

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)**

---

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1973**

Afternoon Morning Sitting

[ [Page 489](#) ]

**CONTENTS**

**Routine proceedings**

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act (Bill No. 34) Hon. Mr. Strachan.

Introduction and first reading — [489](#)

Automobile Insurance Act (Bill No. 35) Hon. Mr. Strachan.

Introduction and first reading — [489](#)

The British Columbia Bill of Rights (Bill No. 88) Mr. Wallace.

Introduction and first reading — [490](#)

Budget debate (continued)

Hon. Mr. Levi — [490](#)

Privilege Mr. Chabot on the question of distribution of bills — 494

**Routine proceedings**

Budget debate (continued)

Mr. Phillips — [495](#)

Mr. Curtis — [509](#)

Mr. Rolston — [515](#)

---

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for Cariboo.

**MR. AN. FRASER (Cariboo):** Mr. Speaker and Hon. Members, I would like you to join me in welcoming

two lovely young ladies from my riding that are in the ladies' gallery. The first one is Miss Shirley Schonik, Miss Cariboo. The other one is Miss Quesnel, Miss Sharon Neilson.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Capilano.

**MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver–Capilano):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like the House to join me in welcoming what has become an annual visit from the Grouse Mountain Division of the North Vancouver Girl Guides, 22 guides led by Mrs. Peters and four leaders.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement.

**HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery are six people: Mr. Gordon Wright and Mr. Mike Whittaker from the Family and Children's Service of Victoria, Mr. Frank McDaniel and Dr. Tom Davis from the Catholic Children's Aid Society in Vancouver, and Mrs. Dorothy Beck and Dan Fenny from the Children's Aid Society in Vancouver. I'm sure all of you are familiar with the work that these agencies do and I'd like you to welcome them.

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

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Members to welcome in the ladies' gallery a former Member of the Legislature, our one-time star, Mrs. Kripps.

#### **Introduction of bills.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Highways,

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways):** Mr. Speaker, I have here something and I would like you to be the first to share it with me. Finally, after many years, I have the honour to present a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

### **INSURANCE CORPORATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** His Honour the Lieutenant Governor transmits herewith a bill intituled *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act* and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move the said message and the bill accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

Motion approved.

House in committee on Bill No. 34, Mr. Dent in the chair.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise recommending introduction of the bill.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill No. 34 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. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

## AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** His Honour the Lieutenant Governor transmits herewith a bill intituled Automobile Insurance Act and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the said message and the bill accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

Motion approved.

House in committee on Bill No. 35; Mr. Dent in the chair,

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise recommending the introduction of the bill.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill No. 35 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for a second reading at the next sitting of the House after

[ [Page 490](#) ]

today.

## THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Wallace moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 88 intituled *The British Columbia Bill of Rights*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 88 read a first time and ordered to be placed on the orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

## ON THE BUDGET

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement.

**HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement):** It's been suggested to me this afternoon, as a result of what the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) has done, perhaps I might just have my speech taken as read and sit down. (Laughter). We know where all the action is going to be later on.

However, this is my first opportunity to speak in this session. I had wanted to make some comments, Mr. Speaker, through you, to my friend from Columbia River (Mr. Chabot). I was quite tickled by the fact that he felt that I really did not fit the description of being sophisticated. And I can only agree with him. Bright, beautiful and capable I might be, but not sophisticated. (Laughter).

I do enjoy fat cigars, and I do very much enjoy dressing casually. I hope one day that it might be possible to walk into this House without a tie and not get thrown out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. (Laughter).

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I would like to just direct a notice to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley). Yesterday some of the Press found out that I cycled to work. They came to me and said, "Do you know there's no

parking spaces for cyclists?" And I said, "Have you spoken to the Minister of Public Works?" They said, "Yes, but nothing's happening." I said, "We'll get up a petition and I'll sign it and we'll see what we can do." So, I hope the Minister will take notice of that. That should be arriving on his desk anytime.

Now, to the issue of the debate. I frankly have found that the Opposition's approach to the debate on the budget has been a little shallow and weak. I find that the Hon. First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) unashamedly came out for corporate profits. I hope one day that in this House we will talk about profit, and the whole question of how much profit is going to be acceptable in this society of ours in the future.

It's usually of course from the free enterprisers that we hear the loudest cry about the huge health and welfare bill that this province has to pick up. And I ask the question, are they really paying their share? Obviously they're not, and that's why we must introduce legislation to see that there is a much more equitable distribution of the load in terms of the taxes. So that those who can well afford to pay — pay, giving some relief to the people who can least afford — which is now what is happening at the present time.

Since the House met last fall, in the five months that we've been here, we have established a national presence of credibility for British Columbia that had been missing for several years. In November of 1972 we hosted a conference of Canadian Welfare Ministers and we were able to give leadership, along with Quebec, on issues of reform of the social services area, of guaranteed income, and guaranteed jobs.

We do subscribe to the setting of minimum standards by the federal government. But we reserve the right as nearly all of the provinces do, to have more control over social assistance funds and family allowances. We best know our priorities.

The federal government announced in the throne speech that there would be a substantial increase in the old age security benefits. And we in this Government take some substantial credit for this, in view of the leadership we've given in the five months that we've been in office, in giving to Canada and North America and legislating for the first time minimum income for people over 65 years of age \$200. I think that it was the thrust that we gave last fall in the Legislature and at the conference and other pressures that exist in Ottawa — which I'm sure you're all aware of. This has brought about a real consideration by the present federal government to make substantial increases to the old age security.

I'd like now, Mr. Speaker, to cover a few points in respect to the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement. And what happens in terms of the operation in my department.

I would like first of all to pay a compliment to my staff — the staff of the department. But particularly, the people who were responsible for putting the Mincome into operation. I don't know whether you have any idea what took place from the time we passed the legislation till the time we got the cheques into the mail in December, and we'd committed ourselves to get them into the mail by December 18. On the first issue we sent out 109,000 cheques. We had staff — and I have in mind people like Evan Wood, Art Rippon, and the people from SARD (Social Assistance and Rehabilitation Division) Norm Brooke, who worked many long hours to deliver the

[ [Page 491](#) ]

promise that we had made to the senior citizens that they would get their cheques for Christmas. And it was those people that made that promise a fulfillment. For that I want to thank them.

The main thrust of the department is directed towards our children and specifically, there were 7,000 children that we have in care under the Child Welfare Division. There are as you know, another 3,000 that are under the care of the Children's Aid Societies. The previous Government failed for three years to do anything about staffing in the department. This budget reflects what the department will do in respect to staffing.

As I said, I want to pay tribute to all of my staff because they have suffered heavy case loads in different Ministerial leadership — it was a part-time Ministry until my predecessor took over as a so — called full time Minister. Because of neglect on the part of the previous government, last year we were apprehending over 300

children a month. Taking them from their families and failing to assist those families. Mr. Speaker, this Government's direction is to keep the child in its own home, and remove only as a desperate last resource. To help communities develop resources for children in their own communities and deal with the problems at that level.

There will be no more edifice complex with us. There will be no more warehouses, and no more dumping grounds. Yes, we will have more staff, And with the social workers and case aides, some 30 in number, we hope to start our preventative programme dealing with children in their own homes and helping the parents.

In the past we've been all too ready to place children in care at \$12 a day, or in treatment centres that cost anywhere from \$55 a day to \$82 a day. Placing them often there for years and sometimes never bothering to tell the agencies what our expectations were from the service we purchased — or without any real understanding of the aims of the treatment.

I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, we are going to state our expectations and we will not commit ourselves to limitless purchase of service. We must be accountable first of all, to the child, then to the family and to the taxpayer. Neglect has been supreme of the previous government in this area. I say to the Hon. First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) through you, Mr. Speaker, neglect and indifference — they fail to develop even a philosophy. After all, it was said by a Member of that side that next to our roads our children are our most important resource. When you've said that, I suppose you've said it all. And we'll develop our resources and we'll certainly do right by our children.

All of the Members of this House know of the stories that are out there concerning children. The deserted mother with small children — locked into her house or an apartment, slowly dying inside from that triple, or that multi-burden of being a mother, a father and a housekeeper — and trying to get by on welfare. There is now for her some glimmer of hope through day-care and through the opportunities programme. And let me be frank, that was a programme that the previous government had the foresight to adopt. These programmes get her out of the home and into the main stream of life, even for an all too brief period.

But what about the serious problems — as well as the ones with children? Last January, four Ministers sponsored a drug-dependency conference to which we invited 20 people who were in the field — on the working level, who knew the problem. We asked them to help us develop a position in respect to this problem. I hope that that position will be forthcoming before this Legislature prorogues.

On Wednesday night, I attended a public meeting with my good friend the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace). There were 600 people there who were seeking answers and solutions to the problems of young people on heroin and other drugs.

Prior to that meeting I had dropped in to a meeting of parents — some weeks before. It's the first time that I had ever seen such a meeting of parents who had children on drugs — who were sitting around trying to help one another — trying to grope for solutions to the problem. At that meeting I assured them that this Government would earnestly pursue the provision of service required by these young people.

But let everyone realize that there are no magic solutions, and there are no panaceas. In the first instance we are talking about managing addicts in a human way as medical social problems, and not as criminals. Forty years of the other method has helped create this situation we have today. We are not in the first instance seeking cures — that's for the researchers and the dreamers.

Our challenge is to do something real here and now. It is a problem for all British Columbians and all Canadians to grapple with because we should ask ourselves — "who has not been touched by this problem; who has not been touched?" The Government is aware of the very serious problem that exists and we must do something about it and it is our intention to do so.

We also have a serious problem in respect to the management of children who are seriously disturbed and I can tell the House and the people of British Columbia that the Ministers of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly), myself and at times representatives from the Attorney General's office have been meeting almost on a daily basis dealing with the problems of children and trying to work out some rational system of delivering a

good service.

For the first time — for the first time — you have

[ [Page 492](#) ]

three Ministers of the Crown sitting down and talking to one another about problems which overlap into their departments. We have learned that we had a situation in the previous government where Ministers were not even talking to one another and they had forbidden their staffs to even co-operate. When we came in, we started right off the bat to have meetings between Ministers and allow meetings between deputy Ministers and staff below.

The Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) referred the other day to the Children's Committee, and that is the vehicle that we are trying to develop which will enable us to co-ordinate our efforts.

Let me turn for a moment to the question of day care. In January we announced a \$200,000 capital programme and we invited people who wanted to start non-profit day care operations to apply to us for assistance. Since that time we have granted to 11 centres substantial amounts of money to get centres operating in all parts of the province.

We have a commitment that we will give \$2,500 to these operations in order for them to provide equipment for these centres. At the moment we have under review five more. There has been a lot of public discussion about provision of service for under three's. At the present time there are 12 operations which provide service for under three's in this province. We realize that this is a very serious need and we have been meeting again daily on the question of making provision of this kind of service. The reason that we are meeting and why there must be concern is because there is an extremely heavy cost factor in providing this kind of service because the staff ratio is almost twice what it is in the ordinary care centre.

There has also been discussion about the provision of day care on a 24 hour a day basis. We are now aware that it does operate in one city — Atlanta, Georgia — and there are some operations in New York which we will be looking at to see if this is an appropriate service for us or whether we can develop a service of our own based on other people's experience. It is extremely important for us at the moment to collect all of the relevant information before we make any decision about that at all.

It is our intention to broaden the availability of day care and we are aware that there is tremendous frustration out there with the people because they had great difficulty with the regulations and the standards. As a result of this we decided to open up a day care information centre. It is now operating in the Vancouver area, we having settled our differences with people last week. Through that office we expect to get a great deal of information on what the problems are from people not only in the lower mainland area but throughout the rest of the province. We have asked people now to contact our local offices and let us know what it is they want and what they want to suggest about standards.

Particularly in the Vancouver area, our basic problem has been that until very recently the city has been unwilling to fulfill its role in a meaningful way on the inspections, but I have now been assured by the city council of Vancouver that they are hiring staff and they are going to co-operate in every way possible to expedite the setting up of day care centres. For this we are extremely grateful.

In view of the, number of problems that are related in the children's area — I have covered some of them just now — we have decided that we want to initiate a study to review services in children's services that are available, a study of all the legislation affecting children, so that we can have a clear statement of objectives and some consolidated legislation with which to work. We expect that this study will take about two years. We are anxious to receive the broadest amount of input from the community and the specialists.

It should be understood that the review will be taking place and the planning and implementation of service to children will be carrying on — because we have plans and we can carry on with these — with the ones that we have already put into operation and the ones that we have planned. But the important thing is that we must do this

review to rationalize the whole legislative system and the delivery of service. So I will be announcing shortly the composition of the committee and inviting the public to become involved in this review.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another concern of the department. That is the question of how service is delivered to people who need it. Some people in the field, myself among them, have long held the view that there is a severe crisis in respect to service.

In almost every community we have a multitude of services that overlap and are duplicated or are inadequate or are just plain bad. In some areas there is even open warfare between agencies and there are defensive empires that have been developed over the years. There is even an enormous amount of confusion. The sum total of this is that the consumer gets inadequate service and millions and millions of dollars are wasted every year. Certainly there are agencies that give good service on an individual basis, but the system is not an agency and it's the source of all of these agencies. It's that system that we have to improve.

Three years ago the Capital Regional District in the Victoria area was the subject of a study which dealt with the question of integrating service. It's a popular phrase. Let's rationalize the service. Perhaps we might save some money, perhaps we might deliver some better service. In my view it means agencies being concerned with service to people — and they have to be concerned about people and not their own survival.

[ [Page 493](#) ]

The study showed a morass of services overlapping, un-integrated and outdated. They made three recommendations about how this service could be co-ordinated and operated. They said that either integration should take place through the vehicle of the Capital Regional District, or it should be done by a separate new structure, or it should be done by the provincial government.

I've had a great deal of discussion with a number of people and I want to say here that in my meetings with agencies and municipal officials, I have made it quite clear in the first instance that I was committed to be democratic and cannot involve people at the grass roots level.

I'm announcing here today that legislation will be brought in during the session to enable my department to take over the administration of the welfare system and the care of children within the Capital Regional District. I am convinced that we must do this in order to make integration work. In any case, we finance the whole operation and we finance most of the administration costs of the municipalities. Let me give you briefly some rationalizations for this. We say that the province has the expertise to deliver the social services. The province has the fiscal powers and the province has the legislative powers, and it doesn't make any sense to separate the legislation from the administration and programme delivery. We are not anxious to create a number of large bureaucracies across the province. It is difficult to communicate through separate organizations. We are more able to maintain a constant high standard of service and the provincial regional model does and is working well.

There is more flexibility in the placement of staff it is desirable to have the authority and responsibility in the same agency. There is greater economy in utilizing centralized services and less bureaucratic build-up and duplication of these services.

Now, let me say this. The crunch in terms of integration of service in this region is going to depend on the kind of leadership that myself and the people in the department will give. That is the essential thing. I have made my basic commitment to do this over a number of years, and I think that the time is now for us to do it and see once and for all whether this thing can be rationalized. That is the intention of our party.

It is our intention to divide the Vancouver Island region into two regions and the Capital Regional District will be one region operated by a regional director.

One of the serious concerns that people have about the route that we are going — and certainly you can have the same concern with the other two methods that were suggested — is how much citizen input we have in terms of the planning and the operation of this kind of model. It does not follow that, because the government wishes to

control this kind of situation in the first instance, it cannot work well, cannot be democratic and cannot involve people at the grass roots level in the decision making. It is our intention — and we have gone further than the recommendations in the report to involve the local citizenry. This is absolutely essential if this is to work.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the commitment of my department and this government that once the Capital Regional District board has shown that it is able, in terms of staff expertise, to take over this operation, we will not hesitate to hand it over to them. That is the direction that we finally want to go in; a regional distribution of services through the obvious vehicle, the regional district.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to say this. In taking over the Family and Children's Service that has given over the years a high quality of service, we need to integrate this. I have met with the staff and with the officials of the agency and they understand what is taking place. As I introduced all of the people in the House at the beginning of the session today, I have met with them; they are aware of it. The mayors of the municipalities have been advised of this. We've had discussions.

I want people in the community to understand that because we are going to operate this in the first instance because, as I have said, we need this model, we continue to need the support of the people out there who have an interest in this field. We hope that they will continue to have this kind of interest. We're going to be as flexible as possible but we want to be able to try this model because it's something that we want to be able to do throughout the whole province.

There is one other topic, Mr. Speaker, that I want to cover. It is a vital concern to a large number of people who are connected with the United Way or the Community Chest or the United Good Neighbourhood Fund — the whole area of the voluntary donor. I know this area. I spent 2 1/2 years on the board of the United Community Services. That was an experience, I can tell you.

My views are well known to these people, as are the views of the Premier. We want to state that we know that the government has an obligation to pick up some of the services that these voluntary dollars provide. It has been estimated that about \$10 million of voluntary money is provided for the health and welfare areas from the voluntary dollar.

To obtain this money takes an enormous amount of organization involving thousands of volunteers whose task is always a difficult one. I candidly admit it is a task that has not been made easier, perhaps, by my statements in the past. However, I'm not going to equivocate. It's getting tougher to raise the kind of money that agencies need. The 3 per cent yearly increase in the budget does not make much impact on

[ [Page 494](#) ]

agency service.

But what I want to say is this. I am now asking the boards of the United Community Services, of the United Good Neighbourhood Funds, of the Community Chests across the province to tell the government what services you want us to pick up.

There is a role and a very real role for the voluntary sector. But in our opinion, that role is one of innovative service and not of continual financing of long-standing operations.

Of course it's been said many times that our approach is that once a service has been developed and demonstrated that it is a necessary people's service, then it has to be picked up by the government. This government is committed to paying for services to people from general revenue.

So I say again to the agencies out there: let us know; really let us know. I've asked this question before and have yet to receive an answer. Let us know what it is that you want us to pick up.

I know that they are waiting out there to arrange their campaigns and to set their goals. I say to them, "Look it



your problem realistically, consult with us, and we will give you an immediate answer on what your proposals are."

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say one other word about the people who volunteer in the service-to-people field. In this province thousands and thousands of people spend millions of hours helping other people in their communities. No government could ever deliver that comprehensive kind of service that these people help to contribute to without their help. We're aware of this and we will always be aware of it.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, let me on behalf of the Government and, I hope, on behalf of the Legislature, pay real recognition to the contribution of the volunteer who helps people in his own community.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I believe the Hon. Member is rising on something. What is it?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you rising in this debate, or what?

**MR. CHABOT:** I'm rising on a point of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Well then, please state it; that you are rising on some point.

**MR. CHABOT:** I'm waiting for recognition.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for Columbia River rises on some point.

**MR. CHABOT:** On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** What is your point of privilege?

**MR. CHABOT:** A little earlier in the day, the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) introduced two message bills. Prior to the introduction, instructions had been issued that the bills would be available to the Press first. Those are the instructions we were told.

We haven't been able to obtain these message bills at the Sergeant-at-Arms' office; it's the first time in this assembly when a message bill has not been available to a Member by walking out and going to the Sergeant-at-Arms' office.

This bill, which is still not available to the Members, has gone out on the air; it's on radio, television and in the newspapers at this time. I think it's really a shocking example of the lack of respect of Members of this assembly. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that you would advise that Government over there to stop deliberately trampling and abusing the rights and privileges of the Members of this assembly forthwith.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Member, the Hon. House Leader for the official Opposition (Mr. Richter) was in communication with the Speaker earlier. As a result of that, I made inquiries and I received the information from the Sergeant-at-Arms that no authority was given to any member of his staff to issue any bill before being introduced in the House.

No bill was issued by any member of his staff until it had been introduced in the House. No message bill was in their possession nor did they have it to distribute until it was introduced in the House.

He further advised me that a copy of the bill had been supplied to the House Leader at the precise time it was introduced in the House.

So those are the facts I have from the House Leader. I'll be glad to look into it further if the Hon. Member wishes to press the matter.

**MR. CHABOT:** Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm making — it's not a question of obtaining the bill prior to its

introduction in the House, but its availability shortly thereafter from the Sergeant-at-Arms office. It was not available. It was deliberately denied to the Members of this assembly. Instructions were issued that it should be available to the Press first.

Our House Leader does not have a copy of that bill. He informed me of this ...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. I have a suggestion for the Hon. Member that a motion be put on the order paper by the Hon. Member to ask a committee on privileges to examine into the question if you wish to

[ [Page 495](#) ]

do so. I think that's the proper course.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, are not the bills placed on the table available to all Members once they're on the table?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Exactly. As a matter of fact, Hon. Members...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order. Hon. Members, the bills of this House, when they are produced in this House and placed on the table, are the property of any Member to examine.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Are you defending the Government or the Chair?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't know all the facts, Hon. Members. I suggest that if you want to examine them further, I'd be pleased to do so.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that when you are examining this situation, you would examine why the Speaker of the House is defending the Government in an irate manner rather than the rights of the Chair and the Members of this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I want to point out that I immediately took action to investigate the problem as soon as it was brought to my attention by the Hon. House Leader (Mr. Richter).

I related the information to the House that I've discovered. If the Hon. Member is not satisfied, I'd be the first to ask that it be investigated further. In that extent, I'm not defending anyone; I'm not attacking anyone.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Then don't...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now, please, there are certain rules of respect required in this House, I try to observe them, I expect other Members to do the same. Now will we proceed with the debate. The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to take my place in this debate. My heart was so full of goodwill when I came in here this afternoon. Now this episode has left me with a big, fat question-mark in my mind. Some of the goodwill that was in my heart, Mr. Speaker...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Address the Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of that goodwill has sort of left my heart. I will proceed with...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Try to silence your Members, Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm the fourth speaker from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition — or Her Majesty's government in exile, whichever you prefer — to take our place in this debate, I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that we have tried on this side of the House to be constructively critical of the budget speech, and to point out to the wonderful citizens of British Columbia where it has maybe the odd thing that hasn't been done properly. This is the attitude we intend to keep on this side of the House in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that that was the attitude of the Government when they were in Opposition last year. I read a few notes out of *Hansard* and last year's budget was called a "fuss budget" by who else than the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan). He also called it a "fudge budget", Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan). He also called it a "fudge budget."

Even the now Premier, Mr. Speaker, said all kinds of nasty things about the budget. But we on this side of the House are constructive and will remain so.

Mr. Speaker, before I start my talk about the budget, I want to mention some remarks that were made in the House yesterday afternoon by the Hon. Minister without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Calder), the Member for Atlin. Finally, when he caught up with what was going on in the Legislature, he announced that he was going to promote aid for rural students to attend post-secondary educational institutions. I guess that was after he looked at the order paper and saw that I was going to introduce two private Member's bills.

He went on to say that he was going to announce that he was going to promote an air ambulance service for the province, Mr. Speaker. If the Member for Atlin will look at the order paper — and if he had looked at it yesterday — he would have seen that I have served notice to introduce two bills: one, the Rural Student Travel Aid Fund, which will be a perpetual fund, the proceeds of which could be used for subsidizing the travel of rural students in designated areas attending post-secondary institutions. It would provide funds for them to have the opportunity to visit their families in their home communities during vacations, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I didn't introduce the bill yesterday, Mr. Speaker, is because I wanted to talk on those two subjects in my talk today. That's the reason they weren't introduced yesterday.

[ [Page 496](#) ]

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Respect for the House.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Yes I have respect for the House and I have respect for the Speaker, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, will always hold you in the highest regard. I want you to know that.

The air ambulance bill will permit the government to provide for ambulance services in remote areas. Later, while interviewed on television, the Hon. Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder) indicated he was going to put a motion on the order paper supporting these two ideas.

**MR. CHABOT:** Expression of opinion; that's all that is.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, what is actually going on over there, because I think the Minister without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Calder) should get together with the Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder) and get specific legislation covering these two points through to his cabinet colleagues in the caucus.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** They're not speaking.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** That appears to be the situation on all of the legislation that they are expected to bring into this House, Mr. Speaker, because there hasn't been very much of it introduced this far in the session. I think that's why the Press says it's such a "dead" session.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** I think there are other reasons.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** There are.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is speaking for himself.

The Member for Atlin was giving this House a complete snow job yesterday afternoon. Then he went on to continue the snow job over television by suggesting that a motion for consideration was the same as the real goods, Mr. Speaker — which I have put on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that the ideas expressed over on the other side of the House should be on the legislative order paper too, so that the people of British Columbia can see what this Government intends to do about policy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Member, I draw to your attention that the Hon. Speaker before me ruled that the words "snow job" were not really acceptable — especially in Victoria. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** We in the north, Mr. Speaker, because of the weather, recognize snow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Not down here. Not here.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, what words should I use, Mr. Speaker — pulling the wool over somebody's eyes?

**MR. SPEAKER:** He ruled that out, too. (Laughter). And also "stacked deck," if I remember rightly. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, do you get the message? As long as you get the message, Mr. Speaker, that is the intent of my well-chosen words here this afternoon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Well-chosen is hardly it.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that instead of the vaudeville performances which are coming — particularly from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) in his posturings on the international stage; his meeting with the Prime Minister, which clearly did not cover him with any glory as far as his understanding of protocol is concerned...dealings between governments...

**AN HON. MEMBER:** He even phoned a janitor in the White House.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Right...his recent episode yesterday involving a grandiose telephone conversation with one of the janitors in the White House; all of these are no real substitute for clearcut policy, decision making and leadership, Mr. Speaker. Oh, the Speakers have changed. (Mr. Dent in the chair).

For the people of the north it's actions on the statute books that count, and the Government opposite is building up an incredible record of waffling on legislation that should be discussed by the Members of this Legislature.

I would suggest, insofar as the Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder) is concerned that he get off his \$33,000-a-year chair and start talking to his colleagues, Mr. Speaker. You're a Member from the north, Mr. Speaker. I suggest you urge him to do just that.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** \$54,000.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I hope, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will support the legislation that I'm going to bring in on these two very, very important subjects to the people — not only of the north, but to all rural areas of British Columbia. I will be introducing the legislation on

Monday, Mr. Speaker.

The people of northern British Columbia are down-to-earth, practical people. They want this legislation. They will recognize who brought forward to the floor of this House the idea, before it was brought in by the Member for Atlin, Mr. Speaker.

It's a sad situation, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition in this House have far more practical legislative proposals on the order paper than the Government opposite. If you look at the legislation that the Opposition has brought in, you don't have to be too intelligent to recognize that we have tabled our legislative programme already. If the Government isn't going to bring theirs in, I wish they'd give us the opportunity to debate ours.

If he's so strong in support of air ambulance service for remote areas in British Columbia, and if he is sincere about seeking aid to rural students, then he has a great opportunity to support the legislation that I will be introducing.

Now I listened with awe — actually with awe. It was unbelievable, Mr. Speaker — it was unbelievable awe, (Laughter). When the Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder), and I wish the Member were in the House, the Minister without Portfolio — I wish he were in the House. But he is very seldom in the House lately; very seldom in the House, Mr. Speaker.

He was in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, while he gave a speech. I would like to read to the House — although I'm almost ashamed to read some of the words from the Member for Atlin yesterday afternoon.

He goes on to say, "What does this road mean to the economy of British Columbia?" And he is talking about the Stewart-Cassiar road. "I would remind the Members that this road now has resulted in the shortest link between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington by 1,000 miles. When in full use it will take at least 50 per cent of the traffic away from the Alaska Highway. Mr. Speaker, I think on this basis no longer will you hear the demand to pave the Alaska Highway."

I would like to remind the Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder), Mr. Speaker, that it was the development of the area around the Alaska Highway that allowed his Minister of Finance to stand in the House last Friday and introduce a budget that is a balanced budget. A lot of the development in the Peace River area and surrounding the Alaska Highway, that has opened up resource industries, that has allowed the Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder) to live in the lap of luxury.

I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Minister of Finance, very disappointed when a Member of your cabinet could be so parochial, so narrow-minded in his thinking that he says, "I've got my Stewart-Cassiar road, we don't any more need the Alaska Highway." If that is the type of narrow-minded, selfish, greedy thinking of the Member for Atlin it's...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** There it is. There's his words. They're right there for everybody to see.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order. I would draw your attention to standing order No. 17, part 2, which forbids the use of offensive words and I ask you to withdraw the word "greedy".

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Is greedy an offensive word? I'll withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member for Atlin that it was over the dust and the rocks on the Alaska Highway that truckers drove to carry the machines to build his Stewart-Cassiar road. It was the Alaska Highway that was substantially the vehicle through which the Asbestos Cassiar was developed, Mr. Speaker, which is in his riding.

Commerce along the Alaska Highway brought economy, education and hospital facilities to many of his

native friends. Now that he's got his highway, Mr. Speaker, he no longer needs the Alaska Highway. It was the Alaska Highway that was responsible for opening up the oil patch, which is where practically the entire petroleum and oil industry in British Columbia is — in that area.

Had it not been for the Alaska Highway, maybe, the millions of dollars that came into the government coffers just recently from that land sale would not have happened. You're not trying to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, maybe, but you're trying to give it a good swift kick, I'll have a little more to say about that later.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, that this Government wants to forget the people that have been eating dust on the Alaska Highway for 30 years. They no longer, now that they've got their Stewart-Cassiar road, can see the potential of what would happen if the Alaska Highway were paved.

The Member from Stewart doesn't realize that 80 per cent of the people in North America live on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains, whether it's in the United States or in Canada. He doesn't realize the potential tourist travel. He can't see the circular route from up to Watson Lake and across and down, making one of the most scenic tours in North America. The Member for Atlin (Hon. Mr. Calder) cannot see that, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that I've lost a lot of faith in the Member for Atlin since I heard him utter those words in this House yesterday afternoon. I stood in this Legislature for three years, Mr. Speaker, and promoted...

[ [Page 498](#) ]

**HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance):** And then what happened? (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** That's all right for the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance to make snide remarks, but what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is very serious and you wouldn't even know because I doubt if you've been north of the 53rd parallel. Like the rest of your colleagues over there, you don't know what's up there and you really don't care. Don't make snide remarks until you go up there and can talk on an intelligent basis.

I stood in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, for three years when I was a Member from 1966 to 1969 and urged the then government to complete...

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** You mean in your driveway?

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well I'm glad somebody on that side of the House has been north of the 53rd parallel, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, you and the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) are about the only two that have been.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Check your facts. Check your facts.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, order.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'm going to say what I was going to say if it takes me all afternoon. I stood in this Legislature while a Member from the South Peace from 1966 to 1969 and urged the then government to complete the construction of the Stewart-Cassiar road.

If my thinking ever became that parochial, that narrow-minded, Mr. Speaker, or if my thinking ever became greedy — and I talk about myself — I would hope that I would never be in public life, Mr. Speaker. And I mean it sincerely.

I think the Members from the north have enough trouble selling no matter what government is in on the benefits of developing the north, and I don't care whether it's a Social Credit government or a Liberal government or an NDP government. The Members from the north have got to stick together, Mr. Speaker, because they have to point out to the rest of the province what the value of developing the north is and what the benefits are.

When we get a Member of the cabinet standing in this Legislature and uttering those words that were uttered yesterday afternoon Mr. Speaker, I don't know what politics is coming to. I really don't. I think politics must be getting political, that's right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was one week ago today that I was able to sit in this Legislature and watch our Premier as he bubbled with pride and stuck out his chest and read his great words of wisdom which were concealed in the budget speech. Mr. Speaker, he had a very difficult time concealing his emotions of pride. Every now and again his face twisted in a great smile and we all realized that this was his great day. This was his great day at spending the well-heeled bank accounts, the legacy that was left by the shrewd financing of the previous Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Bennett).

I took the odd time that I was able to take my eyes off the Premier to look around at his back bench — and man, were they ever proud of you. Oh, were they ever proud, because they knew you were giving them a raise, Mr. Minister of Finance.

I think it must have slipped out because man it was just... it was a fairly long speech and I was actually disappointed when you finished. Great speech, Mr. Speaker, great performance by the Premier and I guess that we can probably look forward to another one or two.

However, the budget wasn't that good. I'm not going to go into the good news and bad news. It was, I think, the first big swing of the club from "big brother" socialism against "bad brother" business. It really didn't kill business. But they did wake up the next morning and realize that they'd been hit, but they didn't know how bad. It's like a blow on the head. You know you may have a headache the next day, but until you go get an X-ray you're not really sure. There may be some blood vessels burst inside, and it takes a little while until you get a chance to really come alive for a little while and realize just how bad you have been hit.

Well, I'm in business. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they haven't been killed. They weren't hit on the head as hard as they had anticipated. But the problem is they really don't know, Mr. Speaker, where that next blow's going to come, because they know that club is still up there. It's still there, still hanging above their head. It's like an axe — what's the old saying — it's like having an axe over your head. Oh, will the next blow be bigger? Oh, Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) took the opportunity last Tuesday to swing the big club again. Yes, he swung it again. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but he didn't swing the club at all segments of industry. He just sort of tapped the real estate people. The real estate salesmen, he touched them up a little bit just to sort of make them come to attention and get ready for the next blow, because it'll be coming for them too. Yes, Mr. Attorney General, you did. You caused them a lot of sleepless nights.

He stood very proudly in the House and said, "Jobs — there's \$64 million in the budget for jobs." How many jobs is that going to create, Mr. Speaker?

[ [Page 499](#) ]

And for how long? Is the Government planning on becoming the biggest employer in the province? Or, Mr. Speaker, are they going to create an atmosphere so that private industry can be the biggest employer? What is the intention? Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General didn't go on to explain how this \$64 million was going to create jobs and for how long. He just came out in his usual wonderful way and said, "There's \$64 million in there for jobs." But there is a lot left unsaid, Mr. Speaker, a lot left unsaid.

Mr. Speaker, there are about three points in this budget that I want to talk about. The first one is the increase by 20 per cent of corporation tax. I feel, Mr. Speaker, this was not done because it was needed, but was done to appease the Waffle group of the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying this to be political. I actually sincerely mean it. I actually sincerely mean it, because I think the hotheads in the party forced the Minister of Finance. You know he said himself that any increase is not really necessary — but we've got to do something to appease those guys out there, or boy, we're going to be in trouble. He and his cabinet sat down, Mr. Speaker, and they said, "What can we do to appease those hotheads out there, those guys that don't understand business and never will — but we've got to do something, because otherwise at their next convention they are just going to give us 'you know what.' That's what they'll do."

Isn't that a fact? And I think some of his own backbench said, "You had better get after that big nasty business — you had better touch him up a little bit or we are going to be in trouble because during the last election we said that we're going to get those big guys yes sir, we're going to get them."

And the votes rolled on.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Yes, all 38 of them.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** But that's going to be your downfall though, Mr. Premier. That's going to be your downfall.

Now the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, since he has taken over a new portfolio has been a great one for giving the best advice. He says he stood in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he said, "We're going to get the best advice possible in everything we can do. We are going to employ the best brains in the province. We are going to have commissions, and furthermore when we get that advice, when we get all these reports, Mr. Speaker, we are going to listen to them."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish that the Minister of Finance would listen to what I consider to be some pretty sound advice from the Economic Council of Canada. Last November, they tabled their ninth annual report and they said that governments can hold the line on taxes for the next few years and perhaps even reduce them. Is that good advice, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, is that good advice from the Economic Council of Canada?

Have you got the report there, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** The council went on to say that in its ninth annual review of the economy "made public last Thursday," that was in November — the council says it "expects the growth of the economy to adequately finance all government programmes. "New ones as well as existing one.

Now there's some advice for the Minister of Finance. Where is he? He's left the House. Would you pass the message on to him, Mr. Speaker, through you to Mr. Attorney General. Tell him that he should listen to this advice. This is good sound advice.

Ah, but there is a point in this report. A very important point. The point is this: that expected increase in economic growth should produce enough revenue.

You know, the spin-off from the increased revenue will produce more taxes to look after these programmes because we are already heavily taxed enough. But there is the key, Mr. Speaker. There is the key — anticipated growth. And I honestly believe that the Premier, Mr. Speaker, doesn't anticipate any growth in the Province of British Columbia, so in order to maintain his tax base — in order to maintain the present amount of taxes coming in — he has to increase the taxes on the existing business.

Because there will be no increase. Is that what this budget is all about?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No progress in the economy.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, I don't know, Mr. Attorney General. I think you think the same as your Minister of Finance — because you said here on January 31, when you were speaking in the throne debate — you said, "Our



forecast is for a very good year in terms of capital expenditure in 1973 — at about the same level — around \$3.6 billion." Which is referring to expenditures in 1972. So you must sit very close to the Premier, Mr. Attorney General. Very close to the Premier and the cabinet Ministers, because you have him thinking now that there isn't going to be any growth. So in order to keep the same tax coming in, we have to increase the taxes and this is the situation that is in this budget. It is a no-growth, no expected growth budget.

How they can stand on the floor of this Legislature and try and tell us in one breath that they want

[ [Page 500](#) ]

growth and then the backbenchers stand up and they say, "We are a no-growth — we don't need any more growth. We don't need any more roads. We don't need any more this. We don't need any more that. We are quite happy — we are quite content."

**MR. CHABOT:** More money though, more money.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, I'll talk about the money situation in just a few moments, Mr. Member.

Mr. Attorney General, you have experts in your Department of Industrial Development. And they will tell you, Mr. Speaker, they will tell the Attorney General that there is no such thing as a no-growth policy. You either have growth or you have recession. There is no way you can stand still.

**HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources):** You don't think you're growing any more do you?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'll talk to you a little later — I just hope you stay in the House. I'm coming to the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources. I just hope he stays in the House, Mr. Speaker, because as a matter of fact I am going to be talking to you in the very near future. As a matter of fact I am going to be talking to you this afternoon.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, please. Please address the Chair.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the benefit to the province of increasing, or at least putting a tax on invested capital in the business? All I can see that this is going to do, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that you keep as little operating capital in your business as possible. If you happen to be an international or multi-province company you will keep your operations in Alberta — I won't say Manitoba and Saskatchewan — in Alberta and Ontario and Quebec. You will keep them with all your free, employed capital. This is kind of a stupid thing to me. It really is.

The Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk) knows better than that. He's a lawyer, criminal lawyer, but he must know something about business.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No, no.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Oh yes he does, he's been on cases where he has been sued by income tax and all that sort of stuff, he knows something about it — give him credit for that. Why don't you get into the cabinet and straighten those guys out?

**MR. CHABOT:** He's trying.

**MRS. JORDAN:** He wants to get in there and do a good job.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to quote some more of what the Economic Council said — but I want to make another point here before I leave this one on the increase in corporation tax.

I want to make one other point, and that point is that the Economic Council feels that inflation is one of the

greatest problems in North America today. That is why they recommend reduction of average rate of unemployment. They recommend maintaining price increases to a level of 3 per cent. They recommend increasing consumer spending by an average of 5.5 per cent before inflation.

One of the reasons for this Economic Council's report is to point out that if the line is not held in taxation, and if these recommendations are not followed, that we are going to be in problems with inflation. More so than we are today, Mr. Speaker. And I want this to be read into the record; that inflation is the biggest problem that we have in the world today — and just witness what happened in the money markets.

Anybody that knows anything about business at all will recognize that if something isn't done about inflation — giving an extra \$15 or \$20 to the people who are on fixed incomes will do absolutely nothing. You are going to have to be talking about giving them \$125 a month more in the very near future. This is the problem. This is the root of the problem and this is where this Government has the opportunity to lead the way. And you haven't led the way. You haven't led the way in this budget, Mr. Speaker.

I predict that this budget will have a greater devastating effect on the economy of British Columbia — more so than the devaluation of the U.S. dollar, which recently happened.

I want to talk for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, on the royalty that has been imposed on the petroleum industry. I am glad to see that the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) is in his seat.

I think, Mr. Minister, that this must be another case of appeasing the Waffle wing of the socialist party — I really do. I don't think anybody in their true mind that knows anything about business would impose this royalty on the petroleum industry at this time. It will certainly be a devastating blow against the economy of the Peace River area.

I predict that there is no way that this Government will sock another \$9 million out of the petroleum industry, because the petroleum industry won't stand for it. And the increases in activity that were expected to produce this \$9 million will not occur, Mr. Speaker. You will drive the petroleum

[ [Page 501](#) ]

industry out of British Columbia in the same manner that Tommy Douglas drove the petroleum industry out of Saskatchewan. Make no mistake about it — he did! Make no mistake about it.

**MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre):** Did he take the oil with him?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** No, the oil is still in the ground.

This increase in the crude oil royalty is unrealistic and will cause a sharp drop in both exploration and revenue from land sales. So, you will not have achieved, Mr. Speaker, what you originally set out to achieve. You will not get that extra \$9 million.

It's all very well and good for the Attorney General to stand on the floor of this Legislature and say that the north has been raped and there are gases being sold to those dastardly Americans. But, the truth of the matter is, and the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) knows it as well as I know it, that had that market not been established — and I want to hasten to say that I think we should renegotiate our gas export price. I'll agree with that. But, just to stand up here and say that the north has been devastated and our resources are flowing out and we're getting no return is not a credible remark for a man in the Attorney General's position to make. And you know it, Mr. Attorney General. It sounds good on the floor of the House, and it sounds good in the Press, and it sounds good to your Waffle group but let's stick to some facts.

Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is holding the portfolio that holds the key to the future of British Columbia — industrial development. I hope that we don't have to learn the lesson, the same as Saskatchewan did, the hard way. Your policies look 100 per cent on paper. But where have they worked? This is the

question, Mr. Speaker, where have they worked?

**MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert):** Out in the world.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** They haven't worked in the world. They didn't work in Saskatchewan. And I'll give you some information my friends on the backbench, before this Legislature is over, about how they're working in Manitoba — what I mean to say is how they're not working in Manitoba. You do the research yourself.

Before the backbench starts urging their cabinet to do all these motherhood things about stopping the raping of our land, and stopping the desecration of our natural resources and stopping the giving of the coal away, they want to sit down and they want to take a good hard look at what is really going on. Because all of these motherhood clauses that they put in look all right in the Press. But when the employment in this province declines, and when the economy declines and there are no taxes coming in to carry on the social programmes that you souls dearly want to bring in, then you will have a problem.

I want to give you a fact about the petroleum industry, Mr. Speaker. At the end of 1971 the petroleum industry had invested \$1.27 billion in the province for development and production, and had recovered only \$694 million before payment of taxes. Now, that's how the petroleum industry is ripping off the profits. Those are facts. They're not ideological statements. They're cold hard facts. But you've got to realize that where the petroleum is in British Columbia — it's not the easiest to find...

**MR. LAUK:** Not the hardest either.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, you stack it up, Mr. Member for Vancouver Centre, you stack it up with the world resources of petroleum. You will find out that it's not the easiest to find. Exploration is very difficult — it can only be carried on in the winter because of the terrain.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** It's costly.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Yes, it's costly. The terrain is very rugged. And when the drilling is carried on, it's not like planning large pools, which there are in Alberta. You might have a pool here, and over here you might have to go down — and I don't know how to explain it in geological terms. But it's not that easy.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well now, Mr. Attorney General, you're an intelligent man — I'll give you credit for being an intelligent man. And I'll also give you intelligence for having to satisfy your Waffle group.

But when this Waffle — group goes in the bread lineup, Mr. Speaker, they won't waffle so much then.

The industry has made a substantial contribution to the economic growth of north-eastern British Columbia over the past two decades and the continued wealth of that area is very dependent on this industry.

Now, it's all very well and good for some of the Members in this Legislature who don't have the petroleum industry in their riding. You know it's like me saying, "Don't take any of the fish out of the Prince Rupert area. No, leave the fish there — my heavens, the fish are all going to be gone." Or saying to somebody that's in the forest industry, "Let's tax that forest industry so it grinds to a halt." That's all right. But that's the type of narrow-minded thinking that prevails on that side of the House. You have to have a government, Mr. Speaker, that works for the good of the whole Province of British Columbia.

[ [Page 502](#) ]

When I was on the Government side of the House, I didn't just talk to my riding. I tried to think of it in terms of the development of the whole province, in broad terms. I've heard some statements from that side of the House during the previous debate and this debate that would lead one to believe that Members in the backbench on the Government side, Mr. Speaker, are interested only in their own ridings. In other words, "If it isn't in my riding close

her down, I don't care. The kids can go hungry and we take all those people who depend on this industry who have worked for this industry for years — they can close it down it doesn't matter to us." And that's what's going to happen to the petroleum industry. In the Peace River — you mark my words. I want it written in the record that the petroleum industry in the Peace River area within four years will be practically nothing.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'll talk to you later, Mr. Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick). And when that day comes, Mr. Speaker, I will stand in this House and say, "I told you so." Yes, you better believe I will.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You won't get the opportunity.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Ah, you people are listening and it's hurting your conscience and I'm glad. I hope you go back to caucus and say, "We should listen to the Member for South Peace River because he knows what he's talking about." (Laughter).

Funds available for increasingly expensive exploration in drilling will be greatly reduced and new capital investment — particularly risked capital required by the petroleum industry — will not be available unless an adequate after tax return is obtainable.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I agree that we renegotiate some of our natural gas contracts — Mr. Attorney General, are you listening? But, I still think a man in the Attorney General's position should not stand in this House and make statements — well, I wouldn't say they are misleading no, that's unparliamentary. But they sure sort of misled me.

Now, let me see...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** No, I'm not through. No, I've got some more. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have to say the same thing about the budget that I said about the throne speech. It really does not tell us what the policy of this Government is. The cloud of uncertainty is still hanging out there over British Columbia.

About all this Government has done since it came to power is threaten, threaten, threaten. I said back in October at the mini-session, when I stood in this Legislature, that businessmen were having a lot of sleepless nights and that the Government should unveil its policy so that we could get on with the business at hand. That has not happened and this uncertainty still prevails over this great province.

It prevails while unemployment continues to rise, Mr. Speaker.

Now this budget certainly did nothing to warm the cold war between the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and the B.C. Mining Industry. And, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. There is a cold war, a very cold war going on between our Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources and the mining industry.

The Minister himself, in his preliminary estimates of mineral production for 1973, stated that mineral exploration is expected to decline. Is that a good policy, Mr. Speaker? Or is it because of the no-policy of the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources?

For the first time in many years, Mr. Speaker, there are no major mines under development in the Province of British Columbia. While the Government appeases some of its backbench and wafflers in the party and indulges in cheap politics on the floor of the Legislature, the economy continues to decline. And the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources predict a "no growth" year.

You need more than \$64.8 million to create jobs, Mr. Attorney General, let me tell you.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, that shouted so loud last October about creating jobs — I'd like to know where they are. The Government, Mr. Speaker, is strangling on its own rope — the rope that it was going to tie around the neck of "big brother" business.

Two copper mines are closed north of Fort Nelson. I guess the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) intends to open them up by making them economically feasible.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, that's the "popcorn" theory of the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources...yes, Mr. Speaker?

He's going to make them economically feasible, because they were ripping off such fantastic profits I guess he thought that they'd close down because they couldn't get enough money to pay their income tax. It was so great that these mines closed down. They were ripping out the copper. These mines closed down, Mr. Speaker, simply because they were not

[ [Page 503](#) ]

economical.

There are a lot of mines in British Columbia that operate on the very verge of closing down. But the waffle group of the NDP would lead you to believe that you just open up a mine and you never look back. You have to hire Brink's to carry 'er to the bank. They don't realize the risk capital that goes into operating a mine. There's two closed up there and I guess the Minister intends to open them up, Mr. Speaker, by charging a royalty on copper. He's going to make them more economically feasible, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources):** How many shares you got?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I haven't got a single share in them, Mr. Speaker. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I resent that statement very much. I want you to know that I can stand in this Legislature with a free mind...

**AN HON. MEMBER:** An empty mind.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I resent that statement, Mr. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** He should apologize.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I suggest to you that it isn't the mining policies in this province that are archaic. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's the Minister's thinking that is archaic.

With all due respect to the Minister of Mines, who has been in this Legislature for a long time, he's reached his summit. But I think now that he's reached his summit, that he should go back home and he should retire and he should give that portfolio over to somebody who can handle it.

Mr. Speaker, if the portfolio of Mines continues under its present administration, the economy of the Province of British Columbia will be on the decline for quite a while. Anybody who knows anything about the economy of British Columbia has got to realize that there are two major contributors to the tax kitty. I don't think, Mr. Minister, that the Government realizes this. They're already going to kill the petroleum industry. They've still got the club hanging...yes, all right. You laugh, Mr. Minister. You'll eat those words next year. You mark my words...going to kill the petroleum industry. And the big club is hanging over the mining industry, so they don't know whether to go forward, to go to the left, to go to the right, they don't know where to go.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) doesn't know where he's going, either, but I suggest he go back home, Mr. Speaker. He's reached the summit of his career. He's a great man and I appreciate him as a politician. But I don't appreciate him as the Minister of Mines

because he's killing the industry. He's killing the economy of this province, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that he get down off his soap box, realize the election is over, and go back home.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, they can laugh and joke all they want to, but if they were living in my constituency today they wouldn't be laughing. You wouldn't be laughing. You go ahead and joke all you want to. It's a very serious matter.

Sukunka coal lay-offs are blamed on government delay. I'm not even going to talk about this because I am sympathetic. I'll call an ace an ace or a spade a spade in this House any day, Mr. Speaker, I'll call it the way I see it. I did when I was on that side of the House; I'll do it when I'm on this side of the House.

I'm sympathetic with what the Premier of this province is trying to do in the development of Sukunka coal. If those great Liberals back in Ottawa would keep their cotton-pickin' noses out of our business, the development would have gone ahead. That's exactly the way I see it. And I know the Premier feels bad, because he sincerely wants to create jobs. He wants to see the project go ahead.

By the same token, I wish he would come out and say what royalty he is going to charge for coal. We still don't know.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I mean this in all sincerity, that in our constituency the things I have been talking about are not laughing matters. The Peace River area has contributed a great amount to the economy of this province.

There's a lot of good, solid people up there; good, hard-working people who put up with living in the north. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, they don't like what this Government is doing to them and I don't blame them.

The third point that I want to discuss in this budget is the inflationary tendencies in this budget, Mr. Speaker, and I wish the Premier were in the House now. As I stated before, the greatest pressing problem in North America today is the problem of inflation. This budget sets the fire of inflation ablaze again.

You might well ask how I can say that about this budget, because at first glance it looks like a fairly modest budget — other than the devastating fact that it increases the royalty of the petroleum industry and increases by 20 per cent the tax on business. But let's get right into the nitty-gritty of the budget.

First we must establish that the Government must lead; the government must set examples. That's what I have been talking about when I say, "Why don't they tell the people where they are going?"

At this point I want to go back in history, because it's very important, to March of 1965. In March of

[ [Page 504](#) ]

1965 there was a dispute developed between the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers. This dispute went to reconciliation and the union demand was for a 35 per cent increase. A strike date was set for June 7. On June 9 Senator Norman A. Mackenzie was named mediator.

Mr. Speaker, this is very important. The settlement was announced within hours of the deadline of June 17. It's the terms of the settlement that are so important. Seaway operators and headquarters personnel received an immediate wage increase of 20 per cent retroactive to January 1 and a further 10 per cent on January 1, 1967. The seaway authority also agreed to take over the full cost of welfare programmes.

This very unrealistic wage settlement by a Crown corporation at that particular date in history set the stage for the fires of inflation to burn so rapidly in Canada that inflation has become the major national issue today, Mr. Speaker. That's what I've been trying to establish. This was the start of it.

Settlements in all segments of the public sector used this wage settlement as a guideline. You will recall that

since that time, we have had devastating strikes in the public sector and in industry. Industrial strikes that followed were because wage settlements were wanting to be based on the same guidelines.

Now today, eight years later, we have another government making the same mistake, Mr. Speaker — a mistake that will haunt them until the people of this province throw them out. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I want to reiterate that those who are elected to rule the province must set an example.

The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), by taking a personal pay boost of 21.1 per cent that could go as high as 57.57 per cent with a full fall session, is not setting an example for the people of this province to follow, Mr. Speaker. It's a very serious matter. I think our Premier is feeding high on the trough because he doesn't expect to be there very long.

What did our Premier say, Mr. Speaker, shortly after he was elected? He said: "I'm only going to be there for two terms. Barrett will resign after two terms as Premier."

Number one, when I saw that statement, I didn't think it was a good statement for the Premier of any province to make. You sort of take the attitude the last year that he's here that, "The Legislation, I bring in doesn't really make any difference anyway because I'm going to quit next year." I don't think that's a good attitude for any elected official to take.

Then we look, Mr. Speaker, at the Minister without Portfolio, who takes a 253 per cent increase without a fall session. My computer wouldn't go that big to figure out the percentage that the increase would be if there were a fall session. All other cabinet Ministers and MLA's have a 20 per cent increase.

The die has been cast and the trend has been set, Mr. Speaker, and it's irrevocable.

What will follow will be the demand by the civil service for a 20 per cent pay increase. Teachers' salaries are about 80 per cent of the total educational budget of \$484 million plus — or \$387 million. Increase that by 20 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and you've got an additional cost for teachers' salaries of \$77,544,200.

I could go through all departments. What about the doctors? They'll want a 20 per cent pay increase. What about the lawyers? They'll want a 20 per cent pay increase.

Because of the inflationary trend of this irresponsible act on behalf of the Government, Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice that we are going to bring in an amendment to the Premier's salary vote to reduce the proposed increase to...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. I would remind the Hon. Member that he may discuss the budget item in general terms but not deal with the specifics. This will come up under consideration of the estimates.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well then, I'll put it this way, Mr. Speaker: we're going to recommend that only a 6.5 per cent increase be paid to all the Members of this Legislature, including the Premier and including the cabinet Ministers and including the MLA's. I honestly feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must set an example and I honestly feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are not setting an example by this large pay boost in one year.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government changes their mind on this very important issue, it will save the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) many, many sleepless nights. How can he honestly say, when he's dealing with labour negotiations between business and labour: "You've already been offered an 8.5 per cent increase, or what have you. Isn't that enough in one year?"

I urge the Government to reconsider this very important issue. As I said before and I'll say again, inflation is the biggest problem in Canada today. Our social service increases, which take up the majority of the budget, will seem like peanuts if inflation continues to soar. You know what happened and you know what will happen in Canada, Mr. Speaker, if you know anything about business.

The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) stood on the floor of this Legislature and he said, "This little province should lead the way and be against the French exploding their atomic bomb down in the Pacific Ocean." Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General knows anything about wars, he will know that the majority of wars are caused by economics.

I would suggest to the Attorney General, Mr.

[ [Page 505](#) ]

Speaker, that if he wants to really lead the way, he will help run the economy of this province so that it will set an example in curbing inflation. That way, you will curb many problems. That way, you can offset many wars that will be because, as I said, wars are based on economics.

You know it, Mr. Attorney General, so why don't you be the guiding light and instead of standing up there, Mr. Speaker, piously saying, "We're against the bombing." — it doesn't cost anybody personally to be against the testing of the atom bomb — down in the south Pacific. It doesn't personally hurt anybody.

But I say if you control the wages in this Legislature, everybody would be putting their heart on the line in showing the way to curb inflation. I say when you put your money on the desk, then you can stand up and shout. You don't have to be pious about it because you're putting your tongue where your pocketbook is. That's leading the way.

I get a little sick and tired of pious statements about, "We're going to do this " and "We're going to do that." The Premier says he gets rid of the previous Premier's chair because it was a little bigger. You could buy a whole bunch of chairs, Mr. Speaker, with the increase in wages he's going to take.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I really can't see too much about job-creating ability in this budget. We recognize that one out of ten people in British Columbia is unemployed. It's been stated that it's a "people's budget" because of a whole bunch of pictures in it of people.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these people that are in there, every one of them is enjoying leisure. I've nothing against that. But I'll say in this House, as I've said before, that people also get a great satisfaction out of having the opportunity to do a good day's work. There isn't too much in that budget to talk about jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that I was going to be talking this long. (Laughter). There are a couple of other items that I want to cover.

I'm glad the Attorney General is in the House, Mr. Speaker, because I have a very important matter that I want to discuss with him. I want to talk to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, for just a moment about consumer protection.

We've heard a lot in this Legislature recently about consumer protection. At the outset I want to say that I'm all for consumer protection. I think consumer protection is great. I'm an automobile dealer and we have a policy that if you're not satisfied with your automobile when you buy, we give you your money back. That's how interested I am in consumer protection. I believe in it.

I don't think that people should be bilked by smooth-talking salesmen.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** No, I'm serious about that. I realize that there are many areas where poor unsuspecting persons are taken by unscrupulous salesmen.

The other side of the coin, Mr. Attorney General, is that there are many small independent businessmen who get bilked by smart operators that hide inside the very laws that were meant to protect them.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.



**MR. PHILLIPS:** Oh, I think you would. Lots do.

There are many small business operators that get bilked by these consumer laws, by smart people who hide inside them. I say, Mr. Attorney General, that if you can increase your budget by 21.63 per cent, which is one of the larger increases of any department in the budget, that you can take something out of this increase of \$48.5 million and set up a fund which will allow the small businessman who has been bilked by the smoothie to go to.

I'm serious about this. I think you should set up this fund so that when a small businessman — and there are many small businessmen that don't have that much operating capital. I'm talking about the small grocery operator, the guy that's starting up in a service station or something like this. These fellows are susceptible to being bilked the same as an unsuspecting housewife is susceptible to being bilked by a smooth salesman.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Oh, my friend, it is the same. I'm going to point out an example right here and now.

We have a case in the Peace River area that I would like Mr. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) to investigate. I'd like you to investigate this particular case.

This fellow is an American. He came to our area in the spring of 1971. His credentials were pretty fantastic, Mr. Speaker. He had a brochure — a beautiful brochure, leather lined — outlining the enterprise that he's going to go into. He had a personal credit rating of \$11 million. His other asset was the smooth, convincing ways of a professional bullshippier.

Now he was going to open cattle ranch...that's bullshippier — s — h — i — p — p — e — r. (Laughter).

Now, Mr. Attorney General, this is a pretty fantastic brochure. Do you know how much this brochure cost, Mr. Attorney General? This brochure cost \$15,000. It's lovely. Look at it.

Now if you were a small, unsuspecting businessman and somebody walked into your place of business and said, "Look, I'm going to run a \$100 million cattle operation here and I want to buy some little old merchandise to get me goin'. I got a (supposedly) \$11 million credit rating back in the

[ [Page 506](#) ]

States."

The guy wanted to buy a vacuum cleaner, a sewing machine or a house or a fridge, and he wanted to charge it because, "the financing isn't arranged just yet — but it's coming."

So he started on his way to fame in the area, armed with this brochure. And, as I say, that's a pretty impressive looking brochure.

The only thing that this man didn't have was cash for the merchandise and services that he would of necessity require to get the project underway. But don't panic, because, "it's coming. The finances are all arranged." Some big bank somewhere back in fairyland had got \$11 million coming to get this project underway. And even the banks in the area were pretty impressed for a while. They put out small overdrafts and loaned him little bits of money.

Then, during the summer of 1971, things began to crumble for this poor fellow and, Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the citizens of the Peace River country were upon him. The eyes of the merchants of the Peace River country were upon him. But the eyes of the police department in the Peace River area were not upon him, because they couldn't find him. He was hiding under the consumer protection umbrella — they couldn't find him. No, it's a fact.

The farmland he was to buy from private sources never really did get transferred, because the fellow who was transferring the land got tired and sick of taking promises and promises and promises. So after giving finalities and finalities, he finally said, "Forget about it."

A truck dealer of all things had to pay about \$6,000 duty on a truck that this fellow brought up from the United States. It had to be repossessed. This was an International truck dealer up there. Somehow he got involved in it and, since the truck had been brought in and wasn't consumer... And the federal government made this dealer pay this and he hasn't even been paid for the truck yet.

Small business firms in the area began to want their money for the goods and services that he had rendered. Well, that didn't stop our Mr. Smoothie, Mr. Speaker. He gave up the Three Rivers ranch idea, and he came up with a new idea.

By the way, I want to say that he threw out this \$15,000 brochure. Do you know why he threw it out: Mr. Attorney General? Because it didn't belong to him. The people who made this \$15,000 brochure, as of yesterday morning, hadn't been paid for it yet — two years later.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** I know all about it.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Do you? Well, are you going to investigate it? Can I stop talking about it now?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Yes!

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, I won't go on, then, if you're going to investigate it, Mr. Attorney General. I won't carry on — except to say that the new enterprise is called the "Hoof and Horn Ranch." I've got my own name for it. (Laughter).

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** You're still the biggest bullshipper. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** But Mr. Attorney General, are you going to touch up the immigration people a little bit?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Come and see me in my office.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'd be happy to do that. With that you've just cut about 10 minutes off my talk ...

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** ...for which the people of this Legislature thank you sincerely. (Laughter).

Now I'm going to rush on — and I realize the hour is getting late — but I do have to talk about my constituency, Mr. Speaker. We've got a couple of problems.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'll really rush through this. I'll let the adrenalin flow and I'll get back to the way I used to be — a mile a minute. Can I change my...you want me to change, Mr. Speaker?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Speak up.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Speak up?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Speak up. Yes.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I want to talk for just a few minutes with regard to education as it pertains to the rural ridings of this province — specifically the northern ridings and, to be more specific, the area of the Peace River.

I must say that I was very pleased to hear the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), when he was speaking January 31 in the throne speech, say that he would like to see the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and himself think in terms of opening doors of opportunity to the higher professions to all young people — boys and girls alike. He went on to say that he would hope that we could increase the number of

dentists who are allowed to train in the province and that he hoped the Faculty of Law could be enlarged.

I must say immediately, before anyone takes the

[ [Page 507](#) ]

wrong attitude about this, that I agree with the Attorney General 100 per cent. However, I would have felt much better had the Attorney General said that he was going to give equal opportunity to students in rural ridings in the lower mainland as he is to those in the upper country area.

One of the problems we have now specifically in the Peace River area is a shortage of dentists. This shortage is caused not only by the limited facilities of the Faculty of Dentistry at the University of British Columbia, but by the fact that, it being such a long course, it takes a well-heeled individual, bankrolled by a well-heeled father, to go through the course.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that dentists or persons from the city are not very prone to go out to the rural areas to practise their profession unless they are from there. If we had some way of creating a financial way that we could help these young people come down from the northern areas, help them somehow financially to take dentistry courses, then when they had finished I am sure they would go back. You could even put it in the terms of the loan or scholarship that you offer them.

I was very pleased to hear the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) say that a study into the whole field of post-secondary education was going to be carried on. There are two vocational schools left in the north at the present time which have not been designated as junior colleges. And I do not recommend that we hasten to designate these, Mr. Speaker, as junior colleges.

I do recommend, however, that changes be made. One of these changes could be to increase the number of courses in these vocational schools. This would involve little immediate expense so far as the capital expenditure is concerned. The courses could be those of particular interest in the north.

When one realizes that last fall the British Columbia Institute of Technology turned away 2,500 students, we realize how fantastically successful the institute has been. But we also realize that growth has not kept up with requirements.

We also have to realize that if it were not for a greater call, or at least an equal call for skilled persons today as those with higher academic degrees — when we realize that people with Ph.D.'s are running around British Columbia looking for jobs — and look at the shortage of skilled electricians, plumbers, electrical engineers, et cetera — you must realize that facilities of those skilled trades must be enlarged upon.

I recommend that a new institute of technology be built in the northern part of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker. And I would recommend to the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) that before she goes and builds a new college per se in Prince George, that she take a real, good, hard look at putting another institute of technology in Prince George.

In the meantime, I recommend that certain courses be transferred to Terrace and Dawson Creek. The Dawson Creek vocational school, for instance — well it could have before handled a course in natural gas and petroleum technology. I don't know whether that will be necessary now or not, Mr. Speaker.

The other course that could be put in the vocational school in Dawson Creek would be a mining technology course — again I'm not sure, under the present Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick), whether that would be necessary or not.

One course that could be put in this vocational school immediately, Mr. Speaker, is a course in practical nursing. Very little cost would be involved and the applicants are standing at the door waiting. I also suggest Mr. Speaker, that our industrial welding course facilities be expanded. With the proposed Mackenzie Valley pipeline

there will certainly be a fantastic need for a large number of industrial welders. Graduates from this course certainly have never had any problem finding ready employment.

I now want to get back to the matter of money to assist students to attend post-secondary education courses and I want to talk about the aid for travel. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the two perpetual funds we have in this province, the amateur sports and physical fitness fund and the cultural fund, give more benefits to the lower mainland area than they do to the rural ridings.

Therefore, I feel a fund established to aid the education of those rural students is certainly in order. Particularly so, Mr. Speaker, when our cultural fund can go to subsidize such shows as are put on by City Stage lunch hour theatre.

Such a show as Moby Dick was written up by the critics as "lewd", "offensive", "dirty-minded", "questionable", "outrageous", "morbidly sexual" and "in the worst possible taste". I think it is a sad and sorry day when in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, we take funds from our cultural fund to support such a show.

Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, if the Province of British Columbia can support the likes of this, they can certainly aid students to have an equal opportunity to attend our universities.

I wouldn't be surprised if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) does think it is funny. I don't think it is very funny.

No, I haven't seen it. LIP (Local Initiatives Programme) finances some pretty questionable enterprises in this dominion and when they withdrew their support, that's enough for me. I don't have to go to court for that one; I don't have to go see it. I'll let them be the judge.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, there you are. You don't

[ [Page 508](#) ]

want to believe everything you hear.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker — I think it is high time that this government took a look at the air fares that northern people have to pay. I don't want to attack Canadian Pacific air lines because they have done a lot to develop the north. But they have also made a handsome profit on it.

I want to give you just one brief example here. From Vancouver to San Francisco, it is 800 air miles; the economy fare is \$65. From Vancouver to Fort St. John, it is 507 air miles or 63.37 per cent of the number of air miles to San Francisco, and yet our economy fare is \$51. It's 78.46 per cent of the fare to San Francisco or, Mr. Speaker, \$19.62 more for return trip than we should be paying from Vancouver to Fort St. John on the basis of what you pay from Vancouver to San Francisco.

That's a very nice flight to San Francisco. The seats aren't too close together; there is a first class area — none of that is provided, Mr. Speaker, on the Vancouver-Fort St. John run. No, it's not; packed in like sardines.

Of course, I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker — and I will be talking about this later in the session — that we in Canada have got to take a different attitude towards the development of our north.

I think we could take a look at Russia and learn a few lessons from them. We seem to do everything that we can in Canada to deter people from going to the north.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Yes, I will tell you. When you people outline all of your programmes you will be saying,

"You go to the north," the same as they do in Russia. But when they say in Russia, "You go to the north," they at least look after them and give them all of the amenities of life.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I have some last few remarks that I want to make. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, the story of Little Red Riding Hood and the wolf was a fairy tale to amuse the youngsters of bygone days. The wolf story of today does not amuse anybody. I wish the Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Williams) were in the House. As a matter of fact, the wolf story that I am going to tell you about is a very critical one.

The wolf population in this area is on the increase and, as a matter of fact, at the present time it is at a critical stage, Mr. Speaker.

This in itself does not create a problem, but the problem is created by the attitude of the Fish and Wildlife Branch, Mr. Speaker. The taxpayers of this province pay out good money for biologists, fishery

[ [Page 509](#) ]

officers and conservation officers — and I must say that by and large they do a commendable job.

This year the budget of Fish and Wildlife Branch is \$4,196,131. But if the people of the Province of British Columbia do not receive the results of that they want from an expenditure of this size, I think they should take a very serious look at it, Mr. Speaker.

I want to cry, wolf for a while and I am on a very serious subject. Let's look at the facts. The Northern B.C. Guides Association conducted a survey of the mountainous portion of northern British Columbia. During that survey they employed approximately 300 men. The men were among the most skilled wilderness observers in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker. These men doing the survey used aircraft, horses, and traversed on foot areas inaccessible otherwise to get to remote areas.

The survey cost in excess of \$750,000, paid for by the guiding association, Mr. Speaker. The consensus of this survey was that there has been a terrific buildup of wolves and that they are present in devastating numbers over the total area. This survey should be sufficient evidence to substantiate the presence of a lot of wolves.

The next question is: Are they an asset or a menace? This is where we get into the nitty-gritty of the situation.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Now, Mr. Member for Vancouver Centre, I don't imagine you are concerned much about wolves. But biologists, Mr. Speaker, say that we need wolves to keep our moose population healthy, that the wolves only kill the sick and the aged, Mr. Speaker. That's what our biologists say.

But I say that I can't really see old Doc Wolf going out around there with a stethoscope and before he starts chasing a moose and eating it off its hind quarters, he goes up and says: "Man, you're about ready for the graveyard; I'll have you for dinner tonight."

I'm a meat eater myself, Mr. Speaker, and I like the best I can get. I suggest that once that wolf has had the taste of a nice juicy moose steak, he's not going to be eating any old rancid, ready-to-die moose with its hair hanging out and its eyeballs hanging out.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to think about what is the weakest moose in the world. (Laughter).

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It belongs to a lodge in Vancouver Centre. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, the weakest moose in the world is a newborn fawn calf and that particular moose is also the most susceptible to the sharp fangs of a wolf. That poor little moose is susceptible for quite a long time after it is born.

A rancher, Mr. Speaker, has to maintain an 80 to 85 per cent ratio of cattle when he is breeding. The present wolf situation indicates that we are losing about 40 to 45 per cent of our moose calves. Right now, the wolves in this province are killing off our best moose herds.

When the Member for Nelson — Creston (Mr. Nicolson) was talking yesterday about the hunter going out and killing three moose and coming back and getting his wife and going out....

Oh, that wasn't you? Well, somebody said the hunters were killing off the moose. Mr. Speaker, it isn't the hunters that are killing off the moose; it's the wolves that are killing off the moose.

So much for the game; what about the ranchers? Farmers in the Peace River area have been complaining bitterly for the past 18 months about losing cattle in community pastures. If something is not done between now and the spring, there will be a continuation of losses in this area, and the ranchers will have to give up using these community pastures that were created at costs in excess of millions of dollars. The ranchers in the area wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether they're raising the cattle for the wolves or whether they're raising them to sell.

One has to ask, Mr. Speaker, why there is no action on behalf of the biologists in the Department of Fish and Wildlife to get rid of some of these wolves. I read in the *Vancouver Sun* just recently that the sheep herders on Cortes Island have been complaining about the same thing. I've asked the game department to get rid of some of them, and I can't even get an answer. I sometimes think, Mr. Speaker, that biologists think that they are some higher power, that whatever they say has got to be gospel.

However, there was a conservationist that was very well respected in this dominion of ours at one time, Mr. Speaker. His name was Jack Miner, one of the greatest conservationists that ever walked in North America. When he died, he was recognized by government officials all over the world. Because of the time, I'm not going to go into all of the ramifications of what he said but I'll say it in a short word.

He said that if man interferes with nature and kills off some of the wild game for food, man must also control the predators of these wild animals. That ideology about preservation is from one of the greatest conservationists that ever lived to this date.

But yet our young biologists, when they go to universities, are taught that they must preserve the wolf population, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering why. It's no longer a laughing matter. If some action is not forthcoming shortly, I would think that some of the ranchers are going to take some action of their own. If the game biologists don't bring us the results that the population wants, I think they should be fired.

Mr. Speaker, because of some of the points that I have brought up during my talk on this budget, because of the inflationary trends, because of the tax increases that are not necessary, because of the imposed royalties on the oil and petroleum industry that are not necessary and which will drive the petroleum industry out of British Columbia — I find, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to have to vote against the budget.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

**MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a new definition for bad luck. Bad luck is to speak on a Friday when government monopoly automobile insurance is introduced in this province. Bad luck is to speak when a very worthwhile statement by the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) interests many people in the Capital Regional District. And, Mr. Speaker, bad luck is to be number three on this list. (Laughter).

I've waited through this week to hear a Member of this House extend congratulations to the Hon. Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson), the leader of the Liberal Party — I'm sorry he's not in the House — who,

in co-operation with a number of organizations, achieved a significant victory in a United States court late last week; a victory, Mr. Speaker, which should have a profound effect on British Columbia's coast line and its future. Yesterday I was pleased to hear the Hon. Premier taking direct action as a result of further developments in Washington, D.C.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Premier, as a citizen of Canada, could not have recognized the efforts of one Hon. Member of this House who has admittedly worked very hard and almost single-handedly in this respect.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. CURTIS:** Not in this House. The comment should have been made in this House, Mr. Speaker, with respect. Surely the issue is more important than political one-up-manship.

Then the day before yesterday the Hon. Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) felt tempted to paraphrase the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) — I do so, as well — and state quite simply: "This isn't a very good budget and I cannot support it." Well, Mr. Speaker, in some respects, you know it's not a bad budget. In fact, there are several points contained in its pages with which we agree quite firmly. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) said so on Monday. We both made those observations in the course of reaction to the media during the weekend.

[ [Page 510](#) ]

These Government backbenchers appear generally appeased — almost, may I say, lethargic — in their reaction to it. The Treasury benches are predictably very enthusiastic. Most of us in Opposition in this House are also predictably responding to various sections of it with varying criticism.

Mr. Speaker, in my view this is a transitional budget, taking its appropriate place in the gradual change — over from 20 years of Social Credit rule to an as yet unknown period of socialist Government in British Columbia. So the budget that I'm looking forward to receiving and reviewing most carefully is that to be delivered by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) about one year from now. By then, the Social Credit government of 1952-1972 will have faded even further into the history books and we will be in the thick of leftist government in the Province of British Columbia. Then, and quite possibly not until then, will the citizens of this province have an opportunity to judge this NDP administration on the basis of what will be, at that time, about 1 1/2 years of power and responsibility, Mr. Speaker, this Government must still prove to the people of British Columbia, to the rest of Canada, to the world — particularly to Europe and the Orient — that it can succeed in that delicate transition from the one — man fiscal dictatorship which came to an end last August to the kind of financial responsibility and maturity, Mr. Speaker, which is absolutely vital if this province is to prosper. I use the word "prosper" in its most correct sense.

If any of us heard a sigh of relief in various sectors of B.C.'s economy last weekend, it wasn't a question of people finding that they had escaped from a difficult and a frightening experience, but rather that the difficulty had at best been postponed, moved down the line to some later date. That's the situation in the province today, as I see it. A sigh of relief, yes, but still a disturbing measure of uncertainty and an unwillingness to guess what our short — term and long — term economic futures will be.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this province has swung from one side of the spectrum right over to the other. We've lived through those long years of Social Credit philosophy — if you can call it a philosophy — of dollars before people, surpluses before programmes, and another one that I think could be paraphrased, "if the Treasury is full, everything else will fall into place automatically." Well, even the most violent critics of the former Premier and Minister of Finance must admit that he managed the financial affairs of this province with skill and with a keen sense of strategy.

However, I submit that had he been serving under a more people-oriented Premier, he could have been the greatest, finest Minister of Finance this country had ever known. His defeat last summer can be traced directly to that

circumstance, to that missing part of his personality. Great ability with dollars, but a massive and growing blind spot where persons and their problems were concerned.

Now we find ourselves, I think, in a complete reversal of that situation. We have here a Premier who is concerned obviously and sincerely about people and their needs and who is introducing a refreshingly new feeling in this Legislature, who has already demonstrated his willingness to accept new ideas even from the Opposition side of the House — but who may not have, on his own or anywhere in his party in this House, that absolutely essential element of fiscal responsibility and the ability to say "no" when more and more demands are made upon the public Treasury, no matter how deserving or how well justified those particular requests may be.

That is what we have to worry about between now and budget time in 1974 and again in 1975.

Let's take some random looks at the new budget and its implications. First of all, it appears that small business gets it in the neck again. Here's what's happened in the past two years. First, the new federal *Income Tax Act* is already hitting small business to a far greater degree than before.

Secondly, and on top of the increases in the minimum wage, which we admit were merited, and for which we voted in this party, but which required time for small business to digest, this new provincial government jacks the corporate tax rate by 20 per cent, from 10 to 12 per cent. Most sadly, it treats all business concerns in exactly the same manner. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there can be absolutely no justification whatever for the increase of corporation tax in this province right across the board.

Then this same Government adds a new type of business tax on utilized capital that applies to all business concerns, again large or small. Unbelievably, it is a tax which may apply in many cases where there has not even been a profit. As we see it, Mr. Speaker, this will strike especially hard at new businesses — those small firms just starting out.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a similar tax in Ontario, but that doesn't make it any better; it doesn't make it any more acceptable in British Columbia. In addition, I'm told that there are a large number of exemptions in the Ontario situation.

Apparently, no one really cares about small business any more. As I tried to point out in the throne speech debate, it would appear that all business is considered to be big. All business is considered to be bad. This is really tragic, in my view, because even Members in the Government benches have spoken this week of the disappearance of the small logger, the small rancher and the small store owner. I really have to call that lip service. Regrettably, then, it appears that we're heading for an economy in this province which will break down

[ [Page 511](#) ]

into just three groups — big government, big labour, big business.

If this socialist government continues to pursue the course faintly sketched out in the 1973-74 budget, then many of our young people will be compelled to work for one of those big three. That, Mr. Speaker, is not what I understand democracy or social conscience to be all about.

Well, in the throne speech debate I enjoyed looking back over the record to see what the present Premier and former leader of the Opposition had to say when he was in Opposition. I've done the same again for today, with the same type of quotes. On Monday, February 9, 1970, and I quote the new Premier, firstly:

"Mr. Speaker, the Premier's financial policy is essentially simple. Budget for a surplus, underestimate the revenue, then invest the resulting surplus augmented by borrowing into B.C. Hydro and P.G.E. bonds."

Secondly,

"The taxpayer of British Columbia would have been better served if these surplus funds were directed towards...(among other things)...job producing construction areas." Another quote from the same year. "We have a golden millstone of debt around



our necks, with no moves by this Government to get us out — a millstone. We must have new policies and new direction."

Fourth, on tourism:

"There is no imagination shown, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that if this Government is really looking for new areas of revenue, then it should go about the business of tourism with some class."

Fifth:

"You are the government with the flair. Where is it? It is so bogged down with 38 Members, that you don't think you have to do anything new any more." So much for 1970. We're not through yet. 1971 — we move down the line a year to Monday, February 8, again quoting the present Premier as he leads off the budget debate, page 268 of the record:

"Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the best thing that could happen to the northern part of British Columbia is to kick out every Social Credit MLA they've got." — the quote is not complete — "I want to tell you that they never had it told the way it is in the north. Well, Mr. Speaker, — and I'm still quoting the former Leader of the Opposition in 1971 — I wonder how the people of the north feel about that."

In February, 1973, how are the people of the north reacting to the land freeze, no action as yet on the cubing plant that was to mean so much to the Peace River, the decision to apparently let Prince Rupert stagnate, the discouraging of mineral exploration and the increase in the petroleum royalty?. Mr. Speaker, if that is this Government's bold new vision for the north, then there are going to be some very disenchanting northerners, and they're not big business either.

Here's another statement by the former Leader of the official Opposition in that same speech in 1971, and this I really enjoyed finding:

"What have they done about creating new jobs? Mr. Speaker, what have they done about creating new jobs?" — I'm still quoting — "You tell me about the 1,000 new jobs. Mr. Speaker, don't talk about 1,000 new jobs."

Also from 1971, quoting the Premier on secondary industry:

"The most obvious role that British Columbia could play in terms of industrial development would be to attract the head offices of major companies here to British Columbia, with the sustained employment that those head offices would give."

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that in these quotes on page 269 of the 1971 *Hansard* the present Premier was quoting a leading economist, who is not identified. Here's a beautiful line from that quote:

"There have been no aggressive moves by this Government in the secondary industrial development area." — and on page 270 — "Mr. Speaker, there was really nothing new in that budget. There was no new drive, there were no new directions. All that was new were the taxes, and for the most part, one of them anyway, was completely frivolous,"

Well, so much for 1971.

Can we look in on 1972, February 7, with the same Dynamic Dave leading off the budget debate for the Opposition. Page 294:

"After the fantastic build — up that we were given about the budget, the disappointments were very, very great."

On page 296, we see this scathing indictment:

"Where are the jobs, Mr. Speaker? Over 100,000 people in B.C. today for one reason or another are relying on unemployment insurance. I'm sure the budget was great news to those people."

Page 298, here is the north again:

"The north, the north — so forgotten, not even mentioned in the budget. No hope for the north in this budget, Mr. Speaker,

just politics."

Mr. Speaker, this is not a quote — the more things change, the more they remain the same.

Well, the 1973 budget has been tagged cautious, tinker — toy and disappointing. Perhaps it is all of those. It's also, in my view, schizophrenic. I'm almost certain, Mr. Speaker, that its opening phrases were read by the bright and enthusiastic young socialist Premier who took office in mid-September. But towards the end, with those glowing references, those

[ [Page 512](#) ]

proudly delivered one-liners, there can be no doubt — it was pure Bennett.

Mr. Speaker, the new Premier of this province, in his role of Minister of Finance, in my view has no valid reason to feel satisfied and secure as to the result of his first effort at cataloguing the financial situation in British Columbia. It was sadly lacking in comment on ways in which to combat inflation and unemployment. It has done nothing to quell the uncertainty which is abroad in the province today, It has exerted new and unnecessary pressures on small business concerns, and, most sadly, it introduced additional taxes, when according to its predictions none are necessary for the health of the treasury. I submit that it exerted strain and stress where none was needed. It missed a golden opportunity to put some of its posturing into practice, by means of reducing some taxes. I was working out — do I say Madame Speaker or Ms. Speaker? (Laughter). (Ms. Young in the chair).

**MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey):** There goes the last bastion.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** "Ms. Speaker" will do, thank you.

**MR. CURTIS:** Ms. Speaker, I bow to your request.

It missed a golden opportunity. It could have reduced some taxes in areas where the fixed income or the lower income person who have benefited. Two brief examples — the provincial taxes on B.C. Hydro B.C. Telephone bills under, say a certain nominal amount, 5 or 10 dollars a month.

It could have lowered the automobile licence rate on smaller and or older automobiles. It could have eliminated the tax on home heating fuels. It could have reduced or eliminated the provincial tax on essential home appliances, such as refrigerators, ranges, basic washing machines and so on. And it could have eliminated or reduced provincial tax on other necessities in the home — bedding, household linens, kitchen ware, cleaning supplies.

It could, even, in a burst of socialist generosity have eliminated sales tax on toys, on bicycles, on sports equipment for children and those, Ms. Speaker, are people things — ignored by this Government which regrettably continues to crow about its concern for the individual and for people.

Well, Ms. Speaker, some of us who know very little about giant corporations and resource revenues, about international monetary matters and multinational trade agreements, have to tell you that we are really not very impressed. May I say that those of us who are wrestling on a day to day basis with the financial problems facing municipalities are not very impressed either.

In fact a number of us feel that this is the major error of the first budget introduced. The largest single disappointment of the entire budget for its total, its abysmal failure to do anything more than tell us, and I would do its very best in this first budget to live up local government." More words, Ms. Speaker, more empty, meaningless words by a Minister of Finance who regrettably shows no real understanding of — no concern for — the plight of cities and districts in this province.

Somehow, I believed that the new Government would do its very best in this first budget to live up to its earlier promises concerning tax relief for property owners and for tenants — who after all pay their property tax through their rent. Instead we are presented with what seems to be a typical Social Credit, non-election year pittance — \$15 more for the homeowners grant and a miserable, a measly \$2 increase in the per capita grant.

Let's examine this per capita grant for just a moment, because there may be some Members of the House who don't fully understand what it is intended to do.

As it has been explained to me over the years, this is local government's share of provincial revenues. I note that the mayor of Vancouver referred to it not so much as a grant as a "rebate" to local governments. It's a means of assisting cities and towns in the carrying out of functions which would otherwise fall upon the provincial authority.

At this point I want to be fair, and to congratulate the Government for moving promptly and decisively in removing some of those barbed wire entanglements which started out as strings attached to the per capita grant under the previous administration. Mercifully you have cleared away that ever-increasing list of conditions attached to every single dollar of the grant.

I've said repeatedly in our own municipality, in the Union of B.C. Municipalities, and in the occasional appearance before the former cabinet, that it has to be up to each individual and duly elected council to decide its own budgetary priorities and to then allocate revenue accordingly. If the electorate of that city, the town or district, disagree with the priorities so allocated by council, well then they have a very quick and easy remedy at the next municipal election.

But, Ms. Speaker, in a time of rapidly increasing costs, of mounting pressures on local government, an additional \$2 per capita is simply not enough. It doesn't even keep pace with the inflationary spiral. Could we examine a typical, larger municipality in B.C. — not too far from here — I won't mention the name of the place for fear of embarrassing the mayor, Let me just say that it's a very well managed, attractive, rapidly growing, responsible and responsive local government jurisdiction with a population of about 66,000.

[ [Page 513](#) ]

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. CURTIS:** In 1973, the amount... It's Esquimalt? — that's how much the Member knows! Sixty-six thousand people in Esquimalt?

In 1973, the amount of money generated by one mill on the tax rate will be in the neighbourhood of about \$154,000. The amount to be raised in this municipality by the general tax levy to balance the provisional budget, in its present form, is \$7,512,395. To raise this amount of money — and again this is for general purposes, not including education — would require an increase of approximately 6 mills over the 1972 rate.

Now that is the provisional budget and of course it will be subjected to reductions in council discussions. But for the moment, the taxpayers of that municipality — and I believe it to be generally typical — are facing a 6 mill tax rate increase in one year.

So let's get back to the \$2 per capita increase. Twice times 66,000 — \$132,000 more from that major grant source in 1973 over 1972. And, Ms. Speaker, you will recall, a mill is worth about \$154,000 in this example.

In very straightforward terms then, this highly praised per capita grant boost doesn't even come close to meeting one-sixth of the projected mill rate increase for the current year. In answer to an Hon. Member in the Government back bench who asked yesterday, when the last increase came along, he knows and I know, it was in 1970.

Let's go back a few more years. In 1966, there was a sliding scale of grants based on population units — that was changed in 1968 to flat \$25 per capita. It increased by \$3 in 1969 and a further \$2 the following year — 1970. It was not altered in 1971 or 1972. The increase announced by this new Government then, is the first in three years and it is very, very skimpy indeed.

Let's quickly glance at the annual increase in the homeowners grant. In case some Government Members are feeling particularly smug about that socialist goody — 1968 over 1967, an increase of \$10. In 1969 — significantly I

guess, election year — an increase of \$20. 1970, \$10; 1971, another \$10; and 1972, another election year by sheer coincidence, up \$15 to \$185, with the \$50 assist for elderly homeowners and tenants.

So, Ms. Speaker, a \$15 increase in the homeowner grant this spring is, as I work it out, just about \$2 more than the average annual jump over the past six years.

Now I can't leave this part of my remarks without referring to the continuing sham of the provincial government's lumping together of almost everything it can find under a single financial heading. I refer specifically to table 8 in this year's printed budget speech. It carries the very grand heading, "Financial assistance in municipalities (including local governments)". And it shows phenomenal growth since the year 1965 — with of course particular emphasis on the 1974 estimates. Look at table 8. Look very carefully however, and note that it includes, among other items, medical grants, \$73 million; hospital care, \$273 million and believe it or not, guaranteed annual income, \$53,136,000.

For years those of us in local government have looked with amazement, with incredulity, at the old government's trick of trying to make itself look so good in its assistance to cities, districts, towns and villages. Frankly, I would have expected a more straightforward approach by the new group, but there it is, Ms. Speaker. Guaranteed annual income \$53 million. As desirable as it is and as deserving as its recipients may be, let's not pretend that this is somehow directly associated with — and I quote from the text on the previous page — "helping local governments deliver services to people."

There's a desperate need among many Members of this House, with respect, to more fully understand what local government is all about. The intricacies, the challenges of municipal operations and the pressures faced by mayors and aldermen in the task of providing more services to rapidly growing population and yet trying to hold tax rates at something approaching a tolerable level.

Perhaps, Ms. Speaker, the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters could spend a very informative and interesting two or three or four days in any typical municipality during budget discussions — to watch the council and the senior staff in their efforts at cutting the mill rate for the current year.

Now, Ms. Speaker, I would like to react to comments made by several Government Members in their budget debate offerings. Some of them were very good, and others in my view, have to be rejected as incorrect or poorly considered.

I concur fully with the remarks you made, Ms. Speaker, as First Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain, concerning winter works. You described the situation accurately and with common sense. At both the provincial and the civic levels in B.C., we must have a continuing and basically unchanging winter works programme. One which goes on year after year, where the ground rules are clearly understood by all on a year-to-year basis, and an end to last-minute innovations such as those which have been hurriedly produced in Ottawa each fall for the past two or three years.

Now, the Hon Member for Kamloops (Mr. G.H. Anderson) who on Wednesday, I think, told the House about the abuse of land by — and again I paraphrase, "Hollywood movie stars who buy ranches in Canada as status symbols". I agree with his observation. But once more with respect, he has overlooked that very important fact that his own

[ [Page 514](#) ]

Government has made no official comment on the vital question of limiting foreign ownership of British Columbia land.

Where is the comment? Action in that regard would have been far more logical, I suggest, than the farmland freeze which continues to disturb and worry thousands of our own B.C. farming citizens.

In educational matters, Ms. Speaker...pardon?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** What's your suggestion on foreign ownership?

**MR. CURTIS:** Limit foreign ownership. It was in our platform, Ms. Speaker, last summer. I'd be happy to meet you in my office. (Laughter).

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. CURTIS:** I'll come to your office, then. I'm easy.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Where is your office now? You change it so often.

**MR. CURTIS:** Four blocks down, in the cellar... (Laughter). It's pretty good.

In education matters, I congratulate the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) for her speech last Wednesday. I think it's perhaps the best departmental review we've heard thus far. This party wishes her well as she implements a number of new projects and techniques.

We concur fully with her decision to prohibit corporal punishment in the school system. However, through you, Ms. Speaker, I'm sure the Hon. Minister knows very, very well, as a teacher and one who has demonstrated an interest and an ability in education, that violence in the classroom doesn't necessarily involve use of the strap. Some teachers still insist on resorting to some form of physical contact in dealing with their students. In our view this, too, must be stopped.

I'll be pleased to give the Minister the details of an incident which occurred in a greater Victoria junior secondary school only yesterday — significantly, perhaps, the day after her address to this House — an incident where a teacher apparently found it necessary to put both his hands around the neck of a grade 9 boy while he made the boy repeat some remarks which, I'm told, were nothing more than rude and disrespectful.

We wonder how that youth feels today. He knows that while he will no longer feel the strap — or the threat of it — he may at any time feel two adult, male hands encircling his neck, forcing his head back while an offending phrase is stated for a second time. That's the real challenge, Madam Minister, in classroom violence. We wish you well in coping with it.

**MR. H. STEVES (Richmond):** That's already contrary to the Act.

**MR. CURTIS:** "Contrary to the Act" doesn't help the boy, does it?

May I also suggest that the Hon. Minister of Education has a little meeting with her cabinet colleague, the Minister of Travel Industry (Hon. Mr. Hall), to determine if the time may not have arrived when we abandon the B.C. Festival of Sports and its counterpart, the B.C. Festival of Winter Sports. How much better, Ms. Speaker, to cut back to eliminate what is, after all, essentially a promotional exercise, and pump the same money back into student athletic programmes and inter-school sports.

We all know very well that those activities suffered seriously in the dying years of the Social Credit government. We're convinced that many thousands of students in the province would benefit from such a change of emphasis.

On the removal of education tax from residential property, Ms. Speaker, I think it's healthy for the Premier and the Minister of Finance to state quite frankly that his cabinet is divided on how to tackle the question. The Progressive Conservative Party is prepared to wait while the Government works out a suitable proposal; but we state very firmly that the change should come before this House next fall or a year from now at the latest. We wish you success in that major undertaking — that financing change. Well, Ms. Speaker, I hope this can be considered by impartial observers as a fair assessment of the new Government's first effort in preparing a provincial budget. As I have tried to point out, there are those things which commend it to us and with which I can fully agree. But the Progressive Conservatives in this House, and free enterprisers in the province, will not be lulled into accepting it at

face value.

It is, after all, a socialist document. And, with all humility, I want to quote Sir Winston Churchill to briefly remind the House how he felt about state socialism.

First, in May, 1948: "Socialism is the philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance and the gospel of envy."

And, in January, 1950: "The British nation now has to make one of the most momentous choices in its history. That choice is between two ways of life — between individual liberty and state domination, between concentration of ownership in the hands of the state and the extension of a property-owning democracy; between a policy of increasing restraint and a policy of liberating energy and ingenuity; between a policy of leveling down and a policy of finding opportunity for all to rise upwards from a basic standard."

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon

[ [Page 515](#) ]

Member for Dewdney.

**MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney):** I'm just moving the pulpit here.

I must say we really enjoy, Ms. Speaker, being next to the Conservatives in this House. At times we can hear their little caucus meetings as they sometimes share something that they want to immediately confer with. We try not to hear what they're saying, but us radicals down this end really enjoy the remarks and concur with many of the things that the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) has just said.

But, Ms. Speaker, in promoting this budget, I certainly concur that it is a social budget; it is a good socialist budget. There has been a lot said, from many platforms, about being our brother's keeper, But, Ms. Speaker, it's very important that we're also our brother's brother; that we are our sister's sister; and that in this debate we see more good social legislation for all the people — even the people of Vietnam. That was a very moving experience for me to vote, with everybody in this House, that we provide a facility for the children of Vietnam.

In fact, Ms. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity — the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) has just advised me and I'm announcing to the House that the Government of British Columbia is giving \$25,000 to an emergency fund established by the parliament of Iceland for the relief of victims of a recent volcanic action on Heimaey Island. Thousands of Icelanders have lost their homes and sources of livelihood as a result of this eruption. The grant is to be made from the Agriculture Aid to Developing Countries and World Disaster Areas Fund. It will be sent to the Government of Iceland through Canada's Honorary Consul General in Reykjavik, Mr. H.F. Halgrenson. I think this again is part of the hopes of this House for an opportunity for all the people of the world.

Somehow I think it's very important for me to say — and I couldn't help thinking of that debate a few nights ago — that those of us in the western world have sometimes been preoccupied with our own individual aspirations and needs. Our literature tends to suggest this. But I certainly hope that this budget helps the people of the western world — and we're getting a lot of Press right across this continent on this budget and this new NDP Government in B.C. — that somehow the western world can get along with the eastern world which, Ms. Speaker, has a somewhat different mind state. It tends to think more as a group — and I'm thinking of the largest populated countries of the eastern world — that sees more in a collective way that we are certainly our brother's brother and brother's keeper, as a group.

I hope that as a government and as people in this province that we can help that meshing of the western, individualized mind — and it reflects Calvin and many other great thinkers of the western world — but somehow we can come together with the more ancient eastern mind.

Ms. Speaker, we are democratic socialist. Seventy three years ago, in this Legislature, our forerunners came here and, through our clubs and our councils and our conventions, as a party we have gradually evolved a philosophy

that sees that the essential factors of production are under the control of the people and of their government. Here I am thinking especially of energies, fuels, and electricity — any in what we call basic energy service and utility. The life-giving fuels and energies are far too crucial and must be planned by the total community under the state.

This to me makes much more sense under a socialist government.

I remember hearing a speech to a Rotary Club in Chilliwack about three years ago when the speaker welcomed all Rotarians as "fellow recipients of social welfare." There was somewhat of a gasp when all these men sat back and tried to figure out what that actually meant. Now this was three years ago and in Chilliwack that that speaker reminded them that they have gone on socialized highways, they have gone to hospitals, to mental clinics, their children are in schools and in universities, they have listened to CBC Radio, they have gone on the railroad — federal and provincial railroads, they have gone on ferry systems. And in many ways, we are well along that way.

But here is a Government that wants to deal with some of the very major things that are going to lead us into a somewhat more orderly and consistent socialized state.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that seriously concerns me is that a lot of people feel alienated from nearly everything. They are even alienated from their union. If we read in the newspaper, there is a lot of disenchantment in the whole union world out there: they are disorganized; they are alienated from their employer; the workers, white collar or blue collar, don't feel a sense of the family.

I remember working for two large, American corporations that tried to make me feel as part of a family and yet there is that alienation. Certainly there is the alienation from their work and from their family, even from their community, and worse than that, Mr. Speaker, from themselves.

We know this is a pretty desperate thing. It can lead to all kinds of depressions and dependencies — even to suicide. This is especially true in an urban situation.

As democratic socialists we want to deal with this. We are very aware of this. This is probably of greater consequence than anything that we are going to have to face.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am excited we are going to face in the next few weeks is the land

[ [Page 516](#) ]

issue. I am glad to see that \$10 million is going to be used for government and municipal partnerships in developing land for housing.

It pleases me that \$5 million above the regular amount will be used in acquiring parks so that more and more people can gain access to what was sometimes private land so that the whole community will benefit. Surely the community benefits, the community grows as private land becomes the community worth and the community land.

There are many illustrations where the total society, the 2.3 million people in our province that we are part of can feel together.

I am very glad that \$32 million more will be going to the school districts. These authorities will be able to, in an autonomous way, share power, share their decisions.

It is very important Mr. Speaker, that people have a sense of power under a planned socialist government. Their hopes and their identifying with power through their elected representatives is, I would think, far more likely.

I am very glad to see in the budget that the people will have greater access to research, because research and information is a form of power. Having gone to university for seven years is, in a sense, a form of insight and power. I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that many of our brightest students can be employed between university sessions to work for the government in its various departments.

I am somewhat shocked, Mr. Speaker, that in my riding where we are trying to do more reforestation, there aren't any real economic studies being done on the economy of reforestation. We don't have enough detail on the survival of various types of seedlings. I am very glad that we are asking the university and some of the students there to do some research for the department of forestry to find out what the survival rate is and what the basic economies are. If we are going to plant 13 million trees this year we should know, in economic terms, what that means.

We need research into housing, into meaningful housing units. We hear time and time, in every constituency, sarcastic comments about the cheap, small fourplex or condominium or small apartments that we expect in 15 years time will become a ghetto. I hope that we aren't going to become complacent, and allow that to continue.

We should be concerned about research into rapid transit. In my riding, I would hope that we could get on a CPR Budd car and in 40 minutes be in downtown Vancouver to go and do some shopping or go to the theatre, and after that get back on the Budd car and, in a civilized way, be back to Mission City.

We need a great deal of research into a most simple thing — cedar waste. In my riding, which is the shake and shingle capital of North America, Mr. Speaker, we don't know how to get rid of cedar waste. We waste 150,000 board feet per day. It is burnt up; it is gone. I was glad today to speak to an industrialist in my riding who is looking into the possibility of using cedar waste for a form of fertilizer, with chemicals. This might be a possibility, but the research, Mr. Speaker, is very very wanting.

We are open to looking at the best information we can get. We want to look to some of the very old problems. We want to look at the land problem; we want to see that we have a proper planned way to deal with this.

Some of the Members have been anxious about what the real estate industry is doing to the escalation of land. In a sense that industry is strangling itself. I hope it is a concern of all the Members to see that young families can actually afford to own some land.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very cautious, a very responsible — as one of the Members for Victoria said — a very honest budget. I think it is a real start at looking at some of the very serious unemployment problems that we have inherited and that continue with us.

I said in my previous speech that half of the people that are unemployed in my riding are 23 years old and under. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reflect on this for a minute. I think we have to ask a few questions in the House. Of this high percentage of people that remain unemployed, many of them do have a limited intellectual ability; many of them have cultural and family deprivation. They haven't had the opportunities that some of us have had. Some of these people, Mr. Speaker, we have to admit, have certain health problems. Some of them have had limited training opportunities, very limited exposure to simple work situations. These people increasingly are unemployed.

I think there can be some very positive solutions to this. Certainly, more vocational training. I am glad to see more money in the budget, proportionately, is going into vocational training. I hope into apprenticeship training.

I really would like to ask the Members if they have thought that some of these people that operate at lower levels as far as "productivity" goes might feel very comfortable living in some kind of a communal approach to life where there is a limited, or even in a permanent way, some kind of care for over a 24 hour period. In one of our think tanks, the members agonized about this.

The public health director in my riding said that we have to, as a government, and I hope as private industry, protect some jobs for the disabled, for the people who are not able to, in productivity terms, produce as well as others.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in some more civilized parts of the world, certain jobs such as answering services and hotel clerks and some of these are often the domain of the handicapped. I would hope that



this government could promote that. I think a great deal more needs to be done in training and sheltered workshops for these people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about education. I am pleased that, despite the fact that in some classes enrolment is not increasing, we are willing to increase the educational budget, at least proportionately to the total provincial budget, and this makes me very happy.

We were unhappy that in B.C. previously we were the second lowest per capita in Canada in spending money on education.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that everybody is a teacher — sometimes effective, sometimes ineffective. I am very pleased that the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) and indeed the Premier has encouraged parents to participate in the learning situation in our schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course the professional teacher is in charge of that classroom. But hopefully the professional teacher will not be threatened by inviting parents and other adults and teacher aides to come in and to help that professional teacher in a learning situation.

I hope that many of the professional teachers can be encouraged even more to take up grading courses in retraining. In my other profession, we are not allowed to stay in the ministry unless we go back to school for a summer course every three years. This is essential in most professions. So I am hoping that there is a little more emphasis on the upgrading of some of our teachers.

I would like to digress for about 10 minutes on family life education. You know, a year ago I sat in the gallery. I was right up there, Mr. Speaker, and I heard many of the Hon. Members guffaw and snicker and jeer when the matter of family life education was mentioned in this House.

This was last March and I felt somewhat embarrassed Mr. Speaker, that these people could be so insensitive and so unaware of the kinds of tensions and the problems that are facing parents and adolescents and children and adults.

I heard one of the Members last year say that he didn't know why we needed to talk about this: "There is nothing complicated about sex," he said. Well, if that were true, Mr. Speaker, why are there so many babies that continue to be born by chance and not by choice?

It's easy to give judgmental answers such as "this is a permissive society," but I'm not satisfied with that answer. For one thing, it is an answer that usually is accompanied with a shrug that indicates that "it's not my responsibility." I disagree. I believe that we do have a responsibility — that we are, as I said earlier, a corporate group. We are a community. The neglected child, the abandoned child, the battered child — these should be major concerns to the Members of this House.

I do not suggest that the unplanned child is always unwanted. In fact, at times an unplanned child is a very special child. The ancient terms, you know, the "love child" or the "merry begot" — which incidentally, for *Hansard's* purposes, is spelt m — e — r — r — y — suggest this. Unfortunately, too often the child born by chance and not by choice is unwanted. That unwanted child often becomes an unwanted adult or an unwanted adolescent. Those of us in counseling know that the unwanted person is the person with a negative self-concept. He is one of the most frequent victims of mental and other forms of breakdown — of marriage breakdowns, of alcoholism and other addictions.

What we often overlook, Mr. Speaker, is that the result of a few moments in bed is not complete in nine months' time. The child that is born begins his own story. The kind of welcome that he receives at birth, the kind of involvement and the kind of environment that he in his first few years is born into, are the most important experiences in his life in terms of making his psyche and developing his life story. Surely we can assume that the children that are deliberately conceived have a greater likelihood of being welcomed and loved and cared for than those that are born by chance.

Although it's obvious that we have more information about birth control and the vast range of contraceptive devices available — more than at any other time in history — the question remains why so many unplanned pregnancies occur. In this city, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 there were 104 illegitimate births. In my town last year — in a tiny town like Mission — there were 18 unplanned births. Now those are the statistics and that by no means is the true story.

A very valuable research demonstration project, which is called the Family Planning and Home Visiting Project, has been underway in the City of Vancouver for 17 months. It is sponsored by the United Community Services that the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) referred to. I just want to quote from page 2.

"Two professional and two non-professional workers were carefully chosen and trained intensively for a week in all aspects of modern birth control techniques. These workers then made house calls in selected areas of Vancouver and North Vancouver, talking to mothers of childbearing age. They discussed specific techniques in simple terms. They showed the contraceptives, they arranged appointments with a doctor or a clinic if requested, and kept in close touch with the family to assist them in adopting a method correctly. The decision as to how many children they wanted was always that of the family and not of the worker."

And here I'm quoting by their report, "Babies By

[ [Page 518](#) ]

Choice and Not By Chance," which was sent just recently to the Vancouver area MLA's. Two major questions guided this project: Is there a need for an expansion of family planning services and, if there is, how should these services be delivered.

Certainly, in the affirmative, there is a need. According to this brief, it's very, very urgent. The Royal Commission on the Status of Women reported in its chapter "Women and the Family" and I quote:

"In one sense, birth control is a social problem in Canada. Families with higher education in a higher income bracket have easy access to birth control methods, but the poor and the less well educated have not."

The Vancouver report confirms that understanding. It is unsound to believe that the lower income families desire high fertility. Reports show that low income families do not want as many children as they have. The problem is that the unwanted child and the financial burdens and the accompanying higher rates of infant mortality among the poor, deserve serious consideration.

We have unprecedented information in the field of family planning. But where we fall short, Mr. Speaker, is that our information does not get out to those who desire it.

I will not attempt to summarize this report but I do want to commend it to the reading of the Members of this House. I found it very helpful. I would just like to say that only one of the aspects is the unplanned pregnancy. The concern for this report goes much further.

I was very glad to hear the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) really echo her concern for family life education. The Victoria School Board only recently has taken the word "sex" out of the label and began calling it all "family life education." Really the word "sex" is redundant.

If you ask one of the real pioneers in sex education in our province, Dr. George Szasz, what he would say about sex education, Mr. Speaker, it's simply — and I quote: "It's raising children to be men and to be women within the full framework of our society." So you see, Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about separate school classes being set up to diagram genitalia. I am talking about discovering what it means to be a person in relationship with other persons.

Mr. Speaker, in my files I have detailed curricula that are used in some school boards. I think it should be known. I'm thinking of school boards like Victoria. I'm thinking of school boards like Nanaimo and North

Vancouver. The late Dr. Sam Laycock, who probably in western Canada is the dean of education, recommended a long book list. Two of the largest publishers in Canada, McGraw-Hill and Prentice-Hall, have detailed curricula on family life education, from kindergarten right through to grade

[ [Page 519](#) ]

13. There is an incredible amount of information. Our school board has bought this information. But up until now it has been very tepid to move into this field. It has not felt any encouragement from the Department of Education.

I think we've got to be honest; one of the reasons is because a lot of people don't feel too competent in this field. I have had the pleasure in the last four years of planning marriage preparation courses in Mission. In the church I was serving we wouldn't allow anybody to be married without two hours of counseling, and having taken this marriage preparation course. They enjoyed taking it.

But it was difficult getting doctors or nurses or lawyers or social workers or public health workers or teachers who felt comfortable in this field. This is always the irony — many of the members who are lawyers pick up the dreadful pieces, the consequences of a lack of information, in litigation later on in the lives of these same people. These people admitted with regret that they have had no formal training in family life education.

This is also true in our schools. One of the facts that has emerged most accidentally by this report, "Babies By Choice and Not By Chance," is the work of some public health nurses who, in one case, have spoken to 67 junior high school classes in the last year — always by invitation, Mr. Speaker, from the students and the teachers and the boards, and I'm thinking especially of the District of Burnaby. By invitation these people come in and, in a very free-wheeling and a very mature way, they deal with the whole business of sexuality and birth control and conception and the whole gamut. I'm telling you it's very gracefully, very maturely done and, Mr. Speaker, it is by invitation.

I think that this is an exciting thing. But here is a programme that had to be cancelled because it was on LIP money. I'm hoping that there will be a continuity to this.

Again, I certainly want to refer briefly to the social policy and research committee of the United Community Services of greater Vancouver. They propose a team approach to family life education in the schools. They have suggested what they call the "invisible curriculum." They quote Dr. Szasz from the University of British Columbia, who very forcefully says, and I quote: "A specific curriculum in the school is wrong because it limits the whole area of discussion."

I think many of us know that if there's a definite agenda, whether it is in this House or whether it's in our caucus, we are limited to that discussion, and similarly in school. As soon as you give the kids less information than they can get in the drugstore across the street, you create a credibility gap and the discussion really somewhat stifles itself. Dr. Szasz has really said that what is important is that our teachers get retrained, that they become competent in dealing with sexuality and family life education, in the context of the curriculum or the subject matter that they're already dealing with.

Surely this is most normal. I can think of a great deal of the best of English literature — Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker — where this could be dealt with with real ease.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at considerable length on family life education. I think the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement has, in a very gracious way, dealt with the day-care situation.

I mentioned earlier in my speech that the first few years — even the first few months — of a child's life are the most important, in psychological terms, in that child's development. I'm a parent of two little children who went to a co-operative pre-school. I know something of the frustrations and the lack of clear information of the procedures to be followed in setting up a government or even a private pre-school. I can understand some of the frustrations that those women in Vancouver might have had and I can sympathize in some ways.

Yet I know that the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) is greatly concerned

about bringing us into the twentieth century in this field. Hopefully, he's going to bring in well thought out legislation that will serve the needs of the young children.

I respect him for refusing to be hastened into unworthy legislation. He's been under considerable pressure these last few days from those who he'd like to help and who, by their actions, have somewhat obstructed rather than really assisted his department.

Yet his way of very graciously dealing with it and planning legislation reveals the kind of maturity and wisdom that his department is going to show in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) say that teachers and students must learn how to adapt. I want to tell you about the opening of a junior high school in Maple Ridge.

It was only a month ago, and the Minister was represented by her deputy. Several things went wrong. The chairman of the school board made a few little mistakes — as I'm sure all of us are going to make: the band played at the wrong times; the little drape that was over the brass plaque fell off at the wrong time; somebody got up at the wrong time according to the printed brochure.

But, the most beautiful moment of that opening of Westview junior high school was when the principal got up and said: "You know, that is what education is all about. It's learning how to deal with the moment that we're in. It's learning how to deal with mistakes."

We're going to make lots of mistakes. If we're honest as humans we're going to make mistakes. But education is to learn how to be human; it's learning how to adapt to a situation, whether it's the opening of a school or whether it's the fact that the clock is running out on my speech.

Mr. Speaker, I really do hope that in the educational process we can learn to adapt. I personally don't agree with the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland). I'd like him to detail the recent, innovative processes in education that he's all that threatened about, I hope that in a memo he can tell me about these innovative processes that he is very anxious about. Personally I doubt that.

**MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley):** I told you in the House.

**MR. ROLSTON:** You did? Well, I just didn't get that kind of message from you. I personally feel that it's very important that we be flexible; that we reward teachers.

You know, I can think of a situation three weeks ago where we had a child who was having real difficulty in grade 1. This child was looked after by a teacher aide in the morning period. The teacher aide had a good experience and the child had a good experience because the child realized that he was able to do things creatively, that he was going to have some successful experiences. Both that teacher aide and that child had a very rewarding morning.

Now, as a member of the Christian church, I want to say something about independent schools. I certainly hope that there are alternatives, Mr. Speaker. I hope that there are alternatives in the educational system, inside and outside of the formal Department of Education of this province. But, Mr. Speaker, I have some anxiety about opening the school system up the way some of the independent school people would like to see it.

I admit that sometimes our secular school system is somewhat bland and that there's a need for innovation and for change. But I often wonder if the FISA people have somewhat over-reacted to the so-called radical people and have somewhat depreciated the spiritual values that are in our system now.

I am very happy that one of the real leaders of the Christian church is also the chairman of the school board for the District of Mission; that God is very alive and very real and very influential in His gracious way in the secular school system — if you want to use that word — that exists in our province.

I think it's important that educators on all sides... Mind you, I think it's important that everybody immerse

themselves in the other fellow's situation. I think the FISA people should immerse themselves a little more directly in the community because, in my rural riding — and I know these people

[ [Page 520](#) ]

— they are not always actively involved in what we call the "total community," including the secular school system.

I would hope that the union people could immerse themselves in the dilemma that management feels and management in the dilemma that many of the union people feel.

We have talked about French immersion. I wonder if some of the MLA's should immerse themselves up in the Press gallery. What's it like to sit up in that Press gallery as an MLA? It's somewhat cramped. I gather.

I think it is very important that we see the other fellow's situation.

Now the final thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm very thrilled with the fact that in the socialized budget there is more provision for recreation. The Premier has said that there will be \$10 million as a fund; that we'll see up to a third of a million dollars provincial money going into a community facility. I think that's very thrilling.

The Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain cautioned the House that we are going to run into some staff problems if you think of logistics. I think that's our problem; I think as a government we have to deal with that.

I'm personally very committed to the total recreation of life. The irony is that I like the way the department now sounds. It's the Department of Recreation and the Department of Conservation — had that been true in the last 20 years, it would have been even greater. But the, department sounds great. If we could only make that department really mean what it says in its title.

I'm going back to my riding tonight and I think there's a real interest in that this government is taking the small groups in the community seriously; that this government really wants people to live in a full way, to have recreation; that in this budget there's going to be more money for recreation.

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that more money is spent in the City of Nanaimo for planned recreation than the total provincial budget for recreation in the last year? Do you realize that?

I think that a great deal more could be done. I'm hoping that it's in the context of all recreation — not just the wilderness-camp type of agency that's been in the past.

All of life is a recreational and a beautiful experience.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good budget, it's a good socialist budget. I think it's dealing with some of the real deep-seated problems of people — and I mentioned alienation, alienation from self. I think it's going to really be a shot in the arm to the people of this province. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Stupich moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Cocke files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

---

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

Copyright © 1973, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada