mr. Minister. It was strictly a sham; that's all it was. There is no need for this kind of sham battle for the spoils and for the taxpayers' dollars in British Columbia.

Now we see the board in Vancouver South fighting for what their responsibilities are going to be. They want to know how much money they can extract from the Minister for their services which they are going to render to the community. What a shameful sight it is to see these people trying to come to the conclusion as to how much money they should be paid for the services they are not sure they are going to provide to the community. How stupid can we be?

I think the Minister, when he closes the debate, should give us some idea as to how costly this experiment, this socialist experiment is going to be to the taxpayers of British Columbia. How many millions of dollars will this cost the taxpayers of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker? I think we have the responsibility to have some idea as to what kind of money we are going to spend for this socialist experiment, for this socialist infiltration of the communities of British Columbia — and that's all it is.

I was amused by the Premier when he got up this afternoon and said, "I believe in parliamentary democracy." What a bunch of rubbish! We see this legislation completely erodes the power of the Legislature when one looks at a specific section dealing with the allocation of dollars for the functioning of these political cells within the community. (Laughter.) No longer does that right rest with this assembly once this legislation is passed. And the Premier has the audacity to say, "I believe in parliamentary democracy." Those are shallow words, shallow indeed.

We see this particular legislation placing superpower in the hands of the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi). We see he has the right to regulate certain activities over the administration of the *Public Schools Act*, the administration of justice Act, the *Health Act*, the *Hospital Act*, the *Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act*, the *Municipal Act*, the rehabilitation and social improvement Act, the *Family Relations Act*, the family and children's court Act, the *Mental Health Act*, just to name a few. Absolute power.

We have a super-Minister now who can interfere in every Ministry of government at whim, with taxpayers' dollars at whim as well. Yes, no longer will it be necessary for this legislation.... And the Premier smiles. He knows full well it is incorporated within this legislation. No longer does the Minister have to come to this Legislature and request certain sums for the functioning of this legislation because he has that power through order-in-council to spend the taxpayers' dollars for the fulfilling of the terms of the *Community Resources Act*.

The people of British Columbia can't afford this experiment. I ask the Minister to stop this political nonsense.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): The Minister, in opening the debate, as he often does, made some sense when he was talking about programmes that will fall under the regime of the community resource boards. But unfortunately, despite the necessity for the coordination many of these programmes in the community, with this bill we run an extreme danger of establishing such a tangled web of administrative apparatus that the services will have extreme difficulty ever reaching the people.

I was interested too, and amused, as the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) was with the Premier's comments. He has earned the title again of the old master-twister. He's saying, in effect, that there was no community involvement in the past. That's just simply nonsense because there was all kinds of community involvement.

In fact, the Minister of Human Resources, at his direction, was steering the communities into what we all felt was a very sensible course in the development of community services. They've been developed and been established in many of the communities. Many of the communities in the Fraser Valley, for instance, have either had successfully operating community services organizations or are in the process today or have been before this bill came forward of developing those kind of community services organizations which would have coordinated all of those functions in the community which were necessary to be coordinated and would have kept that

[[Page 3798](#)]

volunteer aspect intact and would have also limited the kind of bureaucratic monstrosity you are going to develop with Bill 84.

We would have been much more pleased to see the Minister continue along those lines rather than to get into this kind of socialist experiment.

The Premier says this bill has excited the interest of the welfare community all over North America. That may be so, but it doesn't seem to have excited the interest of the welfare community in this part of North America because many of them are saying it won't work. Alderman Harry Rankin, who has been on the regional resources board for nearly a year as its chairman, I believe, has said that it is obvious that this system could become highly unwieldy. He says: "Although it may improve the services to the people slightly, the cost would become colossal." That is from the chairman of the regional resources board.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Are you supporting Harry Rankin?

MR. McCLELLAND: A group on welfare, the Federated Anti-Poverty Groups, say: "Dump the Resources Board Act." These people said that the philosophy behind the bill is fine, but the way it is being implemented and the vagueness in defining the powers in the Act make it very poor legislation. And these are the people in the welfare community that the Premier seems to be so concerned about.

Many people in those services think you are going the wrong way. The drain on the taxpayers of British

Columbia could be astronomical because of the setup of these kind of resource boards. We have no doubt that they will be used for political action and that they could become happy hunting grounds for NDP political activists. I don't doubt that will happen and that's one of the major aims behind the bill.

When we talk about the bureaucratic setup to be involved in this, the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) wanted to know how many people are going to be involved. I think that's a pretty fair question to ask.

I refer to one story regarding only the Vancouver community resources board. It was pointed out to another group of people involved on welfare and the Federated Anti-Poverty Groups that in Vancouver, along with the bureaucracy that already exists, we will have at least 163 board members, plus 14 managers and their staffs. That's another minor explosion of the bureaucratic mess this government is getting us into.

As has been pointed out, section 55 of the Act — and I won't deal with it in detail — does give the cabinet authority to give the resource boards astoundingly wide powers.

In this bill we also seem to be moving towards a kind of super-Ministry of Health and Welfare and Human Resources that was advocated in the Foulkes report and which the Minister of Health has denied. Yet here in this bill we see the same kinds of things that we saw recommended in the Foulkes report turning up in Bill 84, a super ministry that in itself will have all-consuming powers. Once again we'll have as well an element of uncontrol to it because it will be difficult for the government, for this Legislature certainly, to get a handle on the explosion of that bureaucracy as well.

There are so many unanswered questions, Mr. Speaker, about who's going to decide how these local boards are going to be set up. Where are they going to be set up?

Nobody seems to know who's going to belong to where in the various regions that are concerned with these boards. The Minister has said that he wants to provide involvement at the community level with social services. Well, I'd like to know how he reconciles that kind of a statement with the fact, Mr. Speaker, that 9.5 per cent of the people involved in south Vancouver even bother to come out to elect that community resource board. Nine point five per cent — what kind of community involvement is that?

MR. CURTIS: Zilch!

MR. McCLELLAND: Zilch is right.

Mr. Speaker, we don't really know how far we're going to go and on what kind of representation. I know for instance there has been some discussion in relation to some of the boards that half of the board members should be recipients of board services.

Has the Minister actively considered that and is that going to be part of the recommendations that half of the community resources board be recipients of some kind of services?

I'd like to know what's going to happen to the local municipal councils and how much of the cost they're going to have to pick up in relation to these boards.

It's been said that the boards can hire professional, para-professional and support staff, all of which will be paid. I'd like to issue a warning to the local councils to look out, because some of these costs are going to have to come from them I would suggest and I would like to know how much of the cost.

How much comes from the municipality? I recall the Minister when he was talking before he got as sophisticated as going toward these community resources boards. He was talking about the simple co-ordination of the support facilities in the community.

In fact, I recall the Minister saying that anybody who didn't make moves toward that kind of coordination wouldn't get funds from the department. And we welcomed that kind of concept, that was great.

But at that time, the Minister was talking about something he called core services, which would be provided by the municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know whether this core services concept is still part of these community resource boards. If it is, what are those core services and how much of the cost of those services will the municipal councils be asked to pick up?

The thing that frightens me, Mr. Speaker, is that once we get these community resource boards set up in the community and one over here decides that we need this kind of a core service, regardless of its applicability to the community over there, that resource board may insist that they have that service as well, simply because their neighbour has it.

If that happens in fact, the municipality involved may have to pick up the tab. So what are core services if they are still a concept of this Minister and how much of the cost of those services will necessarily be picked up by the local communities?

I notice, too, Mr. Speaker, one question that was asked of one of the task force meetings that was set up in the Delta area. The question was asked, does the Department of Human Resources have veto power over the proposed allocation of funds? I don't know where the answer came from exactly, but I guess it was one of the Resource people who was there from the department who said, no, the Department of Human Resources won't.

Now does that mean that there will be an open book given to these community resource boards to spend in any way they see fit without any accountability to the provincial government which provides the major share of the funds? Will there be accountability, either at the local community resource board level or at the provincial community resource board level and who will they be accountable to?

Is the Human Resources board just going to shuck off all the responsibility of making sure that the funds are adequately and properly spent? We see too much of this with this government, Mr. Speaker, abdicating its responsibilities in the accountability of public funds.

There has been some concern expressed in many instances that the citizen, the person who is going to ultimately need the services, is going to get lost in all of this maze of governmental and intergovernmental services. That he is in fact, the citizen — he or she who needs that service — is going to be run around and strangled in red tape so that he never does get the kind of services that he deserves and the kind of services that are necessary.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to be almost impossible for those people at the community level to cut through that red tape that's going to be built up because of this bill.

I understand, and we're told, that it's difficult already to get any kind of decisions from the resource board in south Vancouver. It's only the beginning. Once all the rest of them are set up and interjurisdictional problems begin and the meetings start and the staff get hired, I would suggest that it's going to be even more difficult.

There doesn't seem, Mr. Chairman, to be any consistency in the method by which the instructions have gone out to set up these boards and if it doesn't get any better than what we've seen so far, I'd like to suggest that it is going to be a total mess, a waste of taxpayers' money and the kind of red tape and the bureaucracy that will be built up will rival anything that we've seen in this province to date. And, Mr. Speaker, under those kind of circumstances, under that kind of vagueness, there's no way that I can support this kind of legislation.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): I'd like to say a few things about this Bill 84. My concern is the concern of others who have spoken — the erosion of local control. I feel that these community resource boards are certainly going to take this away from duly-elected municipal councils and school boards, just to name a few.

I have a letter, a very short letter, from the Board of School District 28, Quesnel, inquiring from me about the certain sections of this bill. It refers to section (55) Bill 84, the *Community Resource Act*, in respect of the delegation of any duty, authority or responsibility respecting public education. So it would indicate that they can take

educational funds — I'm referring to the community resource board — away from the education people and spend them without any recourse. Of course, this is what I don't like.

It is really forming a fifth level of government. We have four levels now and I really don't know what is wrong now with the levels we have, but it's obvious the government feel there is something wrong. As I was at the municipal level, in the municipal level they certainly watched closely on the social assistance that's put out and I think they are quite a responsible body.

I am concerned also, as is the prior speaker, the MLA for Langley, about the costs of these community resource board, the grants they make. Is this going to be added to the municipal costs. I want to say here that I congratulated this Minister earlier and this government on a reduction of the costs of welfare from 15 to 10 per cent. That was a good step in the right direction.

But maybe now with this, I'd like to hear from the Minister, are most funds going in? The grants that are made, are the municipalities going to have to pay 10 per cent of the increased grants that are made through the community resource board? If this is the case, it means that the cost of social assistance will go

[[Page 3800](#)]

up higher than it ever has to the municipal taxpayer. I am quite concerned over the discussions that have taken place over the elections of these resource boards. I listened, Mr. Speaker, to an open-line radio show recently where it indicated that even a non-citizen was making the directions in Vancouver. I really hardly think that that is the way that things should be run.

I definitely think that one qualification should be that particularly the ones in charge and giving the direction that they should be citizens of this country. It indicates that this is not the case right now in the city of Vancouver in certain areas;

Section 55 of this bill which, as was mentioned earlier, is a concern, I can assure you, to locally elected people. I refer to school boards and municipal councils. This makes this Minister a super-Minister. He can just take over from any of these other ministries and do what he wants and for that reason I cannot support this bill at this time.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate we were privileged to hear from the Premier speaking not as Premier of this province or as a cabinet Minister but as a social worker and an MLA. I think that we can take some guidance from what he said. He said it was an experiment. Mr. Speaker, if it were just an experiment upon which we are embarking I could perhaps support this legislation, but what we have in Bill 84 is a complete blueprint for a large, amorphous welfare structure in the Province of British Columbia which will go into every segment of every community in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept this kind of a blueprint for community resource boards and regional resource boards with the widest possible powers and the broadest possible functions based upon, as the Premier says, an experiment.

If the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) believes that some experiment is required in order to coordinate in our communities non-statutory services, or even if he believes that there is some need to coordinate statutory services — as he indicated to be the case in the City of Vancouver — then he already has the authority under legislation establishing his department to embark upon such an experiment in one or more communities in this province. If he could prove that it worked, then I am sure that he would be the first to come back before this House with legislation of this kind with a background of proven service which would substantiate this kind of legislation. Mr. Speaker, he has not done that.

He is establishing community boards which are to be elected at the local, community level — local areas which he will define — and the legislation does not provide the eligibility requirements of the person who will cast the vote. It does not. If the Minister will very carefully read the section, all it does is establish the qualification of a

person who may be a director. It does not establish the qualifications of a person who may vote. That is not in the legislation.

Therefore, with such an experiment, how can we possibly embark upon any kind of local community control when, as the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) says, in the South Vancouver experiment only 9.5 per cent of the people in that community were sufficiently interested in the experiment to take the opportunity to vote when all you had to do was walk in off the street and ask for a ballot?

Mr. Speaker, the other day we debated an amendment to the *Public Schools Act* in which the government was taking away from the local taxpayer the right to vote on capital referendums. The government was taking away that right. Now school boards come to the Minister of Education and with her approval can raise capital funds. What was the reason that the Minister of Education gave for this change? She said there was so little interest in capital referendums in the local areas that they were going to take that right away from the local citizen. The experience was that only 12 per cent of the people at the local areas were turning out to cast their ballots. Mr. Speaker, if 12 per cent is sufficient for that Minister to take away the right of local taxpayers with respect to education capital expenditures, how can this Minister turn over the broadest aspects of social responsibility in this province to local boards elected at the local area? It makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, unless the Minister can clearly demonstrate, based on pilot studies that have been made in various communities of this province, that such a scheme will work.

The Hon. Premier suggested that it was time, again as part of this experiment, that the consumers of our social services should have some voice. At the same time he criticized those people who, with skill and responsibility, over the years have given voluntarily of their time, their experience and their service in order to make the social needs of our communities work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it happens to cut both ways. When you allow the consumers to express their concern, when you involve people at the local level without any particular qualifications except that they are able to attract votes establishing them as directors of community boards, then you will also have on those community boards responsible for the administration of these services those people whose motives can be questioned every bit as much as those of volunteers. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, you attract to the community boards those full-time professional social service consumers of whom we have far too many in our community. The Vancouver experience proves that to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, it is only by maintaining in the Department of Human Resources the control of the

[[Page 3801](#)]

administration of the social service, social assistance and community responsibility functions that that Minister and his professionally qualified staff can be certain that the proper intent of the government in these fields will be carried out at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I too must raise, as other Members have, the gravest concern about sections 54 and 55 of this legislation. We are creating these regional boards and these community boards and we are thereby fashioning a system whereby members of the cabinet can divest themselves of responsibilities which are theirs under legislation of this province and place those responsibilities under the control of the regional and community boards. By that very act those Ministers also transmit to those local community and regional boards money which is voted in this Legislature for expenditure in departments of government. That is a loss of accountability. Parts of section 55 show quite clearly that that is the case because the Minister or the draftsman of the legislation has been alert enough to recognize that if the community resources boards fail in their responsibility they have got to give the money back.

Now, isn't that great, Mr. Speaker? Talk about parliamentary democracy. The responsibility of people in this House is to ensure that moneys are voted for the needs of the Crown and we are also at pains to ensure that the Crown expends those moneys for the purposes originally intended. We lose that authority in a classic way when we adopt this legislation with this particular section in it.

Mr. Speaker, the professionals may recognize the need for changes of this kind — and we have two in the

cabinet, in the Premier and the Minister of Human Resources. But Mr. Speaker, it is not enough for the professionals to suggest that change is required and bring in this kind of legislation.

For my purposes the Minister will have to conduct pilot studies and show me that it will work before I will allow that Minister and other Members of the government to divest themselves of their responsibilities and place them in the hands of persons elected by God-knows-who.

MR. GIBSON: The principle of this bill has been fairly well canvassed so I will be brief. I have a few matters that I would ask the Minister to comment on when he closes debate on second reading.

I do believe, as many speakers have said, that this is a well-intentioned bill. But I return, as the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) did, to the remarks of the Premier, who said — and I scribbled this down quickly but it is a reasonable quote — "We have no way of knowing if it will work. It hasn't been tried."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that to enter into such a consequential piece of legislation to apply to the entirety of the province on the basis of an experiment that hasn't been tried is not a proper and responsible thing to do. I can appreciate the wishes of the Minister to proceed rapidly with this but I would suggest to him that he has one or two resource boards either underway now or in the process of election, and the province might be well served if he looked at their progress over the next year before implementing this across the province. In other words, a pilot project approach is a proper one.

I would ask him as well about another matter raised by the Premier with respect to decentralization when he said that welfare and Mincome decisions shouldn't be made by people in Victoria. Yet, if my understanding is correct, out of a circular letter sent by the Minister of May 16, in fact, the decisions with respect to statutory services will be made in Victoria with the exception of the Vancouver Regional District and the Capital Regional District. I'd ask the Minister to clarify that apparent conflict.

In that same letter, at the end of the second paragraph, the Minister mentions: "We have now received a great deal of feedback on the proposed legislation and a number of amendments will be tabled in the legislature." To the best of my knowledge, these amendments have not yet been tabled. I wonder if the Minister will mention when he will bring them forward in order that we may have some time to consider them before committee stage of this bill.

I'm particularly concerned about election details. I hope that the amendments will clarify this. Again as the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) mentioned, the Act does not specify how elections shall be conducted, it simply says that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may prescribe the procedure for the conduct of elections. I would suggest to the Minister that the procedure for the conduct of election should be based on municipal electoral rolls and should be based, insofar as may be applicable, on the electoral procedures of the *Municipal Act*, where that applies on resource boards within the boundaries of the municipality.

Election machinery is of tremendous importance, all the more so of tremendous importance if we're going to get the very low kind of voter turnouts that we've experienced to date. That, I believe, is a section that simply must be clarified, not by regulation but by legislation, before this bill can properly be passed.

The Minister might as well, in closing, make some reaction to the suggestion of provision for consumers of services on the community resource boards. I believe this is something that should be approached with greatest caution in that in general, consumer representatives should be required to be elected like anyone else on those boards.

I'd ask the Minister about the potential difficulties

of boards having the responsibility of delivering specialized services. Let's take for example services relating to the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction, which are specialized and have historically been handled by one

centralized agency throughout the province. Is it the Minister's intention that the community resource board in, say, Prince George or Kamloops or Prince Rupert will be responsible on their own for provision of services relating to alcoholism and drug addiction and numerous other specialized services that could be mentioned?

I'd ask the Minister to comment upon what would be the right of appeal from grant decisions of local boards. Will there be an appeal to the Minister? I can provide no provision for it in the bill.

I would raise with him, as well, and differ with him on the area of local responsibility because it seems to me that this bill does fracture further the principle of local responsibility. What will be the relation of the local municipal councils to the community resource boards? It's not strong enough in the bill, in my opinion. The mayors of the area have the ability to appoint a couple of representatives to the regional board, but I don't believe that's good enough. I ask the Minister if in his deliberations he considered whether the municipal councils themselves might not assume a great many of the duties that he has proposed that these boards should undertake on his behalf.

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: Well, they might have been encouraged further, Mr. Minister.

Finally, I would say to him that I believe the area of Ministerial discretion is far too large. I made a quick count and found in the bill 44 areas of specifically enumerated Ministerial discretion and, of course, various catch-all phrases as well. Sections 54 and 55, as has been mentioned by other Members, are particularly dangerous in this regard.

All in all, it seems to me a bill, which however worthy its intent, is so vague in its presentation at this stage that without an experimental or pilot programme it does not merit passage at this time.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister: This bill has had a fair examination this afternoon and I propose to take no more than three minutes in this debate.

The fact that I find extremely worrying is the powers of delegation, and the fact that aspects of public education could well be put in the hands of these particular boards.

We have had in the last few months, the last few years and even before, a fair number of actions by government which are taken as direct challenges to the people who have served their communities well on school boards and in other areas — municipal councils, library boards and everything else. This particular section, indeed the whole intent of the Act as I can see it, does pose a direct threat to many of the institutions which we have developed. As many of these institutions and many of the local authorities, in my view, have had enough of a hammering in the last few months, I really do wonder whether it's wise at this time to proceed with this type of legislation.

I appreciate the Minister is well intentioned; No one is questioning that. We appreciate the Premier's words in this regard as well. We appreciate the need to try and experiment, to try and get the consumers — as he's referred to the recipients — to get part of the action, to be involved. But the legislation does have an enormous number of aspects which are highly questionable, and there is not, I don't think, at least certainly not in the non-metropolitan areas, much understanding of how they will operate.

The experience of the election, where the Minister himself said it should not be political, yet his own party organization in that area went against the Minister's desires, the experience to date and the legislation which is before us is just, I think, highly questionable. Enough, I believe, has been raised by all Members for me to ask the Minister most seriously and sincerely to take this back for a proper look.

There are too many aspects of delegation — 55 gives, I think, far too wide powers. There are problems concerning election. There are problems concerning changing the boundaries. There are problems with respect to other institutions in the province which have served the people relatively well; all may be improved, but I think that basically our local authorities have done fairly well. I do believe that this particular legislation would cause a great

deal of difficulty.

I most strongly urge the Minister to withdraw it for reconsideration, or perhaps not bring it forward again for another reading during this session of the Legislature.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the Hon. Second Member for Victoria's words will fall on deaf ears as in many instances the House has gone so far as to move amendments or to move motions that bills be withdrawn and studied, and this hasn't happened. I wish him well in his presentation; I would certainly like to echo it myself, but I'm afraid that my confidence is not with the Minister in this aspect that he would.

The Minister said that it is an experiment. He said that he's enlisted, and we know that he has enlisted, a greatly expanded clipping service at public expense to get feedback on this proposal from various communities. He says that he's talked about it all around the province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great concerns is that with

[[Page 3803](#)]

all this clipping service and with all this feedback, this bill, as it's written, shows no indication that the Minister is in any way listening to the people. These are not only the public at large and the consumers of this service, but also the very responsible people who have carried out community programmes in many areas for many years. They are not wedded to a rut, as the Minister suggested, but act in a very sincere and dedicated effort to assist their fellow man in a humane and proper way to bring the matter of social need before their neighbours. We certainly have some of those in our own community.

I have a letter here today from the chairman of our social planning council, a woman who is not in the slightest interested in social prestige and all this nonsense that the Minister and the Premier talk about. The social planning council in the North Okanagan is one of the group that was damned with faint praise by the Premier today. They have a brief which they've sent to me, it's not a brief, it's a comment on the bill, which the Minister has, and nowhere in reading his bill, which was drafted after this, do we see any indication that he is listening to what they have to say.

What has happened in our area, and this is just one example, is that a very effective and useful vehicle representing the community and the consumers, which coordinated our community's services, has been in limbo ever since the Minister announced the programme that he was going to undertake, and they've been shutting down. There's no indication of when our community, which is just one example, is going to be able to proceed.

The Minister has stated publicly that he wants to concentrate in the metropolitan area; that's where the Minister should have taken the advice of one of the former speakers and carried out his pilot project, carried out his experimentation.

One of the major concerns in the province today is that there is too much experimentation going on — too much, too fast, with not enough homework. This legislation, Bill 84, is a classic example.

As a former speaker brought out, elections have taken place, speeches are being made, programmes are being developed and the bill not only wasn't passed in this House; it wasn't even debated. From the words of the people who are helping or supposedly administering the works of this Act in Vancouver, from the consumers who are supposed to benefit from this Act, from the civil liberties people, we find nothing but confusion and concern, nothing but a general consensus that the Act, before it's even debated or passed, is failing all over itself.

Mr. Minister, you stand up and talk about how you want to improve social services in British Columbia. It's a very commendable objective. It's not exclusively this Minister's. But the main thing that the Minister has been doing has been cutting the heads off very useful programmes. He does this, in fact, and then he stands up in this Legislature and says: "We're looking to the community to provide the services."

The care of teenage girls is a very classic example in this province today, Mr. Speaker. Where are these girls? By the words of the Minister's own staff, they are wandering the streets; they are being shipped up north and coming back after two weeks at great expense to the taxpayers of this province.

HON. MR. LEVI: That's nonsense.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Minister, I was in the Interior last week and I had a meeting with a number of workers, on a casual basis, who are deeply concerned about the fact that this Minister has cancelled so many projects and not in fact done his homework and not in fact provided another avenue for treatment. He expects people to become psychiatrists and social workers overnight, and this isn't possible, I have no objection if the Minister wants to cancel any programme, providing he has a vehicle to take its place, providing that people who are trained, responsible and paid to carry out a job, who are dedicated to their work, dedicated to serving people, are not left out on a limb as they are in this province today.

In this bill, Mr. Speaker, there is considerable concern among the professional people as to what their role is going to be. Are they going to be subject to all decisions of the board? Are they subject to the decisions of their own regional director? Are they subject to the decisions of the Minister? This is one of the areas of great concern.

One of the former speakers said that one of the concerns, which I share, in sections 54 and 55 is that the cabinet is trying to divest itself of its responsibility — the responsibility that it was elected to assume and which it is paid to assume. This is verified by the Minister's words himself. Granted, they didn't get very wide publicity, Mr. Speaker, but they did come out in the media at the time that he made it, which was some months ago when he was addressing a group of people.

He said: "No longer will the people of British Columbia be able to blame the Minister if they're not happy with the social welfare services. They'll have to go to their local board." Now if that isn't a blatant admission of a lack of responsibility on the part of a Minister, then I don't know one when I see one. And I believe I do.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, the civil liberties group themselves, who in theory would be in favour of this type of diversification that you're trying to accomplish, are deeply concerned not only about this bill but other bills because they feel — and

[[Page 3804](#)]

many people in British Columbia feel and certainly we in the opposition feel — that this government is really setting up a great number of boards which are, in effect, if you analyse it, a series of specialized courts from which there is little recourse. And each board is going to be very much in danger of becoming a highly specialized, highly powerful structure.

In order to get fair play, you're going to have in many communities people fighting against people, local citizens fighting against local citizens. You're going to have various groups having to fight each other and to fight this powerful select board in order to achieve what may well be very honourable, very necessary and very reasonable programmes.

The Minister keeps talking about the need for efficiency. No one denies that efficiency is an admirable objective. But efficiency, Mr. Speaker, does not necessarily mean fair play. In designing this system as it is in this bill... As one examines it, it does indeed look excellent on paper and in theory until one examines its workability, one examines its cumbersomeness and one examines the whole area of human relations and human responsibility. I suggest, along with others, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should have worked out one or two areas to see whether in fact they will do what he wants to design them to do, and to see if, in fact, people will respond.

In our own area, for example — and the Minister has this paper, a position paper of the social planning council from our area, so I won't go through it — one of the areas that concerns them is that the Minister is imposing concern and programmes from the top, in spite of what he says, and not from the bottom. What they would like to do, if they are going to have community resource boards, is get them started, let them feel their way; let them

experiment too.

Let them undertake some programmes of which they are capable, or move them in a manner which the people will accept. Then let them link directly with the Minister and with the department and the regional director. Don't set them in a position where you're superimposing a regional board over them and nobody knows what they're doing. This is what's happened in Vancouver.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, if you want an example, just take the regional districts in the Okanagan and the Okanagan Basin Water Board. It's taken a long time in British Columbia for people to understand regional districts, to have confidence in them and to accept and support them. They basically do because it hasn't been foisted down their throats. It's given the dedicated people who will....

Interjection.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, judging by this legislation, the Minister thinks that there are some pretty high-flying people around this province. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the Okanagan has accepted regional districts to a degree. I don't say they all like them. It's the regional directors basically, who are dedicated people, who we're looking for for these resource boards. They have worked patiently and slowly and with great effort in the community.

The instance came along where we had a federal-provincial study, and out of that study they wanted to impose a super board over the whole valley and one regional district. I would complement the department in that instance; everyone in that area recognized that to do this was going to destroy all the good work that had been done — that if you want solid and secure progress in a new programme, you have to walk before you can run. It has to be a programme that generates the confidence of the people, both those who are going to receive the benefits and those who are going to support it.

I feel that this statement made by the social planning council in Vernon is indeed very realistic and very well thought out. I would ask the Minister.... Obviously he's going to pass the bill, but we feel that he should do a lot more homework and a lot more study and solve a lot more problems. Don't keep foisting too much in the way of bureaucracy on them to begin with. Let them take their time; let them feel their way. We may, in our area, for example, have some overlapping of services, but not that much. We want to keep the value of the volunteer input as well as the paid input.

I'd also ask the Minister to confirm whether what was said by the Vancouver Resource Board is true, that every community resource board is going to have a manager, an executive assistant, a research assistant, a secretary and other staff as necessary. If this isn't true, why would this be said on a public programme in Vancouver.

What type of staff does the Minister plan to make available? Is it to be in each community where they have a community resource board? If they have them, I hope it will be based on present regional district boundaries where there is a common denominator. Or is it going to be at the resource level?

If the Minister is giving this board, as he does in section 54, power by order-in-council to interfere in the actions of such elected groups as our school boards, our municipal councils, the section, as I understand it, can literally form the basis for taking any duty or any authority or any programme or responsibility which exists under other Acts, such as the *Hospital Act*, and *Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act*, or the *Education Act*, or *Public Schools Act*, and transfer its own authority, including the funds.

Yet the Minister says, in giving them these powers — which frankly I don't support, at this time certainly.... I don't think the public understands it. He says that those who serve on a community resource

[[Page 3805](#)]

board will not receive any remuneration. But the government has suggested that the people on school boards should raise their remuneration, that counselors receive remuneration. What is the....

Interjections.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, if the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) is tired, I guess he's used to working union hours, not legislative hours.

If this is the intention of the Minister to give these community resource boards these powers, why would he then turn around and say that the other boards and the other elected bodies can be paid but these community resource people can't?

I also think there is great danger in the area of paying some people for voluntary services and not others. It is all very well for the Premier to stand up and damn people's motives for taking part in voluntary programmes but my impression, and certainly my experience, has been that the vast majority of people volunteer their services because they are interested, they may have a need in their own life — and there is nothing wrong with that — and because they have a genuine desire to help their fellow man and certainly to help those in need. They often have a genuine desire just to get to know people from other walks of life.

I think that the rest of what I want to say I will discuss in committee.

HON. MR. LEVI: Mr. Speaker, many of the questions raised by the Members were somewhat repetitious. I'll try and just cover the general ones.

First of all, I'm not aware that the Members on the other side have been that concerned about the Act. I don't see any proposed amendments on the order paper. We would welcome them. There will be amendments to the bill. I did meet with the school trustees and with UBCM. I think we had amicable discussions. Certainly there will be some tightening up of the language of the bill. In any case, we wanted to first of all hear your comments before we put in amendments, but there is nothing to stop the Members from putting in amendments.

Let me say a couple of things about turnout. There are jurisdictions in this province that have no elections at all and elect by acclamation. That happens all over this province. For you to suggest that 3,600 people who participated in an election in the Vancouver South area is not very significant — as some people have referred to it... When I was a member of the United Community Services board, the annual meeting used to be attended by about 150 people. When we got on and there was a lot of action on there, the next year, 1971, 1,200 people turned out. Suddenly they became interested in what was going on. Don't tell me that 3,500 people....

Interjection.

HON. MR. LEVI: Madam Member, 3,500 people participating in an election is a damn — excuse me — is a pretty significant.... (Laughter.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order!

HON. MR. LEVI: I withdraw that...number of people, given that every one of them was informed about what was going on, nobody had to put out any money other than the grant we made to the group to run the election, the election was supervised by one of the Members of Mr. Morton's office, and I'm not aware that there were any complaints.

Mr. Member for West Vancouver (Mr. L.A. Williams), I looked at section 40. That is presumably the one you were referring to about eligibility in thy bill. That is the one I presume laid out the eligibility. However, if you have some suggestions about tightening the language I would appreciate it. That is the section in the bill that relates to it.

Interjection.

HON. MR. LEVI: You don't accept it? Well then, by all means let us know....

MR. CHABOT: Clean up your own language.

HON. MR. LEVI: No, no. He's also a lawyer — why not?

Talking about language, I was really quite impressed with some of the language of the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot). I was very impressed with some of the stuff he uses. I'm sure that what he is doing is thinking in French and speaking in English. It really comes out that way.

MRS. JORDAN: At least he's thinking.

HON. MR. LEVI: There have been some questions about an appeal system. In terms of an appeal system one might well ask what appeal system exists to decisions made at the municipal level. As far as I know there are no appeals. You go to council. You ask for a decision and you get it. Where do you go after that?

Interjection.

HON. MR. LEVI: Where do you go? You don't go to the provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER: You go back to the municipalities.

HON. MR. LEVI: Oh, you do. On all kinds of

[[Page 3806](#)]

decisions. That is a very much used function, is it?

Interjection.

HON. MR. LEVI: I don't know of anyone who ever takes it that far. How many cases were there last year?

Interjections.

HON. MR. LEVI: The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) was concerned about cost. There is no cost that will accrue to the municipalities on this. We have in the field a number of people not only in the public service but people who we are funding through grants. Municipalities do not participate in a portion of those grants. Those grants are made completely by the government and that is the process that will continue. We recently announced, as the Member knows, a further reduction in the expense that accrues to municipalities regarding the cheque issuing. The government has a policy of slowly moving toward the assumption of the cost of services to people. This is the direction we are going in. We are not about to turn around and dump it back on. We are gradually moving to take it off.

Let me just say one other thing and then I think we should leave the rest until we get into committee stage.

We inherited an extremely difficult social services system in this province as a direct result of the inability of the previous government to really want to do anything about it. The Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan), who was a cabinet Minister....

AN HON. MEMBER: Garbage.

HON. MR. LEVI: I'll tell you about garbage. It was your government that insisted that if people could crawl they couldn't qualify for the handicapped pension. It was your government, not ours. We don't make those kinds of judgments. We don't make judgments about apprehending children in the way that you people make judgments.

MRS. JORDAN: Speak to the Member for Columbia River about what you do for children.

HON. MR. LEVI: I'm talking to you. You were a cabinet Minister. He wasn't even here.

What we do for children? We've talked about that case. We are dealing with literally hundreds of thousands of

children in the province.

In respect to the section that the Members are concerned about in 54. We saw that and as a result of discussions we have had with the municipal people and other people we only saw the board as a vehicle for other functions that governments want to take place.

Let me give you an example. The government, in cooperation with the Education department, is funding about 40 alternate school models at the moment in the communities. We are providing the child welfare staff and the social work staff that is needed that works with children in the schools. There is a mechanism there. There is a mechanism for a range of involvement. There is no super-Minister power there. You are looking at the community resource board as a funding vehicle for doing this. We are doing it now through the department. We are doing it in terms of the community health and human resources part of the project that is going on with the development group that myself and the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) are sharing in. There is nothing devious about that. It is just a mechanism which enables us to fund programmes outside of the human resources area. That's all.

In certain programmes that we do in the rehabilitation area we do have the opportunity to get 50 cent dollars from Ottawa. That makes good financial sense to do it through the Department of Human Resources where you can get those 50 cent dollars because nobody else can.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say at the moment.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 30

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Strachan	Nimsick	Stupich
Hartley	Calder	Brown
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Williams, R.A.
King	Lea	Young
Radford	Lauk	Nicolson
Kelly	Gabelmann	Lockstead
Gorst	Barnes	Steves
Liden	Webster	Lewis

NAYS — 17

Chabot	Bennett	Smith
Jordan	Fraser	Phillips
Richter	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder	McGeer	Anderson, D.A.
Williams, L.A.	Gardom	Gibson
Wallace	Curtis	

Bill 84, *Community Resources Act*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

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

Copyright © 1974, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada