

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

---

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

---

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1971**

**Afternoon Sitting**

---

[ [Page 39](#) ]

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

**THRONE DEBATE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the Attorney-General.

**HON. L.R. PETERSON (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, the Chamber appears to be filling rather more slowly today than on most occasions and I was afraid that perhaps the participation of so many of the Members last night in the roughest, the toughest, and the fastest Canadian sport might have taken its toll, but I think probably most, if not all, the Members who did play in that game are present today.

In addressing myself to the motion that is before us, Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the excellent addresses they gave. I think they deserve top marks. I felt that both of them in their remarks first of all captured the historical significance of the year — the entry of British Columbia into Confederation. Despite the complaints we voice from time to time, both here and when we go to Ottawa, despite the fact that we recognize that some areas of Canada get greater benefits from Confederation than do others, nevertheless, we are all proud to be Canadians. And, Mr. Speaker, we are determined to make this union more effective than it has been in the first one hundred years to the ultimate advantage of all. The Members, quite readily so, pointed out some of our accomplishments in the past. It's time to remember accomplishments, time to be thankful for our blessings. Nevertheless, they very quickly made it clear that we couldn't, in any way, afford to rest on our oars, and they advanced some constructive proposals. I think, just as in the past, we must always welcome constructive criticism and constructive proposals, as we try to formulate even better policies, as we dedicate ourselves anew to this next century of Confederation as far as British Columbia is concerned.

There are many problems of major proportions facing us as well as all the people of Canada. Some of these have been discussed at some length already in this relatively early period of the debates. Unemployment, industrial disputes, pollution, expropriation — although I couldn't put that quite in the same league as those other topics I've mentioned — are some of the important matters that have been discussed in length already. One of the trends that impresses me, as we look to the future, is the personal involvement of more of our citizens in a host of modern crusades, seeking answers to these kinds of problems. Society seems to be shedding its introverted nature and there is a movement of all citizens to optimize their social, cultural and recreational potentials. All of our citizens want to enjoy the good life; we hear that when they gather in Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Health, or the City Council Chambers yesterday, or when they come to see us in Victoria. But what many of these people who gather together in

this fashion seem to overlook and seem to forget is that we cannot and they cannot receive the good life, unless there is a sound and expansionary economic growth in Canada. That's what's overlooked. Unfortunately, just at this particular time when our prosperity should be at a peak, we are not enjoying the full growth potential. We are not achieving our full growth potential. The reasons are several, I think, and I'm not going to discuss them all. But foremost among them must be what I could only describe as, and I'll do this in a kind way, the questionable economic policies of the Federal Government that were introduced and maintained during the past year. We've pointed out on many occasions that it is the responsibility of Government, through its policies, to establish and maintain sound and expansionary economic growth. Once this environment has been established, the private sector of the economy will flourish, job opportunities will increase and a higher standard of living will be enjoyed by all citizens.

A marked difference of philosophy between the New Democratic Party and the Social Credit administration was apparent today, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke and proposed that there should be a 3 per cent tax on capital investments and improvements, money used to improve. I don't know whether he had in mind homes, or just what he had, but that's capital improvement, in the Province of British Columbia, and that we should use these revenues to provide direct employment; that is, for the Crown, the Provincial Government, to employ the people with the revenue that's produced in this fashion. As he advanced his proposal, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but recall that under some forms of Socialism all of the citizens are employed by the State. All of the citizens are employed by Government. This Government, and I think this points out a basic difference between an administration that subscribes to competitive, individual enterprise as compared to parties that espouse the Socialist doctrine, believes in employing people to do useful work, and we are employing more additional people even at this very moment. But, nevertheless, it is the private sector, through individual enterprise, through the free enterprise system as opposed to the public sector, that must be greatly expanded if we are going to make any real and great impact on the unemployment situation that exists in Canada today. With approximately five hundred and fifty thousand or more people out of work in Canada, it is a serious situation, one in which none of us, or I suggest no one in Canada, can take any satisfaction or pride. It's sufficiently widespread now that I'm sure most of the Members in this House know people personally, friends or relatives, that go to make up these staggering statistics of unemployed. We don't need any demonstrations, whether they are violent or peaceful, to remind us of the unsatisfactory employment situation that exists in Canada today.

The Leader of the Liberal Party, the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey, in his discussion of this important subject, said there was only one paragraph in the Speech from the Throne dealing with employment. He referred to the paragraph on welfare, as I recall; I marked it at the time. He conveniently neglected, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a most important paragraph on page 7 of the Speech which points out that British Columbia leads all Canada in providing new job opportunities. Leads all Canada! "British Columbia increased the number of its labour force gainfully employed more rapidly than elsewhere in Canada. In the Atlantic Provinces, the increase was 23.8 per cent; in Quebec, 30.7 per cent; in Ontario, 33.2 per cent; in the Prairie Provinces, 24.0 per cent; but in our Province, the increase was 57.2 per cent." 57.2 per cent. This is the increase in gainfully employed and is the most important figure, in my judgement, that's contained in the Speech from the Throne. There isn't a Province in Canada, my friends, that isn't envious of the record of this Province in creating new jobs.

The Speech from the Throne also records the fact that British Columbia leads all Canada in the increase in its labour force. As of October last, I was advised that, in the last

[ [Page 40](#) ]

five-year period, our Provincial labour force grew 70 per cent faster than the Canadian average. In the 12-month period preceding October last, at the time when we did have a general economic slowdown in our Nation, this influx was even greater and our labour force in British Columbia was then growing at a rate over three times that of the rest of Canada. I can give you the figures broken down into male and female, if you wish. With this rate of growth, certainly, it would be a conservative estimate to say that there should be more than one million workers in British Columbia within a three-year period. Even in this dynamic Province, there's a limit in our ability to absorb such large numbers in our work force. Here is one of the main reasons: One of the main reasons for a higher rate of unemployment in British Columbia than in many other parts of Canada is because people are flocking to British

Columbia, and they are flocking, in many cases, to no jobs. If they are going to be out of work, why not be out of work here in a much more pleasant part of the world which is the Province of British Columbia? There's no way in which we, in the Province of British Columbia, or the Government of this Province, can ensure the number of people looking for jobs and the number of jobs available come out even. We don't subscribe to the idea of stopping people at the border between Alberta and British Columbia, people coming from other parts of Canada. We don't subscribe to the idea of labour camps, where you put your excess people into these labour camps and put them to work, as has happened in some countries of the world. We believe in the free movement of Canadians across this country, and we also believe that those who don't want to work can opt out, and be drop-outs. That's another question and I won't get into that at any great length.

There is an even more basic reason for the high level of unemployment in this Province. And it's a reason which the Liberal Leader chose to ignore in his attempt to make political capital out of this situation yesterday. Political capital, because when he was talking about unemployment, when the Leader of the Opposition was presenting this unemployment picture, if you turn that picture upside down, you know what's written on the bottom, "Made in Ottawa." He attempted to blame the high unemployment rates in this Province on strikes and lockouts. He read out first the time lost through industrial disputes — a list I might say that is patently false. False, and I'll show that before the day is out. He then said, as a consequence, the unemployment rate in this Province is double that of the Nation, because of these other statistics that he quoted. What nonsense! Certainly, strikes and lockouts have an economic impact that do affect unemployment and I'll have more to say on the industrial relations picture shortly this afternoon. But to lay the entire blame, to say it is a consequence of the time lost through industrial disputes therefore we have this high rate of unemployment, is a red herring drawn by the Leader of the Liberal Party in an attempt to cover up the root cause of unemployment. And the root cause is National Government policy. It's no secret, no secret to anyone in this Chamber. They have said so themselves that they are going to create a condition of unemployment to curb inflation. You've heard it said by the Prime Minister and there's no way this Province could avoid the serious impacts of this policy. In no Province did this policy hit harder than in British Columbia, because in every month last year our unemployment rates were higher than the year before. Yet the Federal Government continued this policy deliberately. I think a parallel can be drawn between the Federal Government's attitude toward inflation and Don Quixote's proverbial view of the windmill — his obsession with one purpose caused him to overlook all else to the detriment of himself personally and, as a result, he suffered. The people of Canada are suffering today as a result of these Federal policies, especially the unemployed.

I want to talk about a few of those policies today, because I feel that they deserve some scrutiny. Monetary policy was used to push interest rates to very high levels and funds required for much needed social capital outlays, home construction, business expansion, all of these were in short, costly supply. In addition, high interest rates forced companies in need of funds to offer bonds at unrealistic interest rates and these costs are going to be built in for years and years to come. In these circumstances, as well, few companies could finance additional activities which inevitably would increase employment.

Then, at a time when high interest rates and the inflation-unemployment problem, when all of this clouded the economic picture, the Federal Government applied its coup de grace by emerging with the White Paper. Is my French not too good or is none of you bilingual? The coup de grace by emerging with the White Paper on Tax reform. If ever fuel were thrown on fires of confusion and uncertainty, Mr. Speaker, this was the occasion. This was at a time when there should have been stability and expansion in the private sector, and they came out with this White Paper, which I gather the Members across the way fully support. Then, in addition, we had something else happen and I won't use any foreign terms, because apparently I don't pronounce them too well. Another questionable decision was made and the foreign exchange rate was unpegged and the employers in British Columbia, particularly those engaged in manufacture for export, immediately faced costs and competition due to this decision. It's difficult to see how this policy could do anything but aggravate an already critical unemployment picture and, certainly, in my opinion, this is what happened.

Now the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, refers to a number of job-producing programmes which will increase employment opportunities this year. The Leader of the Liberal Party said that there was only one paragraph from the entire Speech from the Throne that referred to employment. I've given you one additional one already. If only he had looked at those referred to on page 5 of the Speech — the expansion of the highway systems, railway

construction programmes. These programmes have been delayed and I refer to them not only because they do provide direct employment by Crown agencies, but they also have a very beneficial influence, in an indirect way, of linking communities of the Province together, of developing a sound system of communications which will enable the private sector to expand in growth. You can't criticize this Government as a "Blacktop Government," you can't attack the P.G.E., you can't go through the Province attacking every mining venture, my friends, every pulp and paper venture, and say that nothing has been done in British Columbia or criticize us for not producing jobs. You can't have it both ways. The Speech from the Throne also refers to a school construction programme, a very big programme, a hospital construction programme, all of which will provide additional jobs. But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the direct employment, is the fact that our policies are to expand the private sector, to ensure that the economy will flourish and that job opportunities will increase.

The Leader of the Liberal Party put a question several times yesterday. That question is, "Where is the take home

[ [Page 41](#) ]

pay you promised?" The fact is that in labour-income there were steady increases recorded during the year. At mid-year, total wages and salaries in British Columbia amounted to 377.2 million dollars, a gain of 6.9 per cent over '69. The accumulative total to June, 1970, was up 13 per cent over the previous year and the average weekly wages and salaries in the industrial sector are reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. These are the latest figures I have, \$137.37 in June, a gain of 6.2 per cent over 1969, and 12.7 per cent over 1968 — highest in Canada, the average weekly wages in salaries 8 per cent higher than the National average. I have the comparison, Province by Province, for those who want to see. The Leader of the Liberal Party seemed to be very much involved with the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and Quebec, well, British Columbia is 19.9 per cent higher than Saskatchewan, 12.3 per cent higher than Quebec. The people in British Columbia will know what will happen if they ever elect that Member to lead this Province. I was rather intrigued by the Leader of the Liberal Party's address yesterday. The way he started out, it seemed to me, he had a lot to say about leadership on this side of the House, that is, he was critical of the leadership but, in his Address, he started out by saying that the Liberals would supply leadership through plebiscite. It seemed that everything was going to be submitted by a plebiscite. "We don't know what to do," in other words. He was saying, "We'd like to have the people tell us." In the next breath, how did he end his remarks? "Not Liberal leadership by plebiscite, Liberal leadership by dictatorship". (applause) That's right! Because he advocated, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should dictate what increase should be given to the workers in their particular industry. That's exactly what he said and, in fact, they should be compelled to take it. That's the Liberal idea of collective bargaining. I want to say it differs substantially from our own because we believe in collective bargaining and the only time we believe in making the award public is when the public interest is seriously jeopardized. I'm prepared to stand up and account for the instances in which those provisions of the *Mediation Commission Act* were introduced this year. It was a difficult year — the summer of discontent. I think even though I shouldn't say our political opponents, but most fair-minded people would at least credit this Government with having brought that boiling pot back to a light simmer towards the end of the year. We predicted, as many Members did, that it was going to be a difficult year and unfortunately that proved correct.

There are many, many reasons. The Leader of the Liberal Party chose to ignore these reasons when he spoke at some length here yesterday. The simplest reason, of course, for the increase in industrial disputes last year, was the fact that we had more contracts coming up for negotiation, affecting more workers than ever before in our history so, therefore, even on a proportionate basis, you would expect more time lost than in any other year in our history. Then, too, we had the serious effects of inflation and unemployment, combined with what is a traditional fear on the part of labour and that's the fear of lay-offs because of automation. Last year, I think it's fair to say, this traditional fear of lay-offs because of automation certainly was overshadowed by a conflict of two forces that were meeting head on — inflation, on the one hand, with the workers feeling that although they have negotiated increases it would all be eaten up because of inflation before the year was out and, on the other hand, the business man, sensing a softening of the economy or perhaps more accurately described as a recession and, therefore, that he had to be careful what increases were made in his total cost, because if he went too far he wouldn't be in business very long, he wouldn't be able to remain successful.

Here is the basic confrontation that existed in British Columbia. Aggravated, I might add, by the feeling on the part of some labour unions that we were going to have wage controls on a National basis. More than one union leader that I met with during the past year during the course of negotiations, advised that one reason for holding back their demands was that they wanted to improve their relative position while they could and before any controls were imposed. Basic, I think, to all of these factors, however, is something that we should have touched on before and that is what I call the rising expectations of the workers of this Province. In this day of rapid communication, television, travel, it is natural that more should be expected to arrive than in years ago, a decade or two ago. People are aware that the good life is available and naturally they want to take steps to see that they receive their full measure and this is, I think, a natural thing that's happening in British Columbia today. We see it happening every day and, of course, when demands become exaggerated, when you try and take too big a step at one time, then this is going to lead to confrontation. 1970 was a poor year as far as British Columbia was concerned, but not nearly as poor as the Leader of the Liberal Party tried to paint the scene yesterday afternoon.

I'm giving you the facts today, my friends. You take them down, you go back to your constituency and quote them and you won't get in any trouble. You won't have to rely on 12 votes to get elected next time, if you quote my stuff. 1970 was a difficult year internationally in labour relations. Mention was made of Saskatchewan and Quebec having to call Special Session of the Legislature. Great Britain had to introduce emergency legislation. The United States Congress had to take special action to keep the railways running. In Sweden, the land to which the Socialists always point with pride, there were major strikes last year. New Zealand as well, where they've long prided themselves on the effectiveness of their procedures in settling labour disputes. There was a breakdown in New Zealand in labour relations during this past year. Nevertheless, I would agree that our record was unsatisfactory in terms of industrial disputes last year. But, again, not nearly as unsatisfactory as the Leader of the Liberal Party pointed out. He said, "Our time-loss, man-days loss, was 2,900,000". Do you know what the figures are? The figures of the Federal Government and the Provincial Government were 1,684,463, almost 100 per cent wrong. My sources are my own Department, the Research Branch and the Federal Government — the Federal Government's own department. They have revised their figures. You may have the old figures. The Mediation Commission may even have the old figures. I'm giving you the accurate ones. For instance, one of the errors was that there were 30,000 people directly involved in the construction lockout when, in fact, it was about 15,000. So there is an error in doubled the amount of time-loss.

Let me compare labour disputes, not with other jurisdictions but with our own. This was a bad year. It wasn't our worst year. The only real way to compare is the time-loss as a percentage total working time. Because you have this increased number of people working in your Province and the time-loss this year, I gave you the amount in man-days. Expressed as a percentage of total working time it was .943, less than one per cent. Now for comparison purposes. In 1959 it was 1.338, higher in 1959 than in 1970. In 1952,

[ [Page 42](#) ]

when my friends of the Liberal Party were in power, Mr. Speaker, it was 1.326, much higher than in this year 1970. That's the only fair comparison and, even so, the figures I've given you for 1959 and 1952 only include disputes coming under Provincial jurisdiction. They don't include legal strikes or lockouts, they don't include Federal Government strikes or lockouts for this year for the first time in our figures, so that we have the same figures as the National Government. We include the National Government strikes and lockouts, the Post Office, the tugboats, all this kind of thing, as well as illegal strikes and lockouts and it's still significantly less than in the years that I mentioned. So while we had a bad year, a year that is not one that we want to see repeated, nevertheless, I think we should keep the situation in perspective.

The Leader of the Liberal Party, of course, placed the Federal disputes way down the list, I think No. 6 was the tugboats, because the only reason is, there weren't too many people directly involved in that strike. But anyone in the Province knows what happened in that strike. It was the most disruptive dispute that occurred in British Columbia last year. It shut down the whole forest industry, it lead to more court cases and sentences than any other dispute and you put it at the bottom of the list. What an apologist for the Federal Government.

I could discuss the major disputes that came under Provincial jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker. We had one that

occurred, if you remember, early in the year when we were still in Session — that was the School Board dispute, when the schools were shut down, and we had to threaten to use the binding provisions of Bill 33, of the *Mediation Commission Act*, with the result that that dispute was settled.

The Pacific Press was touched upon by the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey yesterday, which involved a work stoppage of nearly three months. What he didn't say was that the Mediation Commission and the two members of the Mediation Commission brought about the settlement of that dispute. He didn't want to give any credit to the Mediation Commission. Then the dispute that had the greatest impact under Provincial jurisdiction was certainly the construction one, involving the greatest impact on our economy, that caused a rather serious disruption during the summer months, as a result of a lockout. I think it should be made clear by a lockout by the employers, when it appeared that agreements were not going to be obtained without resorting to strikes or lockouts. We made every attempt to settle that dispute through collective bargaining. I personally sat with the parties for many days in negotiations, offering them every assistance we could. If they wanted an independent person, fine. They could have an independent person of their own choice and that would be fine. The Deputy Minister of Labour was with them continuously for nearly two weeks, and the strike carried on. Finally, I had to indicate, on behalf of the Government, that the situation was sufficiently serious that we would have to invoke the final and binding provisions of the Mediation Commission Act. The strike continued. You know the impact, the effect, it had on construction, essential construction, as well as other construction — schools, hospitals. We moved. The Cabinet made an Order under section 18 of the *Mediation Commission Act*. And, now, the Leader of the Liberal Party, I presume from his comments, is most critical of the fact that we suspended the hearing before the Mediation Commission to enable them to continue collective bargaining as long as they returned to work. Why shouldn't we? After all, the objective was to get the parties back to work. The objective was to get construction into full swing in the Province. And if, after passing the Order, we didn't cancel the Order before the Mediation Commission, the Order still stood — and still stands — to go back to work and all that happens is a postponement of the hearings before the Mediation Committee. What's wrong with that, Mr. Speaker?

Compromise the law, that's what the Honourable Member for West Vancouver.... (interruption). That's a lot of nonsense, because here we were. I wanted to make it parliamentary.

Mr. Speaker, another dispute I want to touch upon briefly relates to the forest industry. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I don't often agree with him but the Liberals would bring chaos to this Province. Fortunately they won't have an opportunity. Another dispute which caused considerable misgivings was the coastal forestry industry. We had problems right at the beginning, disagreement as to who could appear at the talks. It was almost like the Vietnam peace talks at the start.

Very early in the game I met with representatives of the IWA, representing the workers, and the Forest Industrial Relations, representing management and, to make a rather long story short, eventually they agreed to the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Justice Nemetz of the Court of Appeal of this Province. With the approval of the Mediation Commission, and I want to emphasize this, this Order was passed by the Cabinet. We are grateful to Mr. Justice Nemetz for assuming that onerous responsibility and for effectively discharging the duties that were given to him. Certainly, there were telephone calls, certainly, because I reported them to my colleagues in the Cabinet and to the Mediation Commission after my meetings with management and labour. This is one of the areas in which we had complete agreement by management, labour, Mediation Commission and Government. So, why try and ridicule it, my friends? Following the report of Mr. Justice Nemetz, I shared in some rather lengthy meetings, with the result that a settlement was achieved.

I can say this, from the experiences I've had this summer, collective bargaining is not dead in this Province, despite what the armchair experts have to say. Collective bargaining is not dead and, certainly, we avoided a major stoppage in the forest industry at a time when, if you think back, both labour and management were predicting the inevitability of such a stoppage in the early part of the year. This settlement and the Nemetz report were used as a basis of agreement in the pulp and paper industry, in the northern and southern interior forest industries and, indirectly, had an effect on the disputes of the smelting industry at Kitimat and Trail.

We tried to be flexible this year in our approach to labour-management relations to meet with the parties and



not tie ourselves to a single approach. I think this has been demonstrated just in the instances I've given you this afternoon. The *Mediation Commission Act*, commonly called Bill 33 and the three-man Commission has been subjected to continual criticism from Day One: The Chairman of the Mediation Commission, a former judge appointed by a former Federal Government; the other two Commissioners, both able, senior, distinguished representatives of labour and management, respectively. All men of integrity and ability; each of them highly regarded by their fellowmen the day before they were appointed to this Commission. But since the day they were appointed, they've been subjected to a relentless and continuing political attack, as has our legislation. It would be too much to expect that we would agree with all they had to say or do, and I'm not suggesting for a

[ [Page 43](#) ]

moment that we do. But the point I want to make clear today is that this Government has not lost confidence in its labour legislation as some members would try to make the public believe. Nor have we lost confidence in the machinery established pursuant to that legislation for the Mediation Commission. If there were ever a need to justify the existence of the Mediation Commission, I draw your attention to the dispute which occurred in Port Alberni. Here's a case where the parties went before the Mediation Commission of their own volition; they agreed to go before the Mediation Commission. And following the receipt of the Mediation Commission's report, they rejected it with the result that 55 electricians were going to directly affect some 5,000 employees and thousands of others indirectly. Because of the welfare of so many persons and the effect on the economy of the area, the Government made the findings of the Mediation Commission final and binding on the parties and work continued for Port Alberni.

Now, if we accepted the advice, the recommendations, of the Leader of the Liberal Party, we would have had to convene a Special Session to get these 55 men to work. That's how ridiculous his suggestion is. As a matter of fact, if we adopted the proposals he advanced yesterday, do you know how many Special Sessions you would have had to have last year? Three, at the least and, perhaps, more, four or more Special Sessions in addition to the extraordinarily long Session we had last year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are those who would flout the law, there are those who have stated they would defy the law. I'm advised that considerable progress is being made in the transit dispute and we are hopeful that this dispute will be settled this week. That is, I think, excellent news for everyone. That is the latest bulletin thus far received and I think even the Leader of the Liberal Party would be gracious enough to acknowledge that that is good news for the people of British Columbia.

I want to say a few more words concerning those who openly advocate the violation of law. These are people who are really preaching anarchy in British Columbia. They are no heroes fighting for the poor as they like to make out, the downtrodden workers, workers who receive the highest pay, the best working conditions in all of Canada. These are advocates of dissension and upheaval who would not tolerate for a moment disruption of this kind within their own organization but they attempt to perpetrate this on the people of the Province. They are the ones who, for political reasons and for political purposes, advocate the nonappearance before the Mediation Commission; who state that, in no circumstance, are the public interest and welfare to have priority over the interests of a select group in our society. These are the people who are supporters of the New Democratic Party, who support the demands of a few rather than the well-being of the public of this Province.

The Statutes of this Province are the result of many years of experience and study. A number of the important features have been copied by other jurisdictions. The labour laws of this Province embody the best ideas and principles we've been able to produce and they are a reflection of the wishes of the public, a public that is sick, tired and fed-up with labour relations where the parties seem unable to resolve their difficulties without disruption to the economy and services to the economy of this Province.

I've made it clear on more than one occasion that our labour laws are always subject to review. Indeed, during the latter part of this year, I made it clear that the Government would welcome proposals for the improvement of collective bargaining and that we would welcome proposals for improvement of our legislation governing labour and management. Some proposals have been received, not nearly as many, I might add, as I anticipated. But may I reiterate this? We are prepared always to review, to keep our procedures up to date. This has been our policy in the

past and it will continue to be our policy in the future. Any proposals that are received, certainly, will be given serious thought.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one or two other matters that I want to deal with briefly. Perhaps just a word on expropriation, which was discussed on Friday as well as yesterday, because I agree with some of the comments that have been made on this subject. I agree with the desirability of a single, comprehensive expropriation statute, rather than the multiple provisions that prevail now in this Province. We have had the benefit of the recommendations of Mr. Clyne. We've also been studying the recommendations of the law reforms connected with the Province of Ontario as well as the new Act that came out from the Government of Canada. We have been working on a draft on expropriation and those of you who have been following the activities of the Law Reform Commission, which is now in full operation in the Province, will have recalled that early in the year, or last year in July, they announced this was one of the subject matters that they were studying in an endeavour to produce a draft statute that would contain the best features of all of the legislative proposals that have been presented, including those that have been drafted by my own particular Department.

Another subject which I want to touch on, and this is final. There are changes of policies in each and every Session as long as we are in Government. There hasn't been a Session since 1952, since the people in their wisdom elected the man to my right as the Leader and Premier of British Columbia, that there haven't been improvements in policy. A reason why you have such a small group in that corner of the House, the Liberals, and why you were defeated is, because you refuse to give the people the results which the people wanted from the management of their affairs and that's why you are out of office and we are in.

Mr. Speaker, automobile insurance. This is probably one of the few Sessions when, in the opening days, we haven't had a great deal of discussion about automobile insurance. The fact that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party in their major addresses to this House made no reference to it, I think, augurs well for the progress that has been made in this very difficult field. A year has passed, Mr. Speaker, since the compulsory automobile insurance laws were brought into effect in this Province. A year ago the indications were that approximately 5 per cent were uninsured. The most recent information that we have been able to gather, particularly from the enforcement agencies in Vancouver and Victoria, the police authorities, indicates that today less than one per cent drive on the highways uninsured. This substantial decrease has been accomplished without any increase in bureaucracy or enforcement, at no cost or inconvenience to the public.

The major change, of course, in addition to the mandatory features of the legislation, was the introduction of the no-fault benefits. These, I suggest, have been very well received by the public of this Province. Unquestionably, the payment of claims under the no-fault cover has placed thousands of dollars in the hands of claimants, where payments could not have been possible under the tort system, dependent as it is upon proof of negligence. All of

[ Page 44 ]

you have received information which shows instances where people could not have recovered, before the introduction of this no-fault, and thousands of dollars in benefits have been paid in these circumstances.

It's too early for credible statistics to emerge to test the adequacy of the premiums that are being charged for the no-fault benefits but I am advised there is no increase planned in the amount of the premium payable in respect to the no-fault benefits this year.

Of continuing concern to the Government is the large increase in the amount of money paid out by insurance companies during the past year in respect of accidents that occurred in British Columbia, together with the increase in premium costs to the automobile driver. Of course, the only effective way to really reduce the cost significantly is to reduce the accidents and the claims that are made for recovery as a result of those.

Nevertheless, since insurance is compulsory now, and has been for one year, in British Columbia, I do feel that we have some obligation to ensure that the rates being charged for automobile insurance are commensurate with the risks being assumed by the insurer. I'm pleased to announce today that the authority to accomplish that objective has now been appointed. The British Columbia Automobile Insurance Board provided for in the amendments to the



*Insurance Act* has now been established. The Board consists of the members of the Public Utilities Commission, the three-man commission, together with two additions — Mr. Cantell, the Superintendent of Insurance, and Mr. Byron Straight. Mr. Straight is a well-known actuary in Vancouver, who served as a consultant to the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance of this House last year.

We anticipate that the taxpayers of this Province will realize considerable savings by having the new authority integrated with an existing one, namely the Public Utilities Commission. In terms of office space, in terms of supporting clerical staff and day-to-day administrative expenses, the savings should be substantial in each and every year. The Board will begin immediately to discharge its duties, the duties as set out in the *Insurance Act*. These include the supervision of premiums, of automobile insurance rates. They include as well the administration of the Motor Vehicle Act Special Fund, which was created for the purpose of automobile driver education and training, as well as research on automobile and highway safety. The Board's function is an important one and I'm confident that it will discharge its duties in a conscientious and equitable way. I'm sure we all join in extending it our best wishes.

One of the problems we face in automobile insurance in making it compulsory is to ensure that everyone who has a driver's license can get insurance. It's not difficult if you have a good driving record. But if you accumulate a lot of points — you know, the Honourable Member across the way does more talking from his seat, but he has very little of consequence to say when he gets on his feet — other than personal attacks against anyone who makes a success in the Province of British Columbia. To make it clear for the record, I was referring to the Second Member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, as I was saying before the Honourable Member persistently interrupted me, is the difficulty of people who have relatively poor driving records to obtain insurance. The companies have attempted to provide this through what they call "the Facility," which in its simplest form is a method by which the companies insuring drivers who may be classed as undesirable risks might reinsure portions of that risk with all those other companies in the Province which write automobile insurance.

The availability of insurance, as of January 18, has been further increased for the people on bad risk driving by amending the Facility arrangements to create a new service known as "The Insurance Exchange." This provides a means by which an agent in any part of the Province who may be unable to obtain insurance for his client in the open market or through the Facility, can telephone toll free to the Insurance Exchange Office, where he will be given the name of an insurance company which is immediately bound to the risk. Immediately, the insurance is placed, there aren't the delays and, hopefully, they will know immediately as soon as the rates are established what the rates will be. There won't be these delays and people will be able to get their insurance quickly.

Regulations pursuant to the *Insurance Act* were approved by the Cabinet today, incorporating these new provisions and requiring each automobile insurer to accept any risk that properly applies thereto. We have also provided for appeals to be made to the new Automobile Insurance Board. First of all, the insured motorist, the fellow with the bad driving record but a record that's not bad enough to involve the suspension or revocation of his license, has the right to appeal to the Board with respect to the premium that's being charged. This is the area where you get into high premiums. Then, too, there's an appeal to the Board provided to insurers in regard to decisions that are made with respect to the percentage of the risk allowed to be shared in the Facility pool, and in respect to the amount of business received through the Insurance Exchange, so that they are required to accept a share of the bad risks and, if they feel they are being unjustly dealt with, then they have a right to appeal to this new Automobile Insurance Board.

These regulations have been approved by the Executive Council today. I have the original Order now signed by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on both the appointment of the Board and the establishment of these new group procedures. Thank you very much, indeed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Yale-Lillooet.

**MR. W.L. HARTLEY (Yale-Lillooet):** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to see that our Attorney-General is back here in good health, his usual good self. We may differ in political philosophies but we wish poor health on no one, and good health and happiness to all. As for my friend from Vancouver Centre, the more this Government smuggles car

insurance up, the better my speeches will be. Thank you for making them.

My friend from Oak Bay, Mr. Speaker, was back proposing taxes on the sick people of this Province. He has raised his ante from three dollars to five dollars a day sickness tax. This is the kind of rubbish he's going to peddle this year. The Social Credit policy of "sock it to the sick." Of course, to some of them earning \$50,000 a year at least in that profession, maybe five dollars a day is nothing to them. But an old age pensioner and those of us who have never been in the hospital, can expect, if we ever go to a hospital, it will be in our later years, in our old age. And that's when we may well be trying to get by on a minimal pension, and \$5 a day, \$150 a month, is far more than the senior citizens of this Province can afford.

My friend from Oak Bay should well know that there are many of his patients who cannot afford to buy the

[ [Page 45](#) ]

prescription drugs that he prescribes. So he writes out a prescription, as all doctors do, and because of the high cost of prescription drugs they cannot buy the medicine that he has prescribed. So he can't help them. What he's going to do now is to make it equally impossible for people to go to the hospitals. He should know that co-insurance is no deterrent. If there are people in the hospitals sooner than they should be or longer than they should be, it's the fault of the man who admits them, the man who discharges them — the doctor. We don't need co-insurance for that, we need doctors of principle and of high professional calibre.

I was pleased to hear the Throne Speech mention pollution. I hope it will do a great deal more than what was accomplished through our *Litter Act* at the start. It faltered very shortly after the start. Our major problems of pollution are caused by the short-sighted policies of the exploitation of our resources. So long as we allow the exploiters of our resources to make pollution pay, we'll continue to have major pollution on the exploitation of these resources. Not only do we allow them to make it pay but we allow the representatives of these exploiters to attack every individual and every group that speaks out against the destruction or contamination of our environment. This is what has gone on under both the Provincial and Federal Governments, who are jointly responsible.

There is one proposal, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to suggest and that is, that as our budgets grow and the work load increases, that the B.C. Legislature should have a Spring Session and a Fall Session. It's all very well for the Leader of the Liberal Party to refund his indemnity; he's probably getting financial assistance from other sources. But for the working M.L.A.s, the men that make this a full-time job, I believe there's a great need for a Spring Session where we can give first reading to legislation that has to do with our hospitals, our municipalities, our regional governments, so that we could mail the legislation out that would deal with the rural populations.... regional population. Then, in a Fall Session, after we've discussed it with our constituents, come back and give second, third and final readings to this legislation.

I'm pleased that the Attorney-General hasn't left, particularly when he expressed disappointment that our Provincial Leader, the Leader of the Official Opposition, had said nothing about car insurance. It wasn't that he hasn't been working on it. Last year he wrote to all of the major car insurance companies in this Province. Our Leader wrote to the leading car insurance companies a very simple, direct letter. I'll read the copy of this letter to the Zurich Insurance Company and, as you know, the Zurich Insurance Company is one of the great international insurance companies with its head office in Switzerland. Last year, it grossed almost four million dollars and had almost four million dollars worth of premium income in this Province. To the Zurich Insurance Company: "Dear Sirs: I would appreciate a copy of your latest annual financial report. I am particularly interested in your profits and loss on the sale of auto insurance. Yours very truly, David Barrett, M.L.A., Leader of the Opposition." Now, there's a one-paragraph, one-sentence letter. Zurich Insurance Company certainly made a speech about it, about three pages, and they go on and on. I'll read the second paragraph. "As you will now be aware, I telephoned you when I was in Victoria last week. In an effort to clarify just what you are after I spoke briefly with Mr. John Wood, your administrative assistant." He goes on, quotes figures this way, and back to front. I won't belabour you with this but I thought that that one sentence there just tells us that they are not going to come clean. Three pages of gobbledegook. It's not just from one company, it's from practically all of them. Not one laid it on the line and said, "This was our operating profit," not a single one. You can have the whole file. Now, there's another interesting development, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Attorney-General, out of this letter. When Mr. Jamieson, not the B.C. manager but the manager for

all of Canada, came over to Victoria to pay his respects to our Provincial Leaders, he announced on January 11 what the Attorney-General just announced this afternoon. He announced that an Insurance Board would be set up in this Session of the Legislature. You were listening; it will be on the tape to play it back. Why weren't we told this at this time? What does this tell us, Mr. Speaker? This tells us that the insurance industry has this Government, has this insurance, the Attorney-General, this Department of Insurance, in its pocket. This Government Board, it's not more freedom for the car-driving public but it's more bureaucracy and less service, more Government and less freedom. This is what you're doing under your Government. More bureaucracy, more boards.

Now, the Attorney-General stated that, in his opinion, the no-fault insurance was working well. I don't know whether he has spoken to the Superintendent of Insurance or the Deputy Superintendent or whether he's even been in touch with any of his constituents. These files that I have here are files of correspondence from constituents who have found it most difficult to collect under the no-fault plan. Each one of these files shows no monies were paid until after months and weeks and, in desperation, these people got in touch with an M.L.A. After writing some letters, the claims were paid. Now, to me, this defeats the entire purpose of no-fault insurance. It was my impression that no-fault insurance should work something in the fashion of Workmen's Compensation, that if the person were injured in a car accident they would receive their \$50 a week, little as it is, to supplement their income until they are able to go back to work. They would receive this within a week or two weeks; there would be no hang-ups, no need to resort to lawyers. This has not been the case and many people are now finding that while they pay the full \$20-odd premium for no-fault insurance, they're not covered. If anyone in this Legislature, if any sitting Member, has been injured in a car accident, you will have realized that you are not covered by the wage indemnity of the no-fault insurance. If your mother and your father are senior citizens and are injured in a car accident, they are not covered. If your brother, your sister, your nephew, your niece, are on welfare or unemployment insurance, they're not covered. If you're driving a vehicle and covered by Workmen's Compensation and have an accident, you're not covered. The 100,000 welfare recipients, the unemployed, the members of the R.C.M.P., are not covered. Mr. Attorney-General, and you, Mr. Speaker, your no-fault insurance is being very poorly run; it's very inefficient and it's too little, too late.

There was a young man, driving a motorcycle. A pick-up came out onto the highway and knocked him down. He had his pelvis broken and was hospitalized for several weeks or months. This involved the case between the CIS.... and Norwich Union, The contacts were made and while the adjuster sent forms, from that day until this, that lad has received no payment, and this accident took place on May 1, 1970, eight months ago. That man has not received one penny from no-fault. He did receive a \$4,500 out-of-court settlement quite recently, but I doubt if he would have

[ [Page 46](#) ]

received that if the Department of Insurance and his M.L.A. had not concerned themselves. There was a young man killed on March 22, last year. The vehicle that he was riding in was Policy No. 765448, Western Union Insurance. The insurance that his parents held was with the Guardian, Policy No. 8286077. The same agent handled both companies. That young man was killed on March 22, last spring. I heard about it or, at least, I heard no benefits had been paid out in November. I wrote to Mr. Cantell, I wrote to the insurance companies and, along in December, the \$500 death benefit was paid.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General says that no-fault insurance is working in this Province. It wasn't working for that old couple that lost their only son. They've been put through enough grief and emotional despair without having to go on hands and knees to beg for \$500 to bury their son, their only son. And you say the plan is working.

I have several other cases; I believe I'll wind up with this one. Some of these came from other constituencies. I have a very interesting case in the North Okanagan that took three years. I had a very interesting case very recently. A couple of ladies were driving up the Fraser Canyon, the car slid around over the bank. One passenger was rendered unconscious and very badly bruised, but, after they'd been taken to hospital and checked out, they were allowed to find their way home. This lady has received payment for her broken glasses, but she has received no allowance for the fee that she had to pay or the taxi service to get her home. She's received no allowance; nothing from the no-fault; no \$50 a week; and no allowance to pay for the help that she had to get in to look after the house, cut the lawns and so on, while she was laid up. I wrote to the Federated Mutual Insurance Company, where Mr. Froese is the

Manager, under Claim 522A9722, and he wrote a beautiful letter, saying that this lady had given them a release. It was such a sweet letter, it was just dripping with honey. So sweet that I became suspicious. I went down and asked the lady if she had signed a release, and she said: "At no time have I signed a release but within 36 hours of the accident, while I was still suffering from shock, I did receive a long distance phone call from Vancouver and they asked me many questions. They told me that the conversation was to be taped, and they asked me if I would try to answer yes or no, if possible. They did ask me about signing a claim form." This conversation, no doubt was what the Federated Mutual was trying to interpret as a release. This is what they were doing, knowing that they have this Government in their pockets and that they can get away with anything. They wouldn't try to get away with it, if they knew that they hadn't set up the campaign funds that helped elect this Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh. Oh.

**MR. HARTLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I wasn't imputing a thing, I was making a statement. Mr. Speaker, I stated that the insurance corporations of this Province have this Government in their pocket, and I'm not withdrawing it. I refuse to withdraw that statement.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No, there's nothing wrong with it.

**MR. HARTLEY:** No, there's nothing wrong with that statement whatsoever. I am stating my position and that's it. I have sufficient evidence here.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the Member, by his statement, imputing improper motives to the Government?

**MR. HARTLEY:** I was imputing nothing. I leave to you to draw whatever opinions you may have.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the Member imputing improper motives to the Government?

**MR. HARTLEY:** No, no, I'm not imputing anything.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** All right, proceed.

**MR. HARTLEY:** It's my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that when the insurance companies are feeling so secure, knowing that they have the legislation they asked for two years ago, knowing that they have the Insurance Board as they stated on January 11, two weeks before it was laid before the House, they were feeling so confident with this Government that they are, instead of sending a new agent over there to say, "Will you sign a quick pay claim, will you sign a release?" They merely get on the long distance phone, they tape it, and then they try and use this against the poor widow who had a just claim. This is what's going on in this Province. I have named names, I have named companies. It's there for the records. Mr. Speaker, my neighbour from Chilliwack, the Member for Chilliwack, says that he's through (interruption). All right, I'll read a letter to you, Mr. Speaker, from the Superintendent of Insurance. It was written to Mr. H. Tall, Tall Agencies Limited, 1310 East 12th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.: "Re: Safeco Insurance. I acknowledge receipt...." and this is from Mr. Anderson, the Deputy Superintendent of Insurance. "I acknowledge receipt, of a copy of your letter of November 15 to Safeco Insurance Company of America, and have noted the contents therein." Next paragraph, follow this. "The availability of insurance to all persons, subject, of course, to unbiased underwriting requirements, is needed. Yours truly, D.E. Anderson." Is that abusing the rules of the House, Mr. Member from Chilliwack?

**HON. W.K. KIERNAN (Chilliwack):** No, Sir.

**MR. HARTLEY:** This is your own Department, indicting what is going on under the *No-Fault Insurance Act* in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if the people of this Province don't recognize that the New Democratic Party, not only in the Opposition but in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the Province of Manitoba, are the only groups in the one hundred year history of this Nation, that have dared draw up legislation that the insurance companies opposed, don't try involving me. We have a record that we are proud to stand on.

Mr. Speaker, there's another great shortcoming in our insurance laws and that's this Traffic Victims Indemnity



Fund. Out of every dollar that is collected, two cents, or two dollars out of every one hundred, is repaid by the insurance companies and can be called on by the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund when they need it. When we checked this out with the Auto Insurance Committee, we found that only a small portion of the money that the insurance companies was retaining had never been called on, and the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund operates on overdrafts. While 2 per cent may not seem like very much (two cents in the dollar), when you realize that this year the premium income in this Province will reach 120 million dollars, that means that two and one fifth million dollars are being paid out by the public

[ Page 47 ]

to operate a Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund that is not indemnifying, in a proper fashion, the people that are injured in accidents that are not covered by insurance. And if my friend, the Member from Chilliwack, thinks that I'm abusing the House, I would like to tell him of a lady who was picked up along the street, in Hope, with a broken hip, bruised, shook up. They took her to the Hope Hospital, then took her on down to Chilliwack. Eventually, when she got back home to Princeton, they thought, they could be covered by no-fault insurance. But here they were, two pensioners; they earned no salary; they lost no income; they had no coverage. So we turned to the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund. I phoned them up long distance and they said, "Yes, we'll look after that, we'll pay ambulance costs. Tell them to get a housekeeper, nurse, and we'll look after that." Very good, time went on, I thought it had been looked after. I got another call from the old folks, "When are we going to give them some assistance?" So I got on the phone again, wrote a letter to cover that call. I got word back that they were getting right after it, sending a copy of a letter to the adjusters. Then, in about two weeks' time, I got a letter from the Fund, saying that they weren't sure that it was a car accident. This lady was picked up on the street, seriously injured, too serious for the local hospital. Now, how do you prove that you were injured in a hit-and-run car accident when you're alone and no witnesses?

Before I took it up, as a layman, as best I could, I got the name of the specialist, Dr. Victor M. Raz, in Chilliwack. I'll read the letter: "William L. Hartley, M.L.A. Re: Mrs. Marguerite Cadsand — 63, Princeton, B.C. — Thank you for your letter regarding Mrs. Cadsand. I first saw this lady on July 2nd, 1970, when she was transferred from Hope Hospital to Chilliwack, by Dr. Murakami. Both she and Dr. Murakami informed me that she was hit by a small red car which went away without stopping, near the bus depot in Hope. She had bilateral fractures of the femoral neck, with considerable bruising. These injuries are almost certainly due to the car knocking her down. It is very difficult to produce such injuries by any other mechanism. I hope this information will be of assistance to you, in helping Mrs. Cadsand. Kindest Regards, Signed: Victor Raz."

Am I again abusing my privilege? Mr. Speaker, I say it's my right. If these Members across there were doing their job, I wouldn't have to be taking up problems from Chilliwack and North Okanagan, and all over. They're sitting back. They have too big a majority, they're too cosy, and they're too comfortable.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are certain very simple remedies for this situation, but before I go into that I would like to say that I feel that Mr. Cantell, and Deputy Minister Anderson, do a good job in assisting people. They've done a good job, I know, in helping me to bring a little pressure to see the right thing done and I commend them for this. But, to me, the answer to a better programme, a proper programme, of automobile insurance in this Province is not more bureaucracy. As you can see, we have the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund, and the Facility which is the poor risk pool. We've got 185 insurance companies; we've got a Superintendent of Insurance; an Assistant Superintendent; and, now, we have an Insurance Board. And you say the Socialists bring in bureaucracy. This is the biggest bureaucracy there ever was.

Now there's one simple answer to this. I would like you, when you go out of here, to go to the library. I'll send you this copy of the Minister of Public Works Report from 1953 to 1954, signed by the Honourable Phil Gaglardi, when he was Minister of Public Works. The Coalition Government had been concerned about the high costs, the thousands of dollars that they were paying out in car insurance, so they set up an Insurance and Safety Committee, under a chap by the name of Lonsdale. In 1953-54, he suggested that they send 3,000 Government-insured vehicles: the Department of Highways' vehicles; the Forestry vehicles; the Department of Agriculture; that all the Government-used vehicles set up a fund and self-insure them. This is a statement from that Report. "The Report of the Insurance and Safety Committee from Department of Public Works, 1953-54: From the standpoint of



self-insuring the fleet of Government cars and vehicles, our experience for the fiscal year ending, has shown conclusively that very great monetary advantages accrued as a result of the Government deciding to take this step. The costs were reduced to one eighth, from 105 thousand dollars to 12 thousand dollars." Now, in today's language, when we have considerably more vehicles, that means reducing, Mr. Speaker, a one million dollar premium to 125 thousand dollars. That's what we're talking about and we propose, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very simple answer to this. But it takes courage, the kind of courage that Ed Schreyer, the Premier, had, when he had a majority of one. He took on all the insurance agents and all of the insurance companies, not only of that Province but of this Nation, on this continent. How would you do it? You would set up a fund, similar to what we have now in the Honourable Wesley Black's Department of Highways Report, under their Safety and Insurance Committee. We would go to Mr. Hadfield and have his computers that contain the vital statistics on your and my driving record, and the vital statistics on one million motor vehicles in this Province, and we would programme those computers, so that when we bought our license plates on March 1, or prior to March 1, we would pay an additional sum of money. If an old age pensioner were knocked down in Hope, or Chilliwack, or Hat Creek, or anywhere, she would be made well to the best of the ability of the medical profession and the other professions that would be looking after her. If a car were damaged, it would be repaired, and it would be repaired out of this fund. You wouldn't have to have 185 presidents, and boards of directors of insurance companies. You wouldn't have to have 185 sets of computers, you'd have one set of computers. Mr. Speaker, if this Government fails to act on this issue, just as hospital insurance created the collapse of the Coalition, car insurance will bring this Government to defeat.

**Concluding on car insurance, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Legislature, every citizen in the Province, pays approximately \$20 to buy no-fault car insurance.** Just as I read from the Department of Public Works Report from 1953-54, 17 years ago, in excess of 6,000 Provincial Government-owned and operated vehicles are reported in the Minister of Highways' Report this year (see p. 30). Those vehicles paid the approximate \$20 but did they get no-fault coverage only? No, they received complete coverage. There is no deductible on the collision and there's no limit on the public liability. Those aren't just little mini cars; these are the great low-bed trailers that the Department of Highways operates; the snow ploughs that are operating under the most dangerous and severe conditions 24 hours around the clock. It would probably cost you \$2,000 a year to insure them under the regular commercial channels through the regular commercial companies, but under this publicly-administered plan by this Government, they are insured for an average of \$24 per

[ [Page 48](#) ]

vehicle. Yet, because this Government sits back, because this Government is in the pocket of the insurance industry, they sit back and allow the insurance industry to believe that the people of this Province will wait when, if they would read their Province's own Report, they would know there is a much better way (interruption). Well, you sat there and the previous speaker got up and called us a bunch of Communists, and you've never asked him to withdraw that. I am making no imputation. If you read something into it, you'll have your turn, Mr. Minister, and you can reply.

**HON. D.R.J. CAMPBELL (Comox):** I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you make a ruling on the use of that language in the House.

**MR. HARTLEY:** You should have been here, Mr. Member from North Okanagan when I was telling what's happened to car insurance in your district.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I would like to deal with is with regard to the raising of the Whatshan Dam and the proposed flooding of the Skagit Valley as agreed by this Government with the city of Seattle under an amendment to the Treaty of January, 1967. At that time, in 1967, I raised the matter in this House and placed a question on the Order Paper. It was discussed quite fully here last year by Members on this side, including the Member for North Vancouver-Capilano. Both he and I attended hearings in Seattle, hearings put on by the Seattle City Council and, while they were interesting, I really didn't go down there expecting that they would withdraw their right to our assets, assets that had been given to them under such favourable conditions. I thought we were being very presumptuous going down and expecting this, so we didn't come away disappointed. But I did learn certain things by going down there. I learned that, on their second hearing which was held in December of last year, under

Item No. 12 of their agenda that day, the City of Seattle was exporting sufficient power outside of the city and outside of the State on which they levied a 5 per cent sales tax that brings them in an annual revenue of a quarter of a million dollars which is better than eight times what it will pay us for the right to flood those six thousand-odd acres in the Skagit Valley.

This matter was also discussed at the Wildlife Convention in Trail. The Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, spoke as the guest speaker and he was asked if the Government would consider withdrawing their end of the Treaty. After a long, round about answer, he said, "No, possibly the Department of Recreation would consider recommending to the Federal Government that it be withdrawn but the Federal Government opposed it."

Now the Skagit Valley dispute has generated considerable public interest and, I believe, this is a good, healthy sign. It shows the people of this Province and the people in the State of Washington are concerned about their environment. They're concerned about the right to have good recreational areas. Now, what are some of the unique potentialities of the Skagit Valley? (1) It is the only undeveloped flat valley within easy driving distance of the great metropolitan area of this Province, within two or three hours drive of Vancouver, Westminster and the lower mainland. You can go up into this valley, where there is not a farm, not a road, not a railroad. I didn't appreciate the value of this until I heard the Trailhounds Association from Abbotsford presenting their brief to the hearing in Seattle. They pointed out that in this Province of British Columbia there are very few places where you can let hounds run without the danger of them running across the highway and being killed by a car, or a bus, or running in front of a railway. When you think of that, there are very, very few flat, level valleys, such as the Skagit, where that can be done. It's also one of our best fly-fishing streams in the Province. It has a first-class spawning area in the reaches of the river, in the portion of the valley that is not flooded. I should mention that a portion of the valley is now flooded, probably the better part of a mile. Approximately six hundred acres above the American border did flood and has been flooded for many years. But like most hydro dams with water there in the spring, the spring water collects. The dam holds it back but the minute the draw-down takes effect, you have just a great mudflat, with stuff sticking up here and there. I don't have to tell you that. The Member from Columbia knows what's going on in his riding. We've all seen what's going on in the Peace River. But why add more of that to our problems? (Interruption.)

I believe this Government has made it abundantly clear that they're not concerned about saving the Skagit Valley for the people of this Province. I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for North Vancouver-Capilano has given considerable time and effort; he attended the demonstration in the valley, as did one or two other M.L.A.s. I think only one other M.L.A. spoke. The Skagit Valley is in the Yale-Lillooet riding and we appreciate and are pleased to get help from any and every source. We feel that this is a worthwhile project to save for the people of British Columbia. I believe the Government recognized this when they set aside a park reserve last year, adjacent to Manning Park, adjacent to the Washington State National Park, and by fitting in the six thousand-odd acres under the Treaty, tying it in with Manning Provincial Park, the new recreational park reserve that was set up last year, and the North Cascades National Park, we could have one great international public reserve. This is a place where Americans and Canadians, people of all lands, could play together and relax. When you realize that last year we spent close to 30 million dollars in mental health, surely, is there any better way to keep people out of mental institutions than to see that they have good, clean, healthful recreation? Now, where do we go from here? This Government says, "No, what is Ottawa going to say?" I see where the Honourable Jack Davis went to Washington for the International Joint Commission. Did he go with blood in his eyes, fighting for that valley, or did he go half-and-half? I'm afraid he went half-and-half. You will remember in February of last year, the Leader of the Opposition read a letter from Mark Rhodes, where the Honourable Mitchell Sharpe stated that the International River Improvement Act of 1955 could be used to block the giving away of the Skagit Valley from the people of British Columbia to the people or to the power corporation of Seattle. Now, Mr. Sharpe has put this in writing. It's there on the record. I think the record of this Government is the alienation and giving away of resources: natural gas, oil, copper, coal, minerals, hydro electricity. They have sold the natural resources of this Province to foreign lands unforgivably and their record is only exceeded and excelled by the Federal Government. In the hundred years since Confederation, going right back to the days of the late Honourable William Lyon MacKenzie King, the Liberal Government in Ottawa has done anything and everything to placate our cousins from the south and I expect very little from the Federal Government in blocking this sale. I hope that I am disappointed but, if I'm not disappointed, I would invite my friends, who I believe are

seriously and honestly concerned about this, to either sit here or sit as Independents so that the Liberals in Ottawa can say, "Well, those Liberals in British Columbia that took up the fight for the Skagit are men of principles" (interruption). The Deputy Minister tells me they are preparing to make a move. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Leader.

There are alternative methods that could be used to generate electricity as an alternative to hydro. One is to sell natural gas to the United States or build a thermal plant and sell the electricity so that we're involving some man-hours. Give them a good deal on some electricity, tell them we feel that we have erred in signing this amendment to the Treaty three years ago, that we're living in fast-moving times and so we'll give them a good deal on some hydro. Two: The B.C. Hydro owns millions of tons of coal in the upper Hat Creek coalfields. Next to hydro, the cleanest form of electricity is electricity generated through thermal power. Some of the old lands in the clear field where the seams are too narrow to get in and mine them by manpower, by hand, they set these coalfields afire, they drill a shaft down and blow air in to facilitate the combustion. This, in burning the coal, generates coal gas similar to what the city of Vancouver was using under the old B.C. Electric before the advent of natural gas. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that as an alternative, rather than flooding this valley, we make some use of those great coal reserves that are owned by B.C. Hydro in the upper Hat Creek, that instead of strip-mining that area, we merely start a fire in the seam below, control the combustion, control the amount of coal gas generated and develop thermal, on-site power — and make some jobs for Canadians rather than flooding another valley.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that our philosophy is quite different from the philosophy of these people over here, that say, "If there's a tree, chop it down. If there's a beautiful valley, flood it. If there's a mountain, flatten it." That is your philosophy and, gentlemen, it will go down as having been known as the Government of fast-buck Bennett. It will go down in disgrace to the future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on unemployment. I know of nothing that is more devastating, more demoralizing, particularly to young people. My faraway friends over yonder like to call out about differences in political philosophy, differences in economics and I would just like to have a word, Mr. Speaker, about that. There is a marked difference in the philosophy between this group of Social Democrats and those people representing corporate capitalism. Whether it is the international corporate mining interests, or the international corporate insurance companies with headquarters in Zurich, Switzerland, there is a marked difference. First, a Social Democrat believes in full employment. They believe in a planned economy that's planned for progressive development of the natural resources with full employment. The corporate capitalists call them Social Credits or Liberals or Conservatives. You all represent corporate capitalism, and there's no more free enterprise. The best example you have is your insurance. What free enterprise is there in insurance? You're not free to take or not to take; you're compelled by corporate capitalism headed up by a Social Credit Government. Now, we have a basic difference in philosophy. We believe that it is possible to plan for full employment. A member from North Okanagan says, "What's an example?" Three years ago, Sweden had 2 per cent of the work force unemployed. Did they go bury their heads in silence and say, "We hope it'll go away?" No. They called a Special Session of Parliament and enacted legislation so that everyone was shortly back to work. The Social Democratic Government is concerned with people. It gives people the first priority. Corporate capitalism guarantees to the captains of industry a minimum of 2 per cent of unemployed at all times. That little Government in Manitoba, when it comes to standing up to the people that tried to hoodwink the Churchill Pulp Mill, had a previous Government invest 90 per cent of the people's money and put up 15, and then stood by and said, "We will administer that 90 million dollars for the people." Have they ever been dictated to? Have they ever been in the hooks of corporatism. I'm sure when the Honourable Second Member from Vancouver East speaks he will give you a few examples of just what has gone on in this Province.

I was moved by the speech of the Leader of the Liberals. His ranting and demands for antilabour legislation; his comments about the unemployed, made me wonder. I closed my eyes and I recalled how the late Gerry McGeer read the riot act from the Cenotaph and I wondered if he had been the leader on January 21 in this House, would he have stood up and read the riot act here? I hope not. Certainly, the type of talk that he gave in these very serious and trying times leaves one to wonder. I doubt very much if he will be given that opportunity; I'm afraid it will be many, many years before a party of that brand will form a Government here. Because in Canada, there are just two political philosophies. There are not the Social Credit and the Liberals and the Conservatives, and the Social Democrats.

There are the parties of corporate capitalism on the right, and the party of the Social Democratic on the left. The Social Democrats believe in full employment, worthwhile pensions and a high standard of living in a good, clean environment for all. Those are our policies and we'll continue to fight for them.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I would like to move an amendment and I have a copy here for you. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Atlin that the motion in reply to the Opening Speech of His Honour be amended by adding the following words: "...but this House regrets that the Speech of His Honour failed to provide any proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the Province, affecting many thousands of our citizens and their families, and fails to deal with the impact of widespread unemployment upon the social and economic life of this Province."

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Atlin.

**MR. F.A. CALDER (Atlin):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding the amendment, I would like to say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this Centennial Year, it is gratifying to me to take my place to speak on behalf of the people whom I represent, the people of the constituency of Atlin.

I don't intend to be very long because I am going to say my little piece this afternoon as a speaker. You know, not so very long ago, people said to me, "Oh, you're the baby of the House" and this was in 1949. Today they say, "little chief with his grey hair." They say, "you're the granddaddy of the House."

The person who moved the motion, the Member for Columbia, made reference to the fact that I was the only Member that had assumed position in the House here and that Doug Jung assumed position as a Chinese representative in the Federal House, and that my good friend, Marchant, was the first Indian in the Federal House. But we are

[ [Page 50](#) ]

celebrating the Provincial House and the little chief, he's still the first one here, and I would like to thank you, Mr. Member for Columbia, for that comment. It brings to my attention that there are Indian people in this Province who would like to see Indians appointed to the House, just like they have in the House in New Zealand with the Maori people. You know one of the happiest moments in my life was that competitive spirit. Do you know, I fought to get into this House? In this respect, I fought to become friends of yours and we became pals. I do not agree with the Indians who are now peddling and saying, "Well, let me in the door." They are going to have to get into the door on their own initiative, just like I did, and I don't agree that we should have the same plan that they have in New Zealand. If Indians in this country are going to be recognized, they're going to have to be recognized on their own initiative. I don't agree with appointments — they've got to get into this House exactly the same way I got in. Many of you may not agree with that but that's the way it is. I'm very sorry for the native Indians who may disagree with my point of view. It's been made a front-page story and I particularly brought this to your interest because the Member for Columbia brought it in. I take this opportunity to say that if Indians come into the House, the Senate or anywhere, they have to have the same recognition as anyone else. That's the way it is. They have to be recognized and this is the way they have to be recognized. I'm glad that, in this Centennial Year, I'm standing on my feet representing the constituency of Atlin, speaking on their behalf, speaking on the behalf of great people. You know, Atlin is a great riding. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a Klondike up north and Atlin was involved at the northern section of the riding. I said not too long ago that one of the keys to the development of this Province, and I think I also speak for all the northern Members, was the mining industry and the guys who blazed the trails in the mineral industry. I'm rather disappointed that there was nothing in this Centennial Speech that paid tribute to these people who, in one hundred years, blazed that trail, built the Province that culminated in this grand celebration which we're going to witness this year. Not only on behalf of the people that I represent in the Atlin riding, and I don't have to elaborate on the many klondikes that took place in other parts of this Province, I would like, at this time, because the Throne Speech didn't do it, to pay tribute to those people who prepared and laid that pathway upon which we are now celebrating. And I'm going to also state that the Indian lands are going to be paid in this country. I wouldn't say this outside the House, but we are prepared to go into the Supreme Court of Canada.

I'm very happy that the lawyer for the Government appeared in October and said before my lawyer, "There

are no objections." So now we are going to appear on the third stage of the fight for our lands in this country. I only hope that this Government, to whom we are directing this case, is going to adopt a gracious attitude in this Centennial Year and hold this country for the Indian people. We are going to fight, we're going to end up in the Supreme Court of Canada. We are going all the way. I haven't even talked about this matter to my own lawyers on this side of the fence but we are hopeful that justice will prevail.

I'm going to tell you that this is a beautiful country. You stated that you went through the country, Mr. Barrett. It's a beautiful country. Do you know this is the only piece of real estate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has not been paid for? You're going to pay for it and I stand on my feet, even though I know that I may be ridiculed on account of the fact that I'm the plaintiff in this case. We are going all the way on this case. We sued this Government in 1967 and what happened in '67? It was a grand year, I don't have to elaborate on that. But now we're celebrating this particular year and I don't have to elaborate on that, either. All I'm saying is that you had better recognize our position.

Let's talk about confrontation and meeting people. On the opening day here, I was a little frightened. I was one of the twelve people who were appointed to meet the Russians in October, the results of which you read the other day — that certain agreements had been reached. I was in Ottawa all during that month. I walked in Ottawa, back and forth from the Chateau Laurier over to the old station as one of the twelve delegates for Canada that talked with the Russians. We were escorted back and forth with machine guns, this was during the time of the kidnapping and killing. It was most amazing. I just couldn't believe that this thing could happen in our country but I was a witness to it. This freedom — I just couldn't buy this. Here we are meeting with the Russian delegation, about twenty of these very grand people who belong to the Russian Embassy. Only two maybe could speak fluent English, and yet the people who came over as a delegation for the fisheries all spoke fluent English. I was very much taken by what the chairman of the Russian delegation said to me when we were sitting in the window and we saw all the soldiers walking back and forth. He said, "Well, Mr. Calder, you see all those boys walking back and forth, that's what takes place when you dish out too much freedom. You fellows accuse us of confining freedom." I almost grabbed that, as a matter of fact, I still grab it because this guy, I think, was quite sincere. And so this is what happened the other day. We are giving too much freedom. Our way of life is to give freedom but I think we should learn a little bit from other countries. Here is a country which we accuse and yet they don't have it. In the same breath he says, "Mr. Calder, you see those armed guys walking back and forth. There's about two hundred of them." At the reception on our last day, he said, "You know, Mr. Calder, we don't have that in our country." I almost said, under my breath, "You've got them in plain clothes." There is still that underlying freedom. So now we come to our very own existence. I was frightened the other day. I sat over where Mr. Alex Macdonald is sitting. Mr. Deputy Speaker, here's a guy who admitted he was afraid. I'm going to tell you I admitted to a lot of my friends here that I was afraid. But why do these things happen? Here it's happened in the East where I was a witness. It's happening here. I think the reason why it's happening is because the Governments and the people who are engaged in the welfare of people are just not meeting the people. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say this. I have my tribe in the Nass River who are hostile to me and we're righting to be heard. They want to know, they want to give me their problems and tell me all about them, so that as their Member I can speak on their behalf in this House. The same thing applies to all other people. We've got standing committees, like we heard the other day, that are provided by the rules of the House. We also provide that if there's any special thing to be heard, we provide special hearings. We did that with the fisheries not too long ago, which I'm going to say something about in the later debate. Those people who appeared in the House — that was drastic. There is no end to this, Mr. Speaker, it's going to happen again, and again and again, whether we like it or not. Please don't blame our Party because I take my hat off to people, commentators, the

[ [Page 51](#) ]

people who saw this. It is rather foolish of my good friend from Columbia to come out the next day and point a finger....

**MR. SPEAKER:** I regret drawing the honourable Member to order but the discussion, as proposed by the amendment, is the subject of unemployment. While I agree there is some indirectness to be attributed to the show that was put on here the other day, I wouldn't like to see a debate on that particular subject. I'm not objecting to you touching upon it lightly but try to deal with the real problem which is the unemployment which is facing the Province.



**MR. CALDER:** I'm just arriving at that, Mr. Speaker (interruption).

**MR. SPEAKER:** I realize that, but I presumed that he was talking to the amendment. I wouldn't like it to be understood generally in the House that we're going to be discussing the situation which took place the other day.

**MR. CALDER:** I'm rather sorry that I had to enlarge on my introductory remarks. I'll go now into unemployment. I was just getting into it because here were the people up in the gallery. I think it is rather embarrassing for the Government, particularly my good friend the Member for Columbia, to get engaged in accusations. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something on which you have directed me to speak. It has to do with the motion that has been introduced by the Member for Lillooet and I would like to relate that to what is going on in the north. There is unemployment, Mr. Speaker, in the north and I'm very unhappy about the situation up there. You don't ever hear statistics about people who are unemployed up north. I would say 50 per cent of the residents in northern British Columbia, let's say from the Prince Rupert to the Jasper belt, let me pick a figure out of the clear blue sky and say 50 thousand people. That was the figure I used when I said not too long ago that there should be natural gas going through all the areas that involved 50 thousand people and I never even asked the departments exactly what that figure was. They use that figure in the statistics of Government and say that there were 50 thousand people involved in natural gas requirements. So I'll say that maybe half of those people in that belt are unemployed. I think I could be safely backed by all the Members on the floor of the House including the Member for Peace River, the Minister and everybody else. I am very much concerned about this unemployment and this is the motion we're talking about. I don't have to elaborate upon the points raised by my leader, Tommy Douglas. I think he made very specific points, which you all read in the paper, the points he raised during our banquet in Victoria. I think the people who didn't attend the banquet certainly read the account of his presentation at that banquet. It was good, I certainly enjoyed it. But in addition to what he said, the Government also should be doing something about it. I am rather amazed that the Government hasn't done too much about this. The only way, Mr. Speaker, that we can solve this whole problem is by cooperating and this Government has not cooperated. You just don't cooperate with the Federal House.

We're talking about the unemployment insurance, we're talking about everything and all you're doing is blaming the Federal House. Do you know that all the time you're blaming the Federal House, the poor guy who is in need is sitting back there. I think the only way that we can help solve the situation is for you and all the Provinces and the Federal House to cooperate. You people have met in the Provincial House. The Governments of the day have asked you to appear. Why don't you do something about it? You don't want to. You just want to place before the people this halo over your heads. You know I had an occasion to spend one month in Japan this year and I certainly enjoyed my time at B.C. Day. I think B.C. Day was a terrific day. We also had a terrific Canada Day.

You know, I had the occasion to go through the secondary industries. It was one of the motives upon which I went to Japan to see them. I had a very happy occasion. I was taken by certain Japanese authorities to see these. I think back, "What about these superports?" I see you have a little smile on your face, Mr. Speaker, because a superport involves your city. If it goes to Ridley Island, naturally, you'd be very happy; if it goes to Kitson Island then you won't be so happy because it's next door. Whether they go to Stewart, which isn't my riding, whether they go to Bella Coola, whether it be all the way through Roberts Bank, I wouldn't call these superports, Mr. Speaker, if I were you. We're neighbours. I wouldn't call them superports because as far as I'm concerned they are an exodus for jobs and secondary industries. That's all they are. They're just funnels by which our raw materials are going through out of the country. I found this out in one little encounter in Japan.

Yet we can open up right next door. Our committees, upon which several Members of the House sit, talk about investments, the American investment, the Japanese investment, and see whether or not we can arrive at certain areas which we can reach and work together on these investments. I really believe that. I'm sorry the Premier is not here. I want to tell him, especially when my Leader talked about talking to certain industries. I went broke in Japan, Mr. Speaker. I knew I was going to go broke so I made an arrangement with my banker that if I went broke I would go to see the Bank of Tokyo. It just so happened I arrived at the bank just a day after the Premier and his colleagues had left. I was told by the interpreter that they had been given a real grand time in the suite of the President of the Bank of Tokyo. I walked into the place just a day after and I tell you they really rolled out the red carpet when they found out that I was the little chief. And about seven hours later, in the evening, the interpreter

said, "You had a bigger reception than the Premier" (laughter). I'm still talking about the secondary industries upon which I'm going to elaborate later on during the debates. What I am trying to say is this, that the Pacific rim, and this was taken up by my Leader yesterday, this Government hasn't even touched discussions on the Pacific rim. Here is one country which I talked about even to the banker. He talked to the company — I was talking to the Government, which is the Bank of Tokyo, on what they would like to do — investments. Now, we're talking about employment. Here is one field, Mr. Speaker, and I'm saying this about the superports. The ports are no super to me after what I saw in Japan. The ports, whether they be at Roberts Bank, Bella Coola, Stewart, Vancouver, Prince Rupert, are no super to me because to me that is an exodus for jobs and secondary industries. The only time, Mr. Speaker, that I will call them super is when we can export the finished product. I think this was brought out by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I think what he was trying to say was that if there's going to be investment, let's go fifty-fifty with any country that wants to come in here and create these industries so that we can create jobs in our land. We're

[ [Page 52](#) ]

talking about jobs, we're talking about unemployment and I'm very sincere in this. I can go on and on about what I saw in the Far East.

Let's talk about something that's near at hand, Mr. Speaker. Let's go back to the north. I said in the last Session, when the Premier said, "We're going to Dease Lake," "No, let's talk about some examples." He says, "Well, we're going with the PGE up to Dease Lake." What the heck is up in Dease Lake? It's in my riding. We have great hopes in that particular area but it isn't that big, although the people in my riding might not appreciate what I said. We have great hopes in that particular place, and very casually I said in the last Session, "Well, let's go to Whitehorse." Do you know I only said that and boom. I got mail. People up in Whitehorse started to write, "You're right, Frank, you're right." This involves a policy of the Government. No, don't shake your heads, it's true. This is the Centennial Year and when we were coming into Confederation, we talked about, "Well, we're going to join only if the railroads come to the coast." The railroads have not ended, yet we're going north. It's going north, young man. I'm quite sure that my friends from Peace River are not satisfied yet that it's going to stop at Fort Nelson. If we are going to contribute to Confederation, which is not yet at an end, we've got to contribute as a Province which is now realized by people all over the world. We've got to go to the Northwest Territories. We've got to go to the Yukon and to Alaska. There is profit for this Government right there. We haven't finished the railroad system yet. You've got to go into the north to realize revenue for this Province. The same thing with roadbuilding. We're talking about unemployment. We've read nothing but blame for the Federal Government for its laxity in unemployment, but I think this Government has a part to play in this field. I appreciate that this Government has done a good job in apprenticeship under the Labour Department. Some of my own family members went through that field and they've done well. A couple of my own nephews now are earning \$7,000 a year under the Labour Department and you're increasing that potential. That's fine, I think this should be publicized. You can do a lot of things rather than wait for the Federal House to do something. This House can do a lot. Not too long ago the Premier had his finger pointing in *Time* magazine, "Go north, young man." I plead with the people who are responsible in my riding. Now I'm going to be rather parochial. I plead with the departments, "Look, we've got only 20 miles to go on the Stewart-Cassiar Road." A Centennial project. Before you leave, Mr. Premier, why don't you make it a Centennial project? Once that is connected, you are going to see numerous companies building up their claims. We've got a lot there that's ready to go and they're only waiting for this road to be completed. The Members of this House don't even know what is going on in one of the greatest projects in the north. Several people smiled when I said about two years ago there were three big projects in the Province — Columbia, Peace and the Stewart-Cassiar Road. It is a big project. All you require is 20 little miles. The entry is now finished on the north end so let's get rid of him, you know, Ben Ginter. Let's get a new contract and boom. I'm very happy that he is now finished with his contract. I've been waiting for that guy to get off our backs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It's a cost plus, what are you going to do?

**MR. CALDER:** It's a cost plus and he gets about one and a half million dollars every year and he has only averaged about 4.5 miles a year for the last 10 years. Let's get him off our backs and put a new contract on that road and let's finish it this year so that company after company can start developing and create jobs. This is what I am driving at — creating jobs. We've got only one bridge over the Meziadin to connect Stewart and Terrace. You people

know all about the southern tip of my riding. All we need is a 300 ft. bridge. Everybody has been asking for it. Build it and create jobs. The PGE was going to Peace River. Let's go further and create jobs. We're going to Fort Nelson. Let British Columbia help build the Northwest Territories by creating jobs and building that railroad. I read the other day that one of the Members, I think it was Mr. Fraser, mentioned about buying out the railroad in your riding, at least, part of it. I said that several years ago. The Premier has a habit of turning his back to us, but when I mentioned that year that we should buy out the railroad from Prince George to Prince Rupert, he turned around and faced me. He didn't nod but I knew that he was interested. I agree with the Member. Let's buy it out. Let's control the railroads in this Province and let's create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion on unemployment, I believe that the Government has a great part to play and I'm going to say this very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that as long as this Government is going to attack the Federal, and the Federal attack this Government, there will be no solution. There's got to be cooperation in this field and it is a serious matter. As a matter of fact, you've got to confront the people who are engaged. I wouldn't mind seeing you opening up a special committee to hear these people. I'm going to say this because of what happened the other day. You're going to continue seeing that and you'll see it because you don't want to talk to them. You can stop it. You can stop violence. You can stop these people from being violent by opening the front door and hearing them talk. I really mean it, even though I said I was frightened the other day at the opening. Yet those people, a lot of them are university students, you can talk to them. Mr. Attorney-General, if you provide an avenue by which they can say their piece, you are preventing violence.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** That's Labour Committee work.

**MR. CALDER:** Let's activate all the committees. I really mean it, I've got a lot of faith in human beings. You might say that thirty people up there were a nasty bunch. If you can only talk to those people and open the door and hear their piece, hear their suggestions, they'll tell you. I think the whole structure of the matter is that if you avoid it then you are part of inciting a riot, because those people want to be heard. I think in the matter of being heard I think this Government should hear out these people on unemployment because we have a structure here comprised of a lot of Members of Parliament and we can hear them. Let them be heard, let us open up the doors to these people. If you don't, you're going to continue to have these riots and parades and everything else. I'm rather disappointed in the fact that our Party has been blamed for this and I'm very disappointed that even though the commentators and everybody else knew what was going on, I couldn't understand why the Member had to go and accuse us. I think the Member later was rather embarrassed and I think the Government was embarrassed. This case is a big issue, the unemployment. As a matter of fact, I told my own Caucus the big issue is unemployment

[ [Page 53](#) ]

and I think every Member in the House is going to have to say something about unemployment.

Before I sit down I am going to say something that's in my line. I don't give a hoot what my Party says — I'm going to have my say about this. I hope that the people who sponsored any kind of a rally are going to learn a lesson from this. Do you know I made two remarks within a space of four years against the B.C. Federation of Labour. I am not going to take them back (interruption).

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

**MR. CALDER:** I said something about people in the north and I've been talking about unemployment. University students, men and women born in that place up there. I'm very touched over this. Indians and everybody else. You've heard me say that. They don't get the first chance of a job up there because the seniority lists are way down here in the city areas.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Why not?

**MR. CALDER:** The unions. Ever since I've said that, I've had Indian Affairs and the unions phoning the offices up north and saying, "We've got a job for you." It paid off. What I said, it paid off. I won my fight. I'm still being congratulated by the Indian Affairs branches all over the place because they are getting phone calls from the

unions. "How many Indians have you got that can come in?" But it's not good enough yet. I won the fight and I also made a nasty statement which even my colleagues here don't like. I said that the only way that the Party can get into power is to oust the other guy. All of us in the House are all union members. We're all union members. Every rank in here are one-time members of a union and we all know that the unions have played a major role. As a Member of Parliament I don't want that guy to control me as a lieutenant. Never. They're not going to knock me out in the Caucus meetings (interruption). We've got a freedom party going here. If we don't like what Ray Haynes has done, we're going to tell him so. He provided an avenue by which other people told him the other day (interruption).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. CALDER:** You can't accuse him. Even though he hasn't spoken to me, I can't accuse him. I think this nonsense of accusation has to stop. But let him learn a lesson because he provided the avenue through which things happened. I don't care what my Party says. That is right. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think any section of society is going to control any part of the elected Members. This is what I have said to my group and I think this is what you have to recognize in all the groups. No section of society should control — big companies or the unions. I really believe that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Don't forget what he said. Big companies. What about the insurance companies?

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

**MR. CALDER:** I'm going to go a little further than this. I have never forgiven Ray Haynes for what he did to me. I made certain statements two years ago in my riding. I can't very well point a finger at him but I can indirectly do so. The statements I made I believe were true, and the union people in my riding said, "You say it, Frank," and I did, on the floor of this House. But two people arrived from Stewart to try and knock me out in the last election and the people in my riding said, "You go back out, we sent Frank to say this." I said it. With Mr. Ray Haynes — I'm going to say it right now because the next election is just liable to be my last run and I'm going to say what I want to say now — he wasn't satisfied with that. He was on the Provincial Council, which is public knowledge, and refused to send money into Atlin, so I had to foot the bill myself on the last election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** We all did.

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

**MR. CALDER:** I'm not finished with him. That guy should resign for what happened because he instigated the last riot. Honest citizens who are labour people should tell him to take off. I am a fighting man and I'm ready to go to bat against Ray Haynes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Delta.

**MR. R. WENMAN (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, as I enter the debate, I compliment that Member on his forthright statement. I'm sure the Province has been waiting to hear this kind of a statement from a Member from that political party.

I would just like to say at the beginning it is a pleasure to change the trend of things and talk a little bit about money and about inflation and unemployment. As I've said in this Legislature for the past four or five years, there have only been about one, two or three occasions on which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Coquitlam, has made an attempt to speak about the economy of the Province. It was most interesting yesterday to hear his comments as he staggered along from left to right, first of all damning Kaiser, then building up Toyota. What were they doing when he was doing these things? Let's look at these companies for a moment. Let's look at his philosophies. We are talking in terms of jobs and profits. We hope that by bringing other countries' investment into this country we can maintain or gain a maximum investment in jobs and a maximum investment in profits. Let's look at where the most jobs and the most profit are going to come from for Canadians. Is it going to come from Toyota or from Kaiser? First of all, in jobs, he mentioned that the Kaiser deal should never have gone through. He has called it a sell-out on many occasions in this House. Yet, if the Burlington Northern gains their application, that will mean

immediately to the Canadian economy, 1,500 new jobs for Canadians. Now if the CPR is allowed to stand in there and throttle the economy of the Kootenays as the Member of Kootenay suggested last time — and last time he just about didn't make it because of it because those people in that town wanted those jobs. There are 1,500 jobs available there immediately if the coal can become a competitive factor. At the present time, the CPR monopoly is selling coal. In fact, if we had had the way of the Member from Kootenay, instead of receiving anything from there, we, as taxpayers of Canada, would have still been paying \$2.50 for every ton of coal that came out of there. Instead, we are receiving more returns now and this will continue to build into a great enterprise.

There are two ways of making money out of enterprise in our Province. The two ways of making profit: the profit can

[ [Page 54](#) ]

come from dividends or it can come from capital gains. Let's see what the Americans have made in profit out of our country so far in dividends and capital gains. How much in dividends did Kaiser pay this year? Did they pay every American shareholder who invested at \$12 a share? Did they pay a good return? Did they pay 10 per cent, 20 per cent? Of course, they didn't. They haven't paid a dividend yet; in fact, they showed a massive loss. What did they do in capital gains for those who had the faith to invest in this economy? They bought shares at \$12 a share and how much are those shares worth today? For every thousand dollars that every American invested in Canada last year, it's only worth five hundred today. They didn't take out an immense profit, they took out an immense loss. They took the risk the Canadians themselves should have had the courage to take in the beginning. At any rate, Kaiser, at least, offered its shares in Canada; 25 per cent of the shares of Kaiser resources are owned by Canadians. Let's talk about the Leader of the Opposition's proposition. What percentage of Toyota is owned by Canadians? Is it 25 per cent, Mr. Leader, because that's the way the profit is going to go? Will the profit come back through dividends or capital gains? There's not going to be one dividend coming to Canada from Toyota; there's not going to be one capital gain coming to Canada from Toyota, because Toyota is a Japanese-owned company and it is not available in Canada. There will be, in the long term for people who have faith in that project, returns coming to Canada through dividends and, hopefully, through capital gains as well.

How about the job situation now? Now for jobs, the Leader of the Opposition is going to get us 200 new jobs compared to 1,500 in Kaiser. Which is the better deal, with no profits and no dividends? It is a rather simple comparison and he should do his economic homework and study a few of these facts before he goes running about the international market. In referring to the economy, it is easy for us to stand and blame a Federal Government, a Provincial Government but, as we look at this problem, we must instead look first to the international situation because 1970 has been a year of instability and a lack of confidence in the world market. This is largely true because of the importance of the American dollar in the world economy. Perhaps it shouldn't be so, but it is and, for the first time in the history of the United States, they have had and developed a massive deficit of trade balance. In fact, the United States which has usually had surplus capital to invest in foreign aid and foreign investment, foreign investments that we need in the Province of British Columbia this year because of their deficit position, they have not been able to make these commitments to the other parts of the world and this has created instability, this lack of capital input throughout the world, not just in Canada and in British Columbia.

The outlook for the next year does have some hope, though, because the United States is attempting to bring stability back to the American dollar. They have acted in a reasonably successful way to control their inflation and, hopefully, this huge output of money, this huge output of capital, that has caused this deficit position, and the war in Vietnam, may be brought to some satisfactory conclusion. At least from a monetary point of view, and a social one for that matter, the withdrawal of United States from Vietnam should help the economy of the world by stabilizing the United States dollar. While the current crisis has been avoided, the strength of the American dollar itself and its importance in the economy of the world does come into question. We can recognize that because of the importance of the American dollar. To lessen the importance of the American dollar in international trade, some changes are going to have to be made in the international monetary system. We have seen during the past ten years a decline in the value of the tangible of gold as a reserve asset. We have seen gold shipped to the less intangible American dollar as a reserve asset, and then we have seen the third, even more, intangible special drawing right of the World Bank become prominent features in world banking international assets.



It is important that we maintain all three of these forms of assets. We must have a medium of exchange, we must have a credit rating as established by the special drawing rights of the World Bank and we must have an asset reserve situation both on the international level in the World Bank and at the National level in Canada. I hope that stability will be brought to the world economy by a strengthening of the World Bank, both economically and politically. It needs to be tied even closer as an arm of the United Nations and it needs to be given more authority. It's interesting to note that the authority that they will gain will be determined by their method of determining credit. The World Bank, unlike the Bank of Canada and banks of the United States, its reserve assets must be in the tangible gold standard. However, the World Bank has seen a greater wisdom; it has seen that gold is not a real and tangible subject. It has seen that the real credit of any nation must be measured in the productivity of that nation, in the productivity of its people and its resources. The World Bank has seen, not only has it seen but it has demonstrated, that we must look at, to establish a stable world, monetary philosophy and policy. We must understand and accept that the real measurement of credit in any nation is its social credit. The credit of a nation is social and this is being understood by the World Bank and it is being brought into function. It is functioning successfully and it's going to continue to strengthen. I hope that, as it continues to strengthen, we can participate more and more in this World Bank as well.

During the past year, Canada has recognized that inflation must be controlled. This is not just Canada, each country in the world has recognized this. In recognizing the necessity to control, each country has, in its own way, taken action. In Canada, of course, as a young Nation, we reacted a little bit and I'm not blaming anyone, I'm just saying that we over-reacted, as we often do, and we over-reacted at the wrong time, in the wrong place and in the wrong way. What did the Canadian Government do? To start out with they decided to control inflation with increased interest rates, and by increasing the interest rates all they did was people continued to borrow and they added to the cost of inflation. A very unsuccessful ploy. Then they decided that they would tighten the money supply. At the same time as they tightened the money supply, they were passing out and preventing responsible developers from moving ahead in their expansion plans because the responsible developer, like our Premier, didn't move ahead into the borrowing market under those interest rate situations. They prevented the responsible borrower from going ahead and from developing, yet they gave credit to the person who could least support it. They passed out bank card cheques to every consumer who had already consumed more credit than he could possibly afford — the second mistake of the Federal Government. The third mistake, they made a very timid approach towards the Income and Prices Commission, they made a timid approach towards controlling wages and prices because wages and

[ [Page 55](#) ]

prices have to be brought under control to control inflation. The only method of really curing inflation .... the standard of living, after all, is our productivity, and as we produce more goods our standard of living rises as long as wages and prices do not accelerate more quickly. We have accepted in our economy a state of inflation; we have agreed that we will allow some inflation; we have agreed to live with it; but we could not live with the state of inflation that we've experienced in the last two years.

Our Federal Government recognizes rightly; as I said, they just took the wrong action at the wrong time and they went too far, too fast, too soon, in the wrong way. A fourth method that they took was to make discriminatory sanctions against productive Provinces, again defeating their own purposes, stopping productivity when you cannot stop productivity or you lower the standard of living. They were successful in doing it; they lowered the standard of living and they created the unemployment situation that finds us with the people out on the streets looking for work today. That's how it happened. In addition to that, they applied further sanctions, not against just this Province but against every exporting Province in this country. They again freed the dollar. They let it float on the market, let it become a speculative commodity, a speculative device and, once again, instead of the American dollar being worth \$1.08 in Canada and buying more and more of our goods, increasing our surplus of trade balance, it declined and this was most unfortunate. It was unfortunate the dollar was freed at this time in this stage of the British Columbia economy (interruption). I'm sorry I didn't get your question. Mr. Member, you wouldn't understand what I'm saying but if you like, after this session, I'll try to explain it to you. It would take several sessions because it is very important that you should try to understand this. I'd hope also to take your Leader, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, because he needs help and I hope that he will spare us the agony of trying to speak about the economy further, although maybe we should encourage him because, through speaking, he will learn more about it and

understand the problems a little better.

At any rate, the Government of Canada made five basic errors: the increase in interest rates to an unprecedented rate; the tightening of the money supply too far, too long; timid approaches towards wage and price control; and massive unemployment is hardly a practical solution, but that's the one they chose, in fact, that's the one they admit to. I had a Liberal Member on a debate just a month ago and he stood there and said, "Yes, they realized it was important to control inflation and the only way they knew how was to create unemployment." They're not hiding from it; they recognize that that's where the problem happened, that's what it created. It's too bad they didn't take the advice of our Premier a little while ago when he suggested the lowering of the interest rate. However, it is fine to say these are the problems of the Federal Government, this is what the Federal Government has done to create the problem. But how about a solution as to how to get out of the problem? What can we do to correct the situation? Well, hopefully, we can begin by spending any additional Government revenues on productive programmes only, and not on the extension of further social reform. Any money that is spent should be spent for economic development because it is only through economic development that we can create an economy for the people of our Province. It is the creating of that economy that provides the jobs that we are discussing here today.

I must say also that I would hope that they could create a Finance Corporation for the Federal, Provincial and municipal Governments. We have a Bank of Canada. The function, in the British North America Act, and the power to control the money supply and interest rates, was given to the Bank of Canada. As we gave them this power, this responsibility, we gave them a further responsibility to supply money for Governmental development at reasonable interest rates. The Bank of Canada can create money. The Bank of Canada should create money and a special reserve pool for the borrowing of other levels of Government. It should add another function to its already important position in our economy. In addition to this, one thing that alarms me about the Federal Government is that, while I want to see a return of the interest rate to something more in line, I'm a little concerned once again that they are over-reacting. They are over-reacting to our demonstration and to our need and they are lowering the interest rates once again too fast. They have to go more slowly because if they lower the interest rates too fast, we'll be back on the inflation spiral again that we had to make this massive correction for and take this massive recession and unemployment for our people. I wonder if they shouldn't just proceed with caution. They went too fast and too far with the raising of interest rates; now they should bring them back in a very cautious and slow way.

**HON. W.A.C. BENNETT:** No, no, get them down fast.

**MR. WENMAN:** Get them down fast? O.K. Here's some advice from the Premier. I'm glad that the Premier is listening. One of the other things that needs to be done, or another recommendation that I have, relates to insurance companies. I must say while I was listening earlier to the Speech of the Attorney-General I was all prepared to become quite angry because the minimal condition that the committee set up was for three years that this rate board would be established. All I can say is, finally, thank goodness, it's about time you showed your face in the committee and we appreciate that. It might spur us on to an effort another time. At the same time, Mr. Attorney-General, I'm afraid that you made a mis-statement today, one that is going to cost the people of the Province of British Columbia some money I fear, when you said that you were surprised that the cost of the basic insurance didn't go up. I'd like to have you stand up and...(interruption).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the Honourable Member please confine his remarks to the amendment which is before the House?

**MR. WENMAN:** Yes, I'm going to come back and suggest an investment form that will create jobs, Mr. Speaker. I will just take a minute to get there. This cost of insurance is compulsory for everyone in this Province and it's compulsory for the unemployed as well as the employed. This additional cost for them may hurt them, so I would have preferred a statement similar to this: "There are more people insured this year and they have a much broader coverage of insurance and they have that at a higher overall cost, therefore, we are happy that the insurance companies are making a profit." We understand now how they are going to be able to hold the line next year on the compulsory insurance. That we can understand that, with their more profit...(interruption). I appreciate that but I am sure you agree that the cost of

insurance must be kept down. That's the function of this rate board and I'm sure you meant to say that the cost will be kept down next year because there's more profit to the insurance companies because of the compulsory aspect.

Now one of the big problems that we have in our economy is that we do not have enough development capital to create the jobs. Where are we going to get this development capital from? Hopefully, we are going to get this development capital from the investments relating to economy, money brought in, investment, new industry started. But where is this base capital coming from? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would come from the insurance companies. There should be a limitation on insurance companies. Instead of getting the insurance companies to buy the debt of the country, why don't we encourage the insurance companies to buy the equity of the country? Why don't we force, in fact, by legislation, the insurance companies to invest, not in American equities but in Canadian equities? They are to some degree, but not enough. I would like to take almost all of this money for investment in Canadian equity and that would get the economy going. It would create the jobs because all of a sudden there would be a massive pool of Canadian economy. It's only Canadians who can buy that economy back, it's only Canadians who can invest their money and if they invest it in insurance, there's the pool. They can never buy our economy back from the foreign powers that now control it.

I would like to shift the topic to another subject as expanded on in some detail by the last Member. I would like to follow his train of thought which refers, of course, again, to the expansion of the economy to provide jobs. The economy needs to be expanded to provide jobs and one of the areas we need to look into is, as the Member suggested, the great Pacific rim. Mr. Speaker, I know you can appreciate this, too, because like myself, with the superport in my constituency, I hope that you will soon have one. In fact, I am very concerned that you should have one, because I don't want the superport in Delta developed beyond the acreage that is now employed. There is a potential of nine or ten thousand acres there but when that is filled up I don't want it to expand to twenty thousand as some have suggested. I'll fight to stop it. By the time it arrives at ten thousand acres, that's big enough and it's time to expand elsewhere. We're already overtaking our facility. I'm for employment in the Delta but I'm for a few other things that I can't talk about at this point but will talk about a little later on in the next debate relating to the ecology of Delta and subjects along this line. In fact, I have a proposal to make in this direction if the Speaker will let me have a few minutes.

Looking at the great markets of the Pacific rim as economic and employment opportunities for the people of the Province of British Columbia, by 1975, the mineral exports will be in the neighbourhood of 550 million dollars, along with major inputs of capital in the mining industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was mentioning that we should bring Toyota to Canada, but if we bring Toyota to Canada we should make them issue shares in Canada, we should make them establish a public company in Canada of which they would have half and we, in turn, would have half. They would do it, too, and I hope that you and every Member of this Assembly will have the courage to put your capital and invest in it, too. They have done that before in the case of Bethlehem Copper. We're all familiar with that. Look at the potential of jobs for Bethlehem Copper as the Highland Valley opens up, even the potential of a smelter there made possible by legislation of this Government. I hope that, as we move into the Pacific rim, we let our Japanese friends know and I would serve them notice now that, while we are happy to have them establish their car-assembly company here, we want it established on our terms with our control. I hope that they will offer, as I said, share-ownership.

Another thing re the way to bring more jobs here, we must compete more aggressively in world markets. We have, because of our trade with Japan, a surplus of trade, an extremely desirable situation in our economy because, when you have the surplus of trade, your dollar has more value. It appreciates in value your dollar and we want our dollar to become more valuable in world trade. So this trade position we have with Japan right now is about — I think I have the figures here somewhere — Canada shipped 631 million and only imported 495 million dollars, a trade surplus of 135 million dollars in the Pacific rim during the last year. Now, that trade surplus is extremely valuable but we must remember, the Member who suggested that we only sell and not buy, that you can't sell if you don't buy. Canada must survive. To survive or at least to maintain the standard of living that we have now, Canada must export because there is no way we can consume our own productivity. If we can't consume our own productivity then we cannot have the standard of living we have. We could say at the moment, "Cut them all off, nationalize everything," but, with the nationalization, would come such a drastic cut in our standard of living our people just couldn't and wouldn't tolerate that kind of a happening.

I would say that the most important department in our Government to solve this unemployment situation is none other than the Honourable Member for Victoria, the Minister of Industrial Trade and Development, because this is where the jobs must come from. This is the person who must get out and sell British Columbia and sell Canada and, at the same time, protect our investment abroad and insist also, as he is selling, that, "We want your money, we want you to bring it and invest it and we want to invest equal sums so that we can maintain our control. We want you to give our people in British Columbia a chance to go from this antique method of buying more and more debts." You know, a Canadian will always buy bonds, he will always buy the debts of an American company but he won't buy the shares, he won't take the chance (interruption). The Mutual Funds. Well, we could get into that but I think that would be straying a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't want to impose on your good nature.

Relating to labour-intensive industries, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that's why Toyota is willing to come here because, in Japan, they are reaching a standard of living and a wage situation where we will soon be able to compete with Japan because their standard of living is rising and they, in turn, are approaching China and Asia and other parts of the Pacific to make labour contracts to complete their production. I hope the Minister of Industrial Development will encourage Canadian companies to move into the Pacific. He needs to give them support. He needs to give them encouragement. I hope that he will encourage the Bank of British Columbia to move out beyond the borders of British Columbia and move into the international market. I hope that he will not let the thing that we have established with Japan, through our tremendous pavilion there, and I compliment the Minister on that, not let it fall. Now, just after we make the inroads into Japan, do we move out? As a basic

[ [Page 57](#) ]

minimum, we must establish at least, through travel and tourists, a B.C. House there and, hopefully, a B.C. House with employees from your Department, Mr. Minister. The city of Seattle has twelve permanent employees in Japan talking to get this international export and import business going. I think that you and your Department need to expand beyond the statistical branch and need to expand and move a trade office into Japan immediately. I hope that you're going back to Japan again, Mr. Minister, and take another trip. I'm pleased that the Minister of Industrial Development has the highest budget for travel. He should have the highest budget for travel and it should be twice as much, because he's got to be our main ambassador and he's got to get out there and do that selling. While you are there, don't stop in Japan. That's only one small market. Go on to China and open those doors into those Chinese markets.

At any rate, I would like to come back a little bit nearer home, to British Columbia and get back to the subject of unemployment and inflation, relating to one particular segment of our population. You know each one of us in our constituency this year, we're going to be talking to our senior citizens. We're going to be pinning medals on them, we're going to be standing in honour of them. The next point I would like to bring up relates to our senior citizens, and the problem inflation and unemployment has inflicted upon them. I'm going to suggest a financial solution. You know these same senior citizens who have lived for years building up their equity and seeing it disappear because of inflation, seeing their money disappear, they're now seeing their homes disappear. Their homes are being taken away from them because they are being taxed out of their homes. I'll come back to that one a little later on tonight. Another problem I would like to refer to is education. In our Province, one of the biggest businesses is that of education. In fact, one of the biggest give-away of dollars in many cases is in education, dollars that should be going for employment programmes. One way of reclaiming money from education would be.... (interruption).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable Member is abusing the rules. Would he please take his place?

On the motion of Mr. McDiarmid (Alberni), the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The Hon. W.A.C. Bennett (Premier) presented the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company Statement of Accounts as at December 31, 1970.

The House adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

---

The House sat at 8: 00 p.m.

## THRONE DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the Member for Alberni.

**MR. H.R. McDIARMID (Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be here again to represent the great labour constituency of Alberni.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment, I hope that the Member understands he's speaking to the amendment that's before the House.

**MR. McDIARMID:** Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that representing the great labour constituency that I do, most of my remarks pertain to the question of employment, or unemployment, as the case may be.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Well, I would hope that all of your remarks will pertain to unemployment.

**MR. McDIARMID:** Perhaps I might hope for a certain amount of latitude from the Speaker in this regard because it may be that while my remarks are pointed in this way, at times they may seem not to be.

I'm certainly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we have at least one representative from the Liberal Party here this evening. Perhaps it's unfortunate that we don't have the Member from Atlin here who spoke on this subject so eloquently this afternoon. Nonetheless, I'd like to say that I'm pleased to be here on this 100th year of our anniversary since joining Confederation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment, please. I think there may be some misunderstanding. Would the Honourable Member be seated for a moment?

**MR. McDIARMID:** I don't believe there is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** There may be some misunderstanding, so far as Members are concerned, as to their ability to speak to the amendment and still preserve the opportunity to speak in the Throne Debate. The Member who moved the motion, the Honourable Member for Yale-Lillooet, gave his complete Throne Speech, and the Honourable Member from Atlin, who seconded the motion, likewise gave his entire Throne Speech. His right to speak in that debate has now been exhausted. Any one Member who subsequently speaks will be speaking to the amendment. His remarks must be directed strictly to the amendment. He cannot speak on his Throne Speech but he may do so later. I want to make that very clear. This debate must be confined to the content of the amendment.

**MR. McDIARMID:** Mr. Speaker, with respect, I would suggest that my speech, in fact, does pertain to unemployment but that it's rather difficult to speak on unemployment without introducing the odd, perhaps irrelevant, sentence. I hope that while one sentence in a hundred may be deemed to be so, that this would not destroy the spirit and the context of what I propose to say, because what I propose to say does impinge very closely on the question of unemployment or employment in my constituency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** So far you haven't reached the subject.

**MR. McDIARMID:** I am sure that you would agree that once I get into the main body of the speech you will not be unhappy. In fact, it is not my intention to flout the Chair on this ruling, of which I am well aware. I was going to say that, while listening to the Throne Speech, I could not help but reflect that the Speech in 1970 had much in common and we are glad that they are both behind us.

Before the Opposition becomes too jubilant with this remark, I would remind them that politics is not unlike a poker game — you don't show your hand too early. The real crunch comes when the money goes into the pot and so I look to the Budget Speech for the real indication of the



thrust into the '70's. As I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, I must confess that each year he looms larger in that role. So large in fact that I am pleased to announce that he has won the Herb Capozzi Fitness Scholarship at the Marc Athletic Club.

As I listened to him yesterday, I noted carefully his positive suggestions to increase employment, the lack of which was his chief concern, as it is mine, Mr. Speaker. They were two in number. The first, "Operation Parks — B.C.," I believe to be an excellent suggestion. It is good, particularly, in that it would provide employment for the young, single and unemployed, and would be of much use in providing jobs for students during their summer holidays. I think that there would be an incredible demand for this type of employment to make an even more beautiful British Columbia. The second suggestion, that of securing an automobile industry for B.C., is just so much political flack, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion. On enquiring, I find that the Department of Trade and Industry has made more than one attempt over the years in this direction but has been thwarted by our low population density.

**MR. BARRETT (Coquitlam):** Have you read the letter I received from him?

**MR. McDIARMID:** Yes, I have, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, and if you're gulled by such a letter, you're more naive than I would give you credit for. In fact, I would like to say to you, through Mr. Speaker, that if this doesn't come, then we would hold you entirely responsible for this not happening because of your bungling interference. The truth is, there is no question that, on economic grounds alone, there is no justification for this kind of industry in British Columbia at this point in time. However, I had the feeling as I listened to his speech, Mr. Speaker, that for every job that he would create, he would take away at least three or four. As I understood him, he was against dam construction. If we had heeded this, there would have been a loss, I'm sure, in excess of at least 3,000 jobs in British Columbia. He's against the export of raw logs but, at the same time, he wants us to go into manufacturing, although he's against the construction of pulp mills. He almost gloated over the fact that expensive antipollution equipment at the Skookumchuck Mill has not been as effective as hoped for. Too bad, there go another maybe 450 jobs. Of all the pulp mills that have been constructed, perhaps more than this, in terms of temporary employment for construction workers and permanent jobs for members of the Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Workers and the IWA. He is against mines. Utah Construction doesn't want to see this happen. There go another 300 jobs, Mr. Speaker. He wants secondary processing, presumably a steel complex, perhaps a copper smelter but, with current technology, these things would bring us more pollution than all the others combined. Mr. Speaker, as for the Leader of the Liberal Party, it seems to me that he took more than two hours to tell the House something the rest of us have known for some time, and that is that the Liberals are the only real experts when it comes to bull faeces. How otherwise could he stand with a straight face in this House and call for compulsory arbitration, for a compulsory 6 per cent guideline, when his own Party could not even get labour to appear before the Prices and Incomes Commission — a perfectly voluntary thing — to discuss prospects for inflation and for jobs in this country. In 1970, there were some bright spots in the labour picture and the employment picture for the city of Port Alberni and for the constituency. We saw the completion of the River Road construction and a dyking project, a combined effort of all three levels of Government which employed many people during the summer months. Many people, Mr. Speaker, and which has resulted in creating a beautiful spot for the valley.

The community of Zeballos has been saved from extinction by the opening of a road linking it to the east coast of Vancouver Island which provided many jobs during the summer and, in fact, will have considerable impact for employment in the future on the citizens of the West Coast. If the Centennial celebrations can, in any way, come near the celebrations in the Zeballos Hotel the night of the official opening, we are off to a good start for our next 100 years, Mr. Speaker. The Tahsis Company will make Zeballos a logging centre and create many new jobs and homes in this coming year.

One beautiful summer day, I had the privilege of presenting letters patent to the community of Tahsis. This was a great thrill for me and an event which I had been working towards since first being elected. B.C. Hydro has agreed to provide power to the community in 1971 and, at this moment, Mr. Speaker, crews are slashing out a limited access route to Gold River via Head Bay to Tahsis creating more employment than that area has seen in a decade. This work is being done by the Tahsis Company and the road follows, for the most part, the survey carried

out by the Department of Highways in 1969. An interesting thing happened on this day, Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed to digress for simply a minute. I felt that, as their M.L.A. on the auspicious occasion of presenting letters patent to a new community, I should provide some kind of gift to this community and so I ordered a floral decoration from Campbell River. When I arrived on that beautiful day, I immediately searched to see whether it had arrived and you can imagine my chagrin when I found, in fact, that they had delivered, instead of this, a funeral wreath. This is a...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Will the Member please be seated?

**MR. DOWDING:** (Burnaby-Edmonds): The Member from Alberni has been avoiding the rulings of the Speaker in trying to present the Throne Speech in the guise of speaking to the amendment. A certain amount may be permissible but this has gone too far.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment, please. I am rather inclined to agree with the point of order that matters are being stretched very far in trying to relate certain matters to unemployment. I do wish that Members would have some respect for the rules of the Legislature and keep strictly to the amendment that is before this House. The honourable Member may proceed on that strict understanding.

**MR. McDIARMID:** Except for the small digression which I have mentioned, I believe that I have spoken quite substantially and pertinently to the point.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Will the Member proceed with his speech? It is not a matter for argument.

**MR. McDIARMID:** During the coming year, Mr. Speaker, the community of Tahsis will construct a high school in that community, providing jobs, and a new hospital facility, so

[ [Page 59](#) ]

that 1971 will go down as a banner year in that community's history. These three apparently unrelated events have one thing in common. A Cabinet Minister was ready, willing and able to listen to that constituency's M.L.A. and to make all these things happen. One, in his capacity of looking after water resources; one in his capacity of administrating lands and forests; and the other in his capacity as a Director of Hydro. Performance in the true tradition of the Social Credit Government. Performance, not promises, Mr. Speaker, for jobs for people in the Province of British Columbia.

One project of significance did not happen in 1969. During the election, I made an announcement on the strength of the commitment that the project had passed the Treasury Board, that the switchback sector of Highway No. 4 would be relocated and that the contract would be let in the near future. Shortly after the election, Treasury Board approval was rescinded. I can appreciate why this was not possible last year and have told people in my constituency so, but this year it is a different story. This project consists largely of rock work and could proceed, in fact, Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, in mid-winter when jobs are scarce and we desperately need to get the show on the road. I hope that the Premier will let this contract go without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, no speech would be complete for me without a comment on the progress of the National Marine Park at Long Beach. Mr. Speaker, I hope to relate this directly to jobs, if you will permit. It is very important, as far as this project is concerned, that the land involved be accumulated so that the Federal Government can proceed with building the camp sites, building the roads, and building these various facilities which I have mentioned, under, perhaps, the "Park — British Columbia" programme indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to bring to your attention some stumbling blocks which are making it a very difficult thing. Jobs which could be created in British Columbia this year are being thwarted.

I can state from personal knowledge that agreements to purchase property which were entered into between property owners and the Provincial Government have not been completed by due date. At least 10 such cases exist and the whole programme has been placed in jeopardy. On enquiring at our Parks Branch Office, I find that all of the half million dollars voted unanimously by this Legislature last year has been paid out to property owners. The

Provincial Government had transferred in October and November of last year and in January of this year, half a million dollars worth of clear title properties to the Federal Government and, as of this date, has not received one nickel to continue this acquisition, despite repeated assurances from Ottawa that such funds would be forthcoming. The result is that our man in the field, Mr. Rogers, who has been doing an excellent job, has had his reputation tarnished and his position as a negotiator badly undermined. The attitude on the part of the Federal Government can seriously undermine efforts to conclude phase two and get work going on this project this year, Mr. Speaker, because they can't operate until those properties have been transferred and, in fact, have been paid for (interruption). Yes, in fact, they are, Mr. Speaker; many of these people who have been promised this by our Provincial Government acting in good faith are completely at sea. They have made commitments in other areas and are unable to fulfill those and it's absolutely a disastrous situation as far as these people are concerned. They face unemployment because they have not got the funds that they expected to come at this point in time, and jobs are scarce in this area.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** How do you relate abortion to this?

**MR. McDIARMID:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that this Member mentions abortion at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Would the Honourable Member please proceed with the matter of unemployment.

**MR. McDIARMID:** Well, I was proceeding to relate the question of abortion to unemployment. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is, as was brought up by the Member from Oak Bay, who, in fact opened his remarks in an earlier Session and prefaced them by saying, "Let there be no misconceptions," that if there were no misconceptions there would be no need to talk about abortion, Mr. Speaker. But the question of abortion has serious repercussions as he has already mentioned in terms of hospital employees.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I find that the Member is straying too far from the amendment. His Speech is concluded. The Honourable the Member for New Westminster.

**MR. G. COCKE (New Westminster):** Speaking on the amendment, and it is a serious amendment, I wish the Government side would recognize that it is a serious amendment. Mr. Speaker, we have a sick situation in British Columbia and let me give you a couple of examples of just how sick it is.

Here's a symptom: Hydro recently allotted a contract to an outside firm when there are people in the New Westminster area prepared to do that work on fabrication at a reasonable disparity. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't only affect those people working for this small construction company, it also affects the people working for the auxiliary firms and the allied companies. It also affects the people that are dependent upon taxes — that's over there, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House. This Government cut staff, obviously, by one thousand recently, because if they had not cut the staff by one thousand, why was it that the Finance Minister indicated that we were going to hire a thousand people to replace the people that had not been hired over the past?

This is the kind of situation we have in this Province. It's sick. Now as a result of a combination, and I'll agree with the Government when they say that there are others implicated in this situation, as a result of this combination of foolish Liberal policy and short-sighted Socred implementation, we are in the situation we are in today. B.C. is depressed, not recessed. We're not sitting in a situation in this House where we're talking about a slight recession. We're sitting in this House enjoying the prophecy of the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources. In the last Session of this House, he indicated we were in for a very bad time. We were in for that very bad time and I suggest to you that one of the reasons we're in for that bad time is the fact that that bad time was aided and abetted by that side of the House.

Last week in this House and in B.C. too, television was in the House. I wish it were here all the time. This Government will stoop to any tactics to direct public attention from the real problem. Unemployment and poverty; that is the real problem today. I'm confident that even the most uninformed people in our society could not seriously believe that any political party was guilty of staging that upheaval in the

House. But if anyone were to benefit from such a display, surely it would be the Social Credit Party (interruption).

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

**MR. COCKE:** It was effective in diverting everybody's attention from the unemployed in this Province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Would the Honourable Member please refrain, as I pointed out earlier, from this particular event which took place in the House. This is not related, really, to the whole matter of unemployment.

**MR. COCKE:** Mr. Speaker, that whole thing was related to the unemployed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Not in this amendment.

**MR. COCKE:** O.K., it was an unemployment rally, and I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'll continue. Let's take a walk down Main Street, Vancouver, B.C. or Columbia Street, New Westminster. What do we see? Not only are the unemployed affected, the small business men of this Province are affected, Mr. Speaker. Those people are suffering. Let's look at some of the signs. Those signs say, "This Business for Sale." We haven't seen so many of those signs since the Depression, not the recession of '60, but the Depression of the '30's. The kind of signs that we are seeing now: "No Employees Wanted," "No Help Wanted." Those are the kind of things that I'm old enough, unfortunately, to remember. Those are not the good-life signs, Mr. Speaker, that we've been told about so often in this House. Surely those are the signs depicting a decrepit Government unable to perform.

I believe this Government, Mr. Speaker, has let down the small business men in this Province. They have let them down in more ways than one. One of the great ways they've let them down is by undermining labour. The great friends. They keep talking about how great and friendly they are with labour, those people that are on the job. Labour people say, "Let's cut out overtime." What does this Government say, "No, we'll grant overtime privileges to anybody that wants them." Labour has been crying this cry for the last 12 months, and this Government has not responded.

Where is that Order pertaining to overtime? At least distribute what we have in this Province in the way of jobs and wealth to those people who need it.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can do anything else but start to plan and I think our plan should be in the future — a plan for employment. A plan for employment, not throwing kisses to those people who feel that there's a possibility that they might have some influence but a plan for actual employment in this Province. We need a great deal of employment and there's only one way I can see of encouraging that kind of employment. I can see us encouraging secondary industry. I can see us doing this by making UBC, for an example, a mini MIT. At least get going on that aspect of using and utilizing our higher education facility for something that can help the whole community.

Secondary industry can be aided by post-university trainees who are in this Province, attracted by a university that would be a university bent on helping us to provide labour-intensive-type jobs. We all know that "labour intensive" is becoming a bad word in the resource development of this Province.

We've got resource developers in here that can practically develop our resources without using a man — those 1,500 men we were hearing about this afternoon if, in fact, we divert the coal out of the Kootenays and down through the Great Northern Railroad. A ridiculous kind of start. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's time we began to listen to the opinions of some of those people who are not in this House, are neither on this side or that side; people who have spent their lives learning, not people who have spent their lives emoting and responding to suggestions that may or may not be given by friends. I believe that it is necessary for us immediately to get into that aspect of education in this Province, and develop secondary industry immediately and have the aid and assistance of that university, which is certainly big enough to develop the kind of resources we want, in terms of human resources.

We're not encouraging B.C. Co-op's. We're not encouraging any kind of secondary industry in this Province. I give you, as an example, a cooperative industry — at least we know it is home owned and home grown. But do we

have anybody in this Government who is going out and encouraging cooperatives? Helping them to get set up? I think that not only are they not helped but they are knocked down to some degree.

This is the kind of thing that has to be done in the future. We have our resources, Mr. Speaker. Let me inform the Government, if nobody else has done so in the past, that those resources are there and those resources are going to attract the kind of people that are attracted to resources. They are low labour-intensive and are becoming lower labour-intensive. But those people who want to develop our resources, let's have them develop our resources, on our terms, in the future. Let's not suggest to them that they can come in and have reduced price power and that they can have all of the other things they want. Let's suggest to them that, "Maybe you had better go the second mile."

Mr. Speaker, if you want to provide for our people, if this Government wants to provide for our people, I believe that this is the time that you can start proving your point. If they can't prove your point, Mr. Speaker, then I think it's about time they began admitting publicly to their friends in power, and I'm talking about great power and the people who vote for them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the First Member for Vancouver Centre.

**MR. H.P. CAPOZZI (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, I'm constantly disturbed in this House by references from the Members of the Opposition to the question of unemployment, as though unemployment could be blamed and placed solely as a responsibility of the Government of British Columbia. There isn't anyone in this House who is not concerned with the immediate problem of unemployment in this Province. To have a Member on that side of the House indicate that any Member here, on this side or that, is not vitally concerned is to me an insult to any Member who has been elected by his constituency. When they try and point out a single finger and try to blame on one particular party the responsibility for unemployment, to me, this becomes nothing more than a cheap political ploy. When the responsibility was being placed just a few short days ago here in the Province of British Columbia as to where the problems of unemployment are and where the blame for

[ [Page 61](#) ]

unemployment should be placed... At a function I attended I noticed many Members on that side of the House, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and, I think, the good Member who recently spoke, were in attendance. At that time, the true leader of the NDP Party, not just here in British Columbia but Mr. Tommy Douglas, spoke and placed as clearly as he possibly could where the blame for unemployment lies — on the responsibility of the Liberal Party in Ottawa. The Leader of the Opposition and the good mover and seconder of the present amendment singularly pointed out that, suddenly, unemployment is something that exists only in British Columbia. We are not happy with unemployment. We are disappointed in the fact that somewhere in Ottawa there is a leader who purposely and deliberately selected as his policy that there should be a certain percentage of unemployed; cruelly and callously, and then went on to say that, "If you don't like it, lump it." What kind of leadership is that, at a time when everyone in North America is facing a problem of unemployment, when someone can stand and look in the faces of the unemployed and tell them that?

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to look to the south of us and see the terrible situation of unemployment that exists in Washington, if you want to look into California and into the United States and find out what's happening there, then somehow, if you can take any pride at all in some sense of accomplishment, the people of British Columbia should take a slight pride in the fact that at least one of the few areas in which employment has actually increased in the past year has been British Columbia. The total number of people employed has increased, and the figure over the last decade is 57 per cent. I am not trying to swallow the problem by quoting statistics because we all know that a statistic is not a particularly satisfying thing to the head of a household, who has only the amount of dollars that he receives for welfare or for his unemployment cheque. But I am saying this, how often we have heard them talk on the other side of their face. Today, their answer to unemployment is a very logical answer. It's the same answer that we intend to come up with, I am sure, when the budget is brought down. It is the question of priming the pump with the money that this Government has very carefully saved over the past years. I'm sure when the budget comes down, they will see the result of this. But if we had listened to those people on that side of the House, who year after year, as a matter of record, have said, "Spend the surplus, spend the surplus, spend the



surplus," time after time.... That great leader of the Liberal Opposition has often, and I can point out the great budgets that he has brought down in the House... We have 65 million dollars more to spend and if we had listened to him, to his fantastic policies, we would have no surplus left at this stage to start increasing jobs. Already the Government has indicated that there are 1,000 jobs that will be opening up in the Civil Service. There are 1,000 jobs to be filled at a time when they need to be filled. This is the very policy, Mr. Speaker, that is so significant. At a time when employment was rising, that's when the jobs were not filled. Now that there's a need, those jobs will be filled because this is part of the policy.

The NDP Member constantly brings up this question and says, "That no one is serious about the topic of employment," and sits there yelling, "Next, next," as though this were some kind of a debating game. I'm ashamed of a Member like that, Mr. Speaker, who would sit in this House and make a mockery of a debate that was started by them as an amendment.

The question of unemployment is the most serious problem that faces us but to stop, and to try to prevent us from getting on with the business by raising an amendment when they know the responsibility must start from the Federal House is once again, Mr. Speaker, to me, a clear indication of their irresponsibility, and I can think of no better word than irresponsible, by pointing up, as they say, "The great job programme."

Mr. Speaker, that is the NDP Party. Have you examined the record for employment in the great NDP Province of Manitoba? Have you seen how many more jobs there are in Manitoba? Have you examined their great programmes of employment? They have recently decided to take over one industry and release people from jobs. They have lost more industry. You talk about jobs for sale or small businesses, Mr. Member from New Westminster, that are going broke. I was in Winnipeg approximately six weeks ago and I walked through the streets, and you think a problem exists here? You can smile, Mr. Member, you can stand up as though, as a Party here, you've suddenly invented completely new policies.

But in the one Province where you have an opportunity to create great amounts of employment, would you like to stand behind their great programmes? Would you like to see the employment figures? Mr. Speaker, I direct my remarks to you, obviously, because I am speaking about an amendment that would pretend that they had all the answers to the unemployment problem. If they are serious, and I say "if", then I would say, "Let us end this discussion, let's vote on the amendment, let's get through with the speeches and get on with the budget," because that is where the real crunch is. Let's get on with the business and stop this talk, talk, talk.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

**MR. R.M. STRACHAN (Cowichan-Malahat):** Mr. Speaker, the amendment to which we are referring is that this House regrets that the Speech of His Honour fails to provide any proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the Province affecting many thousands of our citizens and their families and fails to deal with the impact of widespread unemployment upon the social and economic life of the Province.

The Province we are referring to is the Province of British Columbia. When I heard the shallow speech of the Member from Vancouver Centre, talking about the budget, when we realize that we have had 18 budgets and the end product of these 18 budgets is the highest unemployment figure in the history of this Province since the dirty '30's, is there any matter of pride in that? Can we anticipate with hope that the budget that is due in a few weeks will provide any more of an answer than the answer given by the last 18? What we have now is the responsibility of that group over there. They claimed the credit when we had full employment; therefore, they must accept the responsibility when, tragically, we have thousands of people in this Province out of work and looking for work. There was a man in Vancouver running for civic office a little while ago and he made a statement that was a direct reflection of the kind of attitude we have just heard from the Member from Vancouver Centre and is a direct reflection of the kind of attitude that got us into this position. One of the aspirants for alderman in the city of Vancouver (I think his name was Graham), when he saw the

terrible housing in which some of the people in that city had to live, said, "Why don't the poor work a little harder, so

that they can get a better place in which to live?"

We have had this number of unemployed in this Province because of the kind of system that these people have supported, that these people have promoted and these people have projected throughout the years. I'm not happy with what's happening in this great Province of British Columbia but I simply ask you to have some humility to try, once and for all, to forget that terrible political syndrome that has been your strength and is now your weakness.

Try to remember we are not talking about 7 per cent. We are not talking about 70,000 people, we are talking about a single human being. There is a man by the name of Burns, born 212 years ago, who said to his brother, Gilbert, that the most mortifying thing in the world was to observe a man looking for work. In a poem he said:

"See yonder poor, o'er laboured wight,

So abject, mean and vile,

Who begs a brother of the earth

To give him leave to toil.

And see his lordly fellow-worm.

The poor petition spurn,

Unmindful tho' a weeping wife

And helpless off-spring mourn.

That's what we are talking about. Tonight, we are talking about human beings. I suggest to you that when the Minister of Rehabilitation and Welfare stands, as he has so often done since he took that Portfolio, and talks about 10,000 jobs, he's talking about a myth. That was expressed very eloquently by someone who went to the Alliance of Business Men asking for a job, and, as he left the PAB Office, said that he realized the unemployed of B.C. were being offered hypothetical jobs that don't even exist in reality.

I heard the Minister of Labour speak this afternoon. I was disappointed. I was more disappointed this year than ever before because I listened to the bragging here this evening about the jobs being provided by various Government enterprises. I heard with pride the Member from Atlin speak today about the rights of the Indian people and I remembered the Pacific Great Eastern Railway and the ads that were placed in the papers by contractors — advertising jobs for the clearance of the right-of-way for the PGE: "Indians preferred: 75 cents an hour. Bring your own blankets." This is the answer to unemployment? You might say, "this is 15 or 16 or 17 years ago," and it was. But have we improved since then? I hear talk over here about the jobs being offered by the Government with regard to the extension (interruption). It was in the initial PGE extension. The ad was in the paper. I'll find it for you. All right, that was an ad that was in the paper so let's examine what's happening now in this PGE extension that is suppose to provide jobs and bring great prosperity to the people of this Province.

I quote from the Vancouver *Sun* of October 14 and they are talking about the extension of the PGE. Now if this is the only answer these people have to employment and unemployment in British Columbia, then I suggest we re-examine our standards because it is contributing practically nothing to the solution of the unemployment problem. It is undermining 60 years of effort on the part of the people of this Province to create a great standard of living. What does it say? It goes into some of the technical aspects of how the PGE is saving money by doing some shoddy work. I won't go into that. But who's working on this? About half of the gandy dancers (this is how they refer to people who work on railroads — it's a normal term, it's not a derogatory term) are nonunion employees who earn \$2.10 an hour and are Portuguese. There are a number of Portuguese employed in this Province. Many of them are employed in Kitimat and do a fine job and intend to become good British Columbia citizens. But what kind of conditions are you asking them to live under and work under? This is why I'm asking you to examine your whole attitude because you will not, and you cannot and you must not solve the unemployment situation in this Province by

reducing the hard-won standards of the people of this Province.

Their automobile and railway car accommodations are adequate but hardly up to the standards of modern construction and mining camps. Mr. Speaker, we have laws in this Province. The Minister of Health is in charge, I think, of that particular legislation governing camps for people who are working in this Province. Roadmaster Ashley says, "They work up to 17 hours a day." With 70,000 people unemployed in the Province of British Columbia, a Government Agency has people not only working for \$2.10 an hour but working the unconscionable time of 17 hours a day.

Where are we going? Where are you taking us? Who's responsible for unemployment? Ottawa? When you are working people 17 hours a day on a Government project and when there are thousands of people walking the streets, looking for work, unemployed. Two dollars and ten cents an hour nonunion. You wonder why I'm union with such an unscrupulous Government that they allow one of their agencies to exploit people at a time of need? "Immigrants," they say, and they are working 17 hours a day (interruption). It's a report in the Vancouver *Sun* of Wednesday, October 14. I've heard no denials from anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about British Columbia. I welcome immigrants to this Province. I'm an immigrant, too. But what do the rest of them say? So are you, Mr. Speaker. I came to this Province and I wanted to stay here and I wanted to help build this Province. The alternative is for them to go back to Portugal, where living is cheap, and go into semiretirement. Is this your answer to the unemployment situation in this Province — part-time Minister of Labour, who obviously can't service the job? Mr. Minister, the man who sits next to you happens to be the President of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway and, if he doesn't know what's happening to that railway, if he doesn't know the conditions under which people are being asked to work at a time when we have 70,000 unemployed, then I suggest to you it's time you started talking to each other.

I could go into some other aspects of what the Minister of Labour said this afternoon. I listened to his bragging. I suggest he looks at the Federal statistics to find the end product of this Minister of Labour and that Government. I suggest you look at the Common's *Debates*, in which we are given the figures on the personal income of the workers of this Province and the people of this Province. Take a look at them and you'll find that, in 1957, 10.8 per cent of the personal income of Canada accrued to the workers of British Columbia. Now it's down to 10.3 per cent of the total worker income in Canada.

If you look at the personal income per capita, you will find that, in 1952, it was the highest in Canada but, as the end product of this Government's administration, we have now slipped into second place and find other Provinces rapidly catching up to us. This is why we've got unemployment. I blame Ottawa some because of their failure to utilize

[ [Page 63](#) ]

their power for monetary control of the system. There are times when they injected money into this system that was not related to productivity. I recollect the debates that took place in this House in regard to the Bank of British Columbia and, certainly, the operation of the financial system has a great impact on the employment situation. I want you to recollect, Mr. Speaker, that when the Bill was introduced into this House to set up the Bank of B.C., the people sitting here supported it 100 per cent. Our only complaint was that we felt that the Government of the Province should have a much larger control than was enunciated in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the relationship of the monetary system to the employment situation cannot be overlooked in this debate. I had great hopes for the Bank of British Columbia and I supported that Bank 100 per cent, publicly or privately owned, because I felt it was an opening of a new era, a new day in the Province of British Columbia. I expected the Bank of British Columbia to make its own policies, to chart its own course. But what do we find? Admittedly, it has set a prime interest rate at one quarter of one per cent below that of the other chartered banks in Canada but that's as far as it's gone. This poor, beleaguered Liberal Federal Government, three times in this past 12 months, has reduced its prime interest rate. But the chartered banks of Canada, that you all support, reduced their prime...and, this is the key, their prime interest rate once, only once. While the Federal Government reduced their prime interest rate three times, the chartered banks reduced it once. The Bank of British Columbia, I feel, should

have charted its own course, should have set its own interest rates, should have really taken British Columbia up that road so it could reflect the pious wishes of the Throne Speech and provided the financial backing. That's the purpose of a bank. It's the reason for having a bank. I have to express disappointment at the fact that the Bank of British Columbia has not charted its own course, has not taken the free trail that could have helped overcome the problem of unemployment that now curses the Province of British Columbia. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am supporting this amendment because I feel that the unemployment situation in the Province of British Columbia is the end result of 18 years of tragic Government that didn't know where it was going.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

**MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey):** Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday on complaints on the problem of unemployment and I certainly don't intend to take the time of the House tonight to reiterate any of those arguments. But I cannot stand by, with the Attorney-General having appeared this afternoon to give us a catalogue of lame excuses, and not reply by saying that our disappointment has been at the failure of the Government to do anything about the problem. Our criticism has been directed at the Government so that you would come up with some positive solutions. I don't excuse, in any way, the policies of the Federal Government, which have been anti-inflationary and which have contributed to unemployment all across this Nation. The Federal Government must bear its share of the responsibility. The reason why that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is not total for the Province of British Columbia is because our unemployment rate in this Province has soared to double the National average. If this were something that had to do only with monetary and fiscal policy, then our unemployment would not have been out of proportion to the rest of the Nation. Yet, during the summer, the peak employment period, here and across all the Nation, British Columbia had an unemployment record that would have embarrassed the depressed Maritimes — by far the highest in the Nation.

All the Minister of Municipal Affairs had to offer then were excuses that people were migrating here from everywhere to stand in our welfare lineups. Any Government, Mr. Speaker, that's worth its salt, always keeps in its pocket jobs that it can bring forth whenever the unemployment starts to rise. That's the first and classic responsibility of any Government. Always there are these public works jobs that have to be done and these are in the total control of the Government of the day. So there are these public works projects under your control right here in the Province of British Columbia. If you were worth your salt as a Government, you would have had those plans ready and would be moving them forward one by one to take up the slack. How much better it would be to take these people to whom you have to pay welfare or unemployment insurance and have them productively engaged in taking on all those things that the Members here, every year, stand up and insist upon for their own ridings. Why not now? Instead, what we had, Mr. Speaker, from the Attorney-General today, was a catalogue of pathetic excuses and an attempt to duck out from under his own responsibilities for leading the way in the do-it yourself depression of British Columbia, with a record of man-days lost that I hope will not be equalled in this Province ever again and which, I hope, we won't even come close to equalling.

"One hundred per cent wrong," said the Attorney-General. Well, Mr. Speaker, the figures which I quoted in this House yesterday were taken from public statistics, which appeared in our daily press in the most responsible series of Labour Reports that I've ever seen in this Province, done by Maurice Chenier of the Vancouver *Province*. You don't have to use the newspapers of the day to get these statistics. The Attorney-General said that these were Federal Department figures. Well, I have them right here, Mr. Attorney-General. This is the *Labour Gazette*, October, 1970, issue. I quoted the seven major disputes that led to industrial chaos in unemployment in this Province. You stood up this afternoon and said that these statistics were quite wrong, and that your own research department here in British Columbia, as well as the Federal Government, said these figures were wrong. Here they are in a Federal Government publication: the *Labour Gazette*. Let's start with the main one, the one that was under your jurisdiction. 2,160,000 man-days lost — I'm quoting from the *Labour Gazette of Canada*, page 754, October, 1970 — the number one industrial dispute under your jurisdiction. I don't have a research department at my disposal but when you stand up and say Federal Government statistics are all wrong and when I quote from them I'm all wrong I'm going to stand up in this House and read you what's in these printed publications.

**HON. L.R. PETERSON (Attorney-General):** The Federal Government agrees with our statistics.

**MR. McGEER:** The second dispute, the pulp and paper workers of Canada, page 901 of the *Labour Gazette*, December, 1970, last month's issue. Here again, 183,680 man-days lost. That's one, as you know, with which I had a little personal experience. The third one is in the same issue — the dispute with the Aluminum Company of Canada of the

[ [Page 64](#) ]

United Steel Workers, page 902, 111,890 man-days lost.

August, 1970, issue. Again, here it is. Federal Government publications, in black and white, 71,820 man-days lost, page 608. It's these man-days lost that led to our unemployment because, month after month, these figures were piling up, particularly during the summer when the total construction industry was shut down. Housing starts off by 75 per cent. That's when our unemployment, not the people on strikes or lay-offs but the unemployment, was 1 1/2 per cent higher than the supposedly depressed Maritimes. This is when our unemployment started. I wouldn't mind you standing up, Mr. Attorney-General, and disputing some of these statistics if you had any positive solutions to offer now. But what we want to hear from this Government today is not the lame excuses, not the arguing over whether it was two million or one million man-days lost, not whether or not the Federal Government was partly responsible for this crisis, but what you and your Government are going to do today. And the problem with all of you is that you've got no solutions at all. What you should be doing is standing down and getting out of the way so that someone else could do a job.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Esquimalt.

**MR. H.J. BRUCH (Esquimalt):** In order to solve the problem we must all, as British Columbians, attack the root cause of that problem. By passing this amendment we would be giving the National Government an excuse. Let's put the people of British Columbia before politics.

Mr. Speaker, how can a Liberal Cabinet Minister, Otto Lang, and the Finance Minister Benson get up on National television and brag that, through their policies of high interest rates, through their policies of putting more blocks in the way of development in British Columbia while they gave incentives to Quebec and the Maritimes, and that by these policies they have slowed down the economy? You can't have it both ways. But if you believe in those National policies, if you believe in those people with whom you are affiliated, then you can't be hypocritical and come out with an attack such as you have come out with in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, when you come to 10 1/2 per cent interest rates, you are going to slow down the economy. You're bound to slow down the economy because the young people can't afford to go and put themselves in hock to buy a home or to build a home. A daughter of mine went to buy an older home in the city of Winnipeg. By the time they calculated the interest from the principal by paying \$142 a month, they were going to reduce the principal by \$128 a year. Under that type of a policy, Mr. Speaker, you can't create employment. If those people were sincere about reducing unemployment, we wouldn't, as British Columbians, be standing here and attacking those policies that have brought about these exorbitant interest rates that are wrecking this country and putting these people in hock.

Mr. Speaker, there's a little more to it, though. I would like to know how many of those thousands of unemployed in British Columbia were given their tickets by Manpower to come out to British Columbia. I would like to know how many of those thousands of unemployed are draft dodgers that were allowed to cross the border by the Immigration Department. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Cowichan-Malahat partially defeated his argument because some of the unemployed, by choice, do not want to take some of the jobs that are available. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition was a little better student than he has shown himself to be because, in a by-election in Coquitlam, when the Honourable T.C. Douglas had lost his seat in Saskatchewan and came out here to get a seat in British Columbia, he was asked the question, "What about the unemployment that you had in Saskatchewan?" Maybe the Leader of the Opposition can recall his answer. He said, "You cannot blame a Provincial Government for unemployment in a Province because it is mainly Federal policy that creates the unemployment." Then he went on to say that the more a Province does to create more jobs, the more people in the other parts of the country that are up against the wall where jobs are not being created, will flood into that Province



and create an even greater unemployment situation than they had before. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the statistics, I must say that Tommy Douglas was right. Because the more jobs you create, and we have a record of creating the highest percentage of new jobs anywhere in Canada, and as long as the conditions that exist across the country are allowed to remain, we are going to bear the brunt of more of the unemployed coming to British Columbia because we are doing something about it. This is no reason to stop doing what we are doing to create more and more jobs but, for heaven's sakes, let's not fight a sham battle, let's not give the Federal Government as an excuse, and let's get after them to see to it that the policies that have created the unemployment are remedied where they should be remedied.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burnaby Edmonds.

**MR. G.H. DOWDING (Burnaby-Edmonds):** I don't usually find that this House directs itself to the question, but we've had two speeches from that side of the House that have not dealt with the really basic problem of unemployment. It angers me somewhat and I must apologize for those Members for becoming somewhat annoyed and straying far beyond the amendment. Now, what does the amendment say? It says that the Throne Speech has neglected to deal with the problem in any way constructively. You have neglected it as if it didn't exist. For the Honourable Member from Vancouver Centre, who spoke today, to suggest that we should all forget the Throne Speech and wait for the Budget Speech falls into very great error, because one of the reasons we were called here today and were called here last Thursday, is for the Crown to tell us its legislative programme to deal with the problems that face the citizens of British Columbia. The Throne Speech was singularly lacking in any constructive ideas that deal with the problems of the citizens of British Columbia. The problem of unemployment was not mentioned anywhere in the Throne Speech and for this House to neglect to discuss unemployment would be to ignore the reasons for which we were called here, and to pretend that one of the reasons that we were called here is to put the case of the people to the Crown or to the Government of what the people need when they call us here. That's what Parliament is all about and to suggest that we can wait until the Budget Speech is to ignore the practical things that this Government should be proposing in the way of legislation in this House before we even get to the Budget of the House. For example, we have laws in this Province that provide for the hours of work. Those hours of work are not divided up among the people who need jobs. Indeed, far from lowering the hours of work to meet the present crisis in British Columbia, no proposals are legislated to do that; instead, we have this very Government allowing overtime

[ [Page 65](#) ]

permits to exist all through industry in British Columbia, when 70,000 people are standing outside the glass looking in at other people working and drawing pay checks, while they have to live on welfare or unemployment insurance. It's a disgraceful situation. We're talking about people who are in need and all they ask for is the dignity of employment. Yet, we're not prepared to change the rules through legislation that would share up the employment that exists in British Columbia today. I would first of all prohibit all overtime permits. The time to do that is in legislation proposed in the Throne Speech. The second thing I would do would be to lower the work week so more people, perforce, would be brought in by industry to be employed. That's a matter of debate that you and I can discuss. We're talking about general measures. I'm not suggesting the 17 hours a day that this Government permits its own Crown agency. Another thing that's happening is that the unemployed are no longer being unemployed for only 15 weeks, which was near the average two years ago. They are becoming hard-core problems of unemployment, because they're beginning to wear out their shoes, they've worn out their means of transportation, their cars have been seized. They're beginning to lose their homes. They're losing their unemployment insurance and now they're on welfare. Yet this foolish Government, because there is no public housing for low-income families, is having to send these people to motels. Just like the Governor of New York who was complaining about a welfare family that was in the Waldorf-Astoria — two hundred and some odd dollars for two days. We are sending people to motels because this foolish Government has forgotten that it has an obligation for low-income public housing.

Construction of public projects is one of the answers within the realm of the responsibility of this Government. You don't need to do it from Ottawa. Ottawa is forced to come along with the Provincial Government if you take the initiative to create jobs by public housing. Look at the need for senior citizens' housing. Look at the need for low-income housing. Look at all the things that we should be doing on this coast in the way of jobs. Right now, in the city of Vancouver, they've come out with a report that was commissioned by Central Mortgage and

Housing Corporation, a study to provide an up-to-date basis for programming urban renewal in Vancouver in the 1970's. They urged that a 40 million-dollar public housing project be developed in the city of Vancouver (interruption). I'm in favour of jobs. I'm in favour of employment. I'm in favour of public housing.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Are you in favour of that report?

**MR. DOWDING:** I haven't read it but I challenge any of you to say you have read it because the report has just come out today from the City Planning Department. Tuesday, January 26, and I've been here in the House watching you and you haven't been reading it today. None of you have read it. What are you doing about the need for 40 million-dollars worth of housing in the city of Vancouver? Indeed, what have you been doing over the years to find the kind of retraining programmes for the unemployed? What have you been doing compared to the tremendous amount of aid obtained in Ontario for job training programmes? They've got 40 times as much money from Ottawa as we have in British Columbia to help retrain their people for useful employment. What have we done? Nothing in the Province. This Government has made no attempt either in the Throne Speech or in any other way to indicate a course that will give work to the unemployed of British Columbia (interruption). Well, all you have to do is read *Hansard*.

You know perfectly well this Province has the worst record in obtaining money, Federal money, from Ottawa. You have the theory that you can fight with Ottawa but you can't take their money. Yet you play politics with the hopelessness of all these people who are unemployed. I urge you to support this amendment because we've got to provide constructive solutions for unemployment and there are none in the Throne Speech. I urge you to support the amendment.

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

**MR. J.D. TISDALE (Saanich and the Islands):** It is true that the motion that we probably should be discussing simply and singularly is whether or not the unemployment problem was included in the Throne Speech, and not discuss, as the honourable Member did, wandering all over, after chiding us and saying we should be sticking to the fundamental point, that the Throne Speech did not provide or deal with the matter. If we're going to speak just to that, then there isn't much time or any need for further debate. It is interesting to note, too, that the Member who moved the motion thought so little of it in his remarks that he didn't do any debating on it but sat down and forgot to move it. Then he had to get up and move the thing. When we get to the seconder, the Member from Atlin, and he's a very fine speaker; I admired his choice of words, listened very interestedly...but, I think, that if anything is necessary in the employment field today, it's a little bit of harmony. If this is to be an attack or a place to have a family squabble inside of the NDP ranks, over the spouse or the husband's position, they certainly put it in the arena today. If it's going to be a time only of casting slurs at each other and dealing with junk phrases, I don't think we're really coming to grips with the need of policies that bring results to the unemployed. That's why I listened to the seconder of the motion. It was an emotion-packed display of attack against an arm of labour. Then, we have the former Leader of the Opposition getting up in defense of trade unionism. You back out of it one way and you head into it the other way, it seems.

The problem that you've tried to raise and intensify on the floor of this House by an amendment, which really wasn't necessary, because every one of us had full latitude and scope in our debate to deal with the matter at large or in detail.... If this were a matter, Mr. Speaker, of urgency, then it would have been dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition on his first attempt to speak in this House. But he tried to talk to us about the problems of the flooding of some parts of this Province, which has nothing to do with unemployment. We have, at a later date, a vain attempt to make a serious matter out of something in which we had full scope of debate. Then it became in-fighting in the Labour NDP camp. I think, today, the greatest force was expended for the dissension of labour and management problems in which they claim the strikes created the unemployment. If this in-fighting has been going on over the years, no wonder we have trouble at our bargaining tables. Who really was getting the bargain? Well, Benson, the Minister of Finance, said a few months ago that he didn't want us to start the economy too quickly. The Minister of Finance in Ottawa, Edgar Benson, said that we don't want the economy to start back too fast. Then we have the Minister of Public Works, Laing, saying that the Federal Government was going to

institute so many programmes to get the economy rolling and the labour force back into business. Then we have McGeer, bringing up the rear, not knowing what either is saying.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Will the Member refer to any Member by his constituency and will he please deal with the amendment?

**MR. TISDALLE:** These men were all talking about unemployment in relationship to the Federal field, because they are Federal Ministers. The Federal Government, of course, got hooked onto the train of events in respect to unemployment and, especially, in respect to inflation, which they felt had to be checked. They were going to slow down the economy, but they towed us all right into the tunnel of unemployment in the mock battle against inflation. I would challenge you, Mr. Speaker, in this House, that if the people had been given a choice, in that federal election not too long ago, to decide between joblessness or the continuation of the type of economy that we were enjoying at that time, they would have chosen not joblessness, I assure you. It's interesting to note that the Economic Council of Canada said this back in its sixth Annual Report. It warned the Federal Government of the dangerous course it was pursuing in 1967. The Council said, "With unemployment in the range of 4 to 5 per cent, it is difficult to argue that excessive general demand-pressure has contributed to inflationary conditions." In the face of that kind of advice, the Federal Government went right out on a wing-ding to throw people out of their jobs. They told all the Provincial Governments down the line and we were hooked to that same train, that we shouldn't inspire expenditures in capital investment at that time or it would be going against their policies, too. So you must fit into the programme because the Federal calls the tune. To sit here this evening and try to slur each other and brand each other as being in favour of joblessness is so much malarkey. I read from *Hansard*, one of the great defenders of the little man, which had this to say, "However, the Government continues with an anti-inflationary policy directed entirely on this false premise," and this is Tommy Douglas, October, 1969. He says the fiscal policy may be a powerful tool in controlling employment and goes on to explain that its result will be excessive unemployment. He's speaking in the Federal House. Tonight, he has been quoted here many times and the people who proposed the amendment apparently do not believe in their Federal Leader's policies. You don't. You can read the whole section here, page after page, where your Leader down there has gone right to bat for Provincial Governments and against the Federal policy that was going to result in extensive unemployment across Canada. He didn't treat the Canadian economy in piecemeal fashion and vulcanize it. He recognized the Federal policies on a fiscal basis with which the amendment deals, with the social and financial effects on unemployment...he recognized that the tide into unemployment are the policies on deflation. At the very time of that speech in October, the Economic Council of Canada had warned the Federal Government that 5 per cent unemployment was already an indication that there was plenty of slack in the economy and you didn't have to cool it off by turning off the finances. They turned off the finances of this country so that they couldn't care less about housing, they couldn't care less about social improvement, they didn't care about taking the local bread off their table, but they swept the crumbs off the floor from the children, even, in many a home. That was the policy of the Federal Government and then they pick on the poor in the name of having a vision. Having a vision — more Welfare policies! Try to police the situation! Benson's new White Paper for unemployment. What does it do? If it comes into being, it will encourage slothfulness, encourage freeloading and featherbedding on the welfare and unemployment situation, does not raise the dignity of man one iota above the carpet, still makes him crawl for what he wants in this economy, when all along the financial resources and the credit of this Nation could be placed at the disposal of the people, for the people, and not be a burden upon the people with deficit financing as we're getting today. The vehicle to make trade and industry run on is at our disposal in the Federal field and could be used for the benefit of the people. But, today, it is being used discriminatorily against those who are on the fringe, on the outside, who haven't got a chance. I don't care how easily you make money. If the jobs aren't available you can't pay it back, and the risk today is extensive because they are uncertain of what the Federal policies will be. People are afraid. You can't build a company on fear, and you can't build a country on fear. That's what they're trying to do. I will not support this motion; it's an indictment against the conditions in this Province that have been perpetuated by the Federal Government.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Surrey.

**MR. E. HALL (Surrey):** The answer is the Minister of Labour. I think it's fair to say that this afternoon's contribution, really, in some ways, prompted this debate. Certainly, I for one, was not satisfied with his speech, at least with that part of the speech which dealt with the unemployment situation in the Province. I don't think that the

House, Mr. Speaker, was given the kind of information this afternoon on unemployment that would enable anybody, any responsible legislator, to really tackle the essential questions that arise in his constituency and in his mail and from companies, trade unions and so on. The purpose of the debate, surely, is to analyze really what is going on, to determine each on our own reasoning what role a Provincial Government does have as far as unemployment and poverty are concerned in 1971. I will yield to nobody in my horror of the Liberal policies, and I certainly agree with everybody who has taken that track of blaming Ottawa for a great deal of the problem. Those who follow me can continue with my full support but it's not good enough just to simply blame Ottawa. We're supposed to have something in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, that should be able to do something in spite of Ottawa. And that's the role, surely, we're looking for and that's the role that's not being filled by a number of Cabinet Ministers. I don't think I need to name them all because I think they know who I'm talking about. But the fact of the matter is that unemployment has reached the highest this Government has ever seen. Surely, it's time to come clean. It's time to share some of the information. It's time for the Minister of Labour to tell us who's unemployed, what kind of trades are suffering the most, what are the age groups of the unemployed, what is the multiplying effect of those who are unemployed. It's safe to say, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are standing here today with a quarter of a million people in British Columbia existing below the poverty level. I admit and I know that many members on the other side of the House are just as sincere in attacking this problem as I am and they should be asking the same questions. Let's

[ [Page 67](#) ]

find out who the unemployed are. Let's find out what skills are involved. Let's find out what mismatching of skills is involved. Let's find out what a mess certain sections of Canada Manpower have made of it over the last 12 months and see what we can do to focus attention onto it. At the same time, we must also point out, as other speakers have pointed out, that there's been over a thousand vacancies in the Civil Service. Now we were told lightly and in one of those off-the-cuff kind of interviews that that really wasn't important, that there was no essential business loss or suffering. I can quote some of the examples of some of the distress that was caused because you adopted a Trudeau policy in your own Civil Service. I can tell you that teacher registration is still behind time, and that some teachers, once the calendar year goes.... The Minister of Education will know what I'm talking about — because of lack of staff, some teachers do not receive their accreditation for nearly four months and if it goes over the calendar year, this could mean a total loss of wages over a lifetime period, amounting to some thousands of dollars. I've got examples, in terms of the Department of Finance, where the shortage of Civil Servants has meant that people have had to pay interest on the loan that you have guaranteed them to buy a house. That's not helping the unemployment situation. There are examples after examples of the delays in processing applications, the delays in dealing with permits and so on and so forth. These have an equally bad, downward, spiralling effect as those things that the Member from Burnaby-Edmonds spoke about — once you're over a certain period of time on unemployment, the feeling becomes really chronic.

We talked this afternoon, to a certain extent, from the other side, about what is going to be in future speeches. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if the Member for Vancouver Centre knows of some of these pump-priming activities that are going to come up in a week I just simply ask why weren't they produced last September, last August and so on and so forth. For the last 18 months the Government has adopted a Trudeau policy in cooling off the economy; otherwise, why were municipalities a year ago not allowed to go to referendum on public works programmes? You've done exactly the same thing as the villain that you've accused in Ottawa. Exactly, the same thing. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about *here* in British Columbia and *now* in British Columbia and no meaningless repetition of figures, as contained on page 6 of the Throne Speech, is going to help any single one as an individual or as a group, whichever way you want to look at the unemployed people in this Province. I think the carelessness of the attitude of the Minister of Labour regarding this problem was only equalled by his carelessness in pronunciation. I don't want to belabour that because anybody can make a mistake, but when he makes the same mistake, year after year, by calling French a foreign language in Canada, you've got to say something about it. As for the Minister of Education, the ex-Minister of Education... (interruption) you did, Mr. Minister, you said, "foreign expression." I won't belabour the point because I'll be out of order but it just shows the depth of understanding of the Attorney-General who, one of these days, will unfortunately represent us at the Constitutional Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this amendment but I will say this: it is a pity that we could not have had a debate, the kind of debate that takes place in other jurisdictions where the Members of the House could ask questions of the

research staff to answer and find out some of the practices and some of the statistics (interruption). You well know that we don't have a question period to ask some of these things and we're told to sit tight and wait and wait, and that if we wait for the Budget Speech, all will be well. I'm not prepared to wait that length of time, I want to see something done now.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Columbia River.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** In speaking to this amendment, I want to say, first of all, that the amendment is a phony amendment and it was presented without sincerity, and it's shallow, indeed. It was presented as an afterthought. The Member from Yale-Lillooet presented this amendment here today on the prompting...

**AN HON. MEMBER:** The Honourable Member is imputing motives and I would ask for an unconditional withdrawal.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Will the Member withdraw the word, "phony?"

**MR. CHABOT:** It lacks sincerity and I am going to point out those facts in just one moment.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Just one moment. Was the Member imputing a lack of sincerity on the part of Members opposite?

**MR. CHABOT:** I'm not saying the Members were not sincere but I am saying the amendment is not sincere. The amendment is not a sincere amendment. It's a shallow afterthought amendment. The Member from Yale-Lillooet would have never presented the amendment had it not been for the prompting of the Member from New Westminster. It would never have been presented unless he had been pushed. He had sat down before he presented the motion. Speaking about the urgency of this amendment, this same amendment was presented on Friday by the Leader of the Opposition. If it were as urgent as they are indicating it is today, it should have been presented on Monday. This does not show urgency, or sincerity either. The fact that you wait until today to present this motion means you people aren't sincere about this problem.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would ask the Member not to cast that reflection.

**MR. CHABOT:** Speaking about the Liberals over here, the one who has just spouted off, it was just yesterday that the Leader of the Liberal Party stated that he is against the workers of this Province, stated that he's against employment because he suggested that we should have the type of guidelines that the Leader of the Liberal Party has in Saskatchewan, a 6 per cent guideline. No wonder that Party represents the few affluent ridings of this Province with their attitudes. It's quite obvious to me that you people haven't read the Throne Speech. There have been certain references to the Throne Speech saying that it had made no reference to employment. So I'm going to read just two lines. I'm not going to tell the full story, because it's printed here in the Throne Speech. It says here that, "British Columbia, at mid-July, 1970, led all Canada in the increase in its labour force, rising by 6.4 per cent, continuing a trend throughout the decade of the '60's." What can be more obvious than

[ [Page 68](#) ]

that, as far as the creation of jobs within this Province? I listened to the Liberal apologists over here for the Federal Government and let me tell you what the number one problem as far as unemployment is concerned in Canada. It's the stupid fiscal policies of the Liberal Government. That's what it is. It is the Prime Minister's attitude about unemployment. "If you don't like it, you can lump it," that's his attitude. I listened to the Leader of the Liberal Party talk tonight about figures — double the National average of unemployment in British Columbia. It's quite obvious that he doesn't know what he's talking about when he quotes figures of this nature. I'd say that this amendment does not show a genuine concern for the unemployed in this Province. I maintain that this amendment is a waste of Parliamentary time. It's an exercise in futility and, furthermore, it's an exercise in cheap politics. I won't support it.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burnaby North.



**MRS. E.E. DAILLY (Burnaby North):** I know we have heard from the other side of the House that they are very frustrated with this debate that we've initiated tonight, and I can assure you no more frustrated than I am, because we had hoped that we would hear some policies from the Government side to solve this tragic unemployment situation in our Province. Yet all that we have been told is, "Wait for the budget." We waited earlier in the day to hear from the Minister of Labour. Hopefully, we would expect some constructive policies from him to give hope to the people of the Province who are unemployed. Nothing came forward.

So this amendment is done in full sincerity because we feel the people of the Province should have an opportunity to find out just where they are going with this present Government as far as unemployment is concerned. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I only wish that this debate could have been televised.

We keep hearing from across the floor, "Well, what ideas do you have?" I would like to suggest, in the whole area of utilizing the work force, that we have had very few ideas from the other side of the House. This is related very closely to the whole matter of unemployment. I'm thinking particularly of utilizing the unemployed, the skilled teaching the unemployed, and retraining those on welfare. Here is something you could do Provincially and all we hear is that everything is the Federal responsibility. Here is an example of what you could do and I want to give some credit to a programme which is making a very small step in this direction — that is the Opportunities Programme. I hope that all the Members of the Legislature are aware of this programme, which is financed by the Provincial Department of Welfare. But I must say great credit goes to the welfare recipients themselves, who have organized opportunity programmes so that they can learn skills, so that they can get out into the world again. So many of the welfare recipients become demoralized after years of welfare and are unable to cope with employment when the opportunity arises. It's a very patchwork attempt and all I hope is that every M.L.A., when they go back to their own ridings, will attempt to see if they can get opportunity programmes going in their ridings, if they are not going there now.

You know, the very discouraging thing is, when we talk again about what the Provincial Government can do — I've mentioned one concrete thing they are supporting — what I find highly discouraging is the fact that we have a situation where they are actually discouraging young people in our Province from improving themselves educationally. I'm thinking particularly of young women, deserted wives, in this Province, who are attempting to go back into universities, and I know a number of them are attempting to go back into teacher training. Now these young girls have phoned me, a number of them in great distress, because they were told recently by their welfare departments that they were to stop their work immediately (the particular university was Simon Fraser), that they were no longer to participate in their course, that they were to give it up and go home, and if they didn't give up their course, welfare would be refused them.

When I discussed this with the Welfare Department officials, I find out it's because they consider, in some cases, these girls have skills. One of them happened to be a secretary but these girls can't get jobs as secretaries. So we have this negative attitude of the Government today, which says, "Quit University, don't upgrade yourself, go back and we'll put you back on welfare." I wish that the Minister of Rehabilitation was in here so that he perhaps could respond to this. Surely, a Provincial Government that's concerned about unemployment should do everything possible to increase the skills of the citizens who want to have their skills increased. I think it's a disgraceful situation where we're encouraging young, ambitious people to go on welfare instead of continuing their education. I also believe that the time has come in this Province, surely, in a time of high unemployment, for Government and management to seriously review their personnel practices to ensure that they are not pegging qualifications for jobs above what is actually needed. Here is something which I hope the Department of Education and other related departments would seriously discuss with management. Jobs that in the past required Grade 10 or 12 are now requiring BA's. I do think that there should be a serious discussion with employers as to whether these qualification peggings are relative today.

I also feel that management and Government must take responsibility for skill upgrading on the jobs. I'm trying to make some constructive suggestions to the Government Members but, as usual, I don't think they seem at all interested in even listening, which I think is most unfortunate; however, I will carry on. I was saying that it is important for Government and management to upgrade skills instead of avoiding it because the person might leave after he's trained. All employers cannot find the skills ready-made in the market today and the monetary investments

which Government and management make in this area, in the long run, will produce more efficiency and productivity.

I'm very, very much concerned, as I'm sure most of the Members of this House are, with the very high unemployment of the youth in our Province. Certainly, the advent of the Regional Vocational College structure is basically designed to equip young people with marketable skills. I'm afraid we are going to have to face the cold, hard facts that today many of our youth are being turned off high school, and I will go into this further in the educational estimates. I'm making the point here because it's very relative to the unemployment status of our young people today. As a matter of fact, most of you, I'm sure, have received the United Community Services booklet on the schools and the drop-outs. There's a shocking figure there which points out that there is a 41 per cent rate in the years 1969 and 1970 of drop-outs and nongraduates from our secondary schools in British Columbia. Now, those figures can be debated — I know they are rough figures as is pointed out in the report —

[ [Page 69](#) ]

but the fact is that roughly between 39 and 41 per cent of our youth are dropping out or not graduating from high school. Well, these are the figures, Mr. Minister, and you can check in the United Community Services book.

I don't think you would deny that many, many young people are being turned off in our high schools today and they are going out on the open market for jobs. Here is our big problem about this — most of you would agree, I'm sure, that the labour market doors don't open until about the age of 21. Certainly, some of these young people get jobs but they get the kind of jobs that lead to nowhere, pay no money and generally alienate young people.

Today, we warn our young people that dropping out of school dooms one in the labour market but I believe we all must admit that the rewards for studying in high school today are pretty meagre as far as success in the labour market is concerned. What does this lead us to do then or to think about? I hope we'll seriously think about this, particularly the Minister of Education, when we are discussing the educational estimates. May I suggest that the world of work and education must be joined together for those students who are not college bound? In essence, I'm suggesting that there be a gradual entry into the work force for those students who so desire and that new policies must be established for this entry, this gradual entry into the work force, in the high school years by both employers and educational institutions, with both sharing the responsibilities.

I realize to implement this, basically, requires a whole change in our society and in our attitudes. I'm trying to point out that we do have this problem of our youth who are floating without work, the ones who are dropping out of high school. My whole point here is, can we not combine the work experience with the high school experience, with part-time work for these students? It means a tremendous amount of new policies in the whole area of education and in our high school system and it also means getting the cooperation of business and management.

I realize that my remarks this evening have all been predicated on the assumption that this Government will embark on new economic policies to stimulate new jobs. That is our basic problem and, unfortunately, you haven't offered it to us; however, I felt it necessary to make these points this evening to point out that, in any discussion on unemployment or employment, we must be very concerned with how we utilize our human resources.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

**MR. B. PRICE (Vancouver-Burrard):** Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to this amendment which, after all, is basically an exercise in publicity.

I think the NDP cannot escape the responsibility for the demonstration of force by an ultra-radical group of the type that wouldn't take a job even if it were offered them; however, the demonstration that was put on last week should, in no way, be permitted to hide the seriousness of the position of those who were here to protest their lack of jobs. The person who is able and willing but who has no job has my sympathy and, if there is anything that this Assembly might do to try and place people in jobs, it should certainly try to do it.

What caused unemployment is the fact that improved methods of production have reduced the labour content

of producing goods over the years, which means that in order to use the same labour force every year more goods must be used, and in order to use more goods, naturally, people must have higher wages or extended credit — one or the other.

One thing we have established and that is, that higher wages create greater production because of the simple fact that low wages do not increase the incentive to invest in labour-saving devices. Actually, the unit cost of production workers over the past number of years has fallen in the United States and Canada. If there is no increase in the actual cost of a unit produced there is no real alarm over higher wages because higher wages mean a higher living standard. They mean better provision for health, they mean more diversified education, more adequate housing and more scope for pleasure.

Another factor that should concern all elected people is that, basically, the labour force of our country, both of the United States and Canada, approximates 40 per cent of the population. The population has gone up, more people are employed but also more people are unemployed and this is a very important thing. The rate of unemployment is increasing at the rate of one half of one per cent every five years. Mr. Speaker, the most expensive thing that a country can have is an unemployed worker.

Social assistance and welfare have never been a solution to unemployment and they never will be. At the present time, it appears that our Opposition Members expect B.C. to supply a job for every Canadian and this is too much. It just can't be done. If we put 10,000 people to work this month in British Columbia, next month we would have 10,000 more here waiting for other jobs. There's no argument about this and you know it.

We cannot solve this on a local basis, we can't solve it on a Provincial basis; it must be accepted as a Federal responsibility. This has pretty well been established as a fact ever since unemployment insurance came into being in Canada. One thing is obvious, although we don't all admit it, and that is that we are going to gradually come to a shorter work week, a shorter work year and a shorter work life. These things are going to come. Just the same as they have been reduced over the generations, they are going to keep right on doing it. With this shorter work life and the shorter work years, must come a basic right and that is the right to an income. So far, there is no right to an income, as such, just the right to live below the poverty level. We know, too, that the percentage of young people between 18 and 25 that are unemployed is going up. How we are going to overcome this may be a problem, but just because it's a problem there is no reason why we shouldn't search for a solution and make sure that we find a solution.

One of the problems that we have with young people today is that many of them would like to take vocational training. It is my information that people with less than Grade 11 find it impossible to get into a vocational school, in spite of the fact that we have had 36,000 people go through the vocational schools. I think we need more of them because I'm convinced in my own mind that it is better to train people when they are young than to keep them on welfare later on when they are married and have a family. It's better to subsidize jobs than to give people welfare. I'm of the opinion that the way in which we are going, in order to take up the slack with young people in the future, the Government will have to operate industries. There is no option, as far as I'm concerned, because it's far better to subsidize a person in a job than it is to keep them in idleness. Idleness is

[ [Page 70](#) ]

the worst possible thing that could happen. I think it would be better to have a longer school life than to have a person leave school and go on welfare and remain idle.

It's useless to berate the B.C. Government for the unemployment situation today because Ottawa has admitted that it is the cause. I was at a meeting on January 15 this year, at which Otto Lang, the Minister of Manpower, spoke and said that unemployment is going to get worse. I would like to point out, too, something else which is quite serious. Manpower is advertising in Great Britain today — at least they are running ads in Great Britain telling people of the opportunity for employment in Canada. They go on to say that they also have wonderful welfare benefits in Canada. This is under the heading of Manpower and these ads have been appearing in Great Britain up until the end of 1970 and they probably are yet (interruption). I don't have one but I have seen a copy. They are available.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the B.C. unions, the trade union movement in B.C., should commend the B.C. Government for having such a high rate of employment over the last few years and also the highest wages in Canada. We've had a tremendous high rate of job opportunities in this Province and this is one of the reasons why we have such a high increase in our population and, with it, an increase in the number of people today that can't get jobs. I think today, Mr. Speaker, that instead of this useless argument that takes place amongst the Opposition and the Government, unemployed people need a little cooperation from the unions and from the Opposition to help solve a problem that is not a Provincial problem. I think we should get away from this useless publicity-seeking.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. D. BARRETT (Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out in my remarks on this amendment of unemployment that it's significant to those of us who have been watching the debate as it progresses that not one Cabinet Minister of this Government has found it important enough to participate in this debate. We have found the executive group that has recently enjoyed a sunny vacation in southern climes has come to a serious unemployment situation in the Province of British Columbia and refuse to participate in a debate as to what this Provincial Government can do to alleviate unemployment. It is all very well for the Members to get up and blame Ottawa. There's no one that is going to disagree — the record is obvious. The Federal Government has stated that they deliberately set out to create unemployment to fight inflation. But, Mr. Speaker, I never once heard this Government during an election campaign say that the Federal Government ever created any jobs in British Columbia. Every single job that was created in British Columbia was created by them — that's their exclusive statement.

During the last election campaign some short months ago, the Premier of this Province said, "Take home pay with Bennett." What a hollow mockery that is, Mr. Speaker. Now 75,000 people are unemployed and over 100,000 people are on the welfare rolls for the first time in the history of this Province. Hardly a record to be proud of and for the last Member to get up and allege that advertisements have been appearing in Great Britain about jobs in Canada without producing the evidence, is not the kind of statement that's conducive to responsible debate. But if the Member wishes to be concerned about political statements that contribute to people flocking to British Columbia, I would commend to his attention the statements by the Minister of Rehabilitation, who proudly announces there are 10,000 jobs open in British Columbia and that was broadcast far and wide across this country.

Many people who are supporters of the Social Credit Party throughout this country do not know the Minister of Rehabilitation as well as we do and they believe his statement, because they lack the kind of information we have. Those kind of fatuous statements about 10,000 jobs available in British Columbia only lead to many people coming out here chasing rainbows.

We had the Premier of this Province, in Prince Rupert last fall, standing up saying that he likes to get out to hear the people and hear the problems locally. He's tired of getting letters from kooks and cranks, as he's quoted in the Vancouver *Sun* as saying. Tired of getting letters about the local problems. He wants to get out there and find out and he promised them a superport as his effort to alleviate unemployment. You can't have it both ways. Mr. Speaker, this Government cannot run around this Province saying that it is providing work, jobs and developments and then come to this House and plead poverty with the argument that it's Ottawa's fault.

Not one Cabinet Minister has spoken but when they go out on the hustings they broadcast the seeds that Social Credit has provided so much prosperity. Cabinet Ministers have made irresponsible statements about employment opportunities in this Province, only boosting the welfare rolls as people flock in believing that something will happen. The response of one Cabinet Minister up at Penticton is to advocate communism. If that's his answer, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Member clarify his remarks (interruption).

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

**MR. BARRETT:** Well, Mr. Member, I would hope that you would get up in the debate and tell us what you said. He has the opportunity; I have never prevented anyone from speaking. That's the duty of the Speaker. You can stand up and tell us what you're going to do about the unemployment problem or perhaps relieve the problems the farmers have in underemployment in the Okanagan.

Now, we all agree in this House that the Federal Liberal Government has been stupid. There's universal agreement on that, even the Liberal Members in this House agree upon it, but there are specific recommendations that have come out of this debate that this Government can act upon almost immediately. Those recommendations have been given by Members of the Social Credit Party, by Members of the Liberal Party, and by Members of our group. Certainly, an aggressive campaign should be waged seeking industry and I know that that competent, aggressive Minister of Trade and Industrial Development, with his fantastic travel expenses, has been very busy producing jobs, at least, certainly, for stewardesses and pilots on airlines and attendants on the railroads. But the specific proposals that have been made in this House can be translated through legislation and this Province can lead Canada in solving some of these problems.

When you go back for the next election campaign, you'll announce all the things that you did. But the memory of this debate tonight shows the vacuum that exists in the Government of this Province that, with your fantastic majority, you can't move in and do the simple things that have been

[ [Page 71](#) ]

suggested.

One, the Minister of Labour must stand up tonight and announce that no further overtime permits will be issued by this Government. The Minister of Labour must stand up tonight and advocate that the heads of the major industries in British Columbia come to his office immediately and confer with him and present to the Labour Committee of this House suggestions as how we can rationalize the work week down to 36, 30 or even 25 hours, if necessary. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that Labour Committee be called immediately and give some demonstration to the people of this Province that the largest single employer, the Government of British Columbia, is so concerned about these measures that it immediately announces that any civil servant who wishes to, may now retire at the age of 55 with full pension.

I am suggesting this, Mr. Speaker, to allow the very expensively trained people that we have put through our technical schools and our universities the opportunity to be immediately absorbed in the Civil Service of this Province. Maybe we are too old to seek the new answers to these problems and possibly, the well-trained, young people, who are now unemployed, could be put to better use solving the problems that their generation must face, that obviously this Government is incapable of facing.

These things, Mr. Speaker, may not have an immediate effect in terms of tens of thousands of jobs but it creates the psychological attitude that the Government is prepared to do something. It creates leadership, it gives the idea that the Government is alive and aware and willing to search out these answers. But to go through a debate where not a single Cabinet Minister gets up and speaks, where backbench Social Credit Members have made excellent suggestions only to be ignored, indicates only one thing. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is impotent to the needs of the people of British Columbia, fat and lazy in office and, long ago, has forgotten the reason why it came here — to fight for the little people. I don't think they are going to forget it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The amendment is that: "This House regrets that the Speech of His Honour fails to provide any proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the Province affecting many thousands of our citizens and their families, and fails to deal with the impact of widespread unemployment upon the social and economic life of the Province."

The amendment was negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 15

Messieurs

Brousson Hall                      Strachan  
Gardom   Williams,R.A. Dowding



Cocke	Clark	Nimsick
Hartley	McGeer	Barrett
Lorimer	Macdonald	Dailly, Mrs.

NAYS — 35

Messieurs

Wallace	Jefcoat	Wolfe
Ney	Tisdalle	Smith
Merilees	McCarthy, Mrs.	McDiarmid
Marshall	Jordan, Mrs.	Capozzi
Wenman	Dawson, Mrs.	Skillings
Kripps, Mrs.	Kiernan	Chant
Mussallem	Williston	Loffmark
Price	Bennett	Campbell, D.R.J.
Vogel	Peterson	Brothers
LeCours	Black	Shelford
Chabot	Fraser	Richter
Little	Campbell, B.	

PAIR:

Messieurs

Williams, L.A. Gaglardi

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for North Peace River.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in my place once again and address my remarks to the Throne Speech debate, particularly after such a long debate on the previous amendment. It made some of us wonder if we were ever going to get an opportunity to participate in this debate today or not.

I feel a little important due to the fact that I'm taking my place this evening, it seems, at the expense of the Minister of Agriculture who has stepped aside to allow me to participate in the debate at this time. I certainly thank him for moving aside to allow me to get into this debate. It's not often that a backbencher gets an opportunity to move into the spot of a Cabinet Minister in one of these debates. My sincere thanks, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, for your consideration.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we are in a little better mood this evening than the last time I had an opportunity to rise on my feet in this House, when it seemed every time I said something I was promptly ruled out of order. I'm not going to speak about any of the Bills that are before the House and I'm not even going to complete my speech about the transit system in New York City this evening. I am going to speak for a few minutes, though, concerning the mention in the Throne Speech about the extension of the PGE Railway.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's pleasing to note that the final contracts which were awarded to R.J. Keen Construction for the extension of the PGE Railway from Fort St. John to Fort Nelson are well along the way towards completion. As a matter of fact, Mr. Keen anticipates that he will complete the grade and the laying of rail well ahead of schedule. I think it should be noted and, this is a fact, he'll be there well ahead of schedule. It should also be noted that this contractor bid this job at a contract price well under the next lowest bidder, almost half of what the

next low bidder bid in at. As a matter of fact, a number of reputable engineering firms declared the job could not be completed for the price that was quoted and they tried to persuade the PGE to award the contract to someone else. To the credit of the PGE, however, the contract was awarded to the lowest tender and a northern contractor working in conditions with which he is most familiar is once again showing the industry that ingenuity coupled with ambition and a technique learned by repeated attacks against the elements can produce amazing results. Many people said it would be impossible to build grade in a northern climate in the winter months. Just listen and you'll learn something about the contracting business, far more than you know about the planning business. This contractor

[ [Page 72](#) ]

proved them all wrong. He was able to build grades in the most severe weather conditions all last winter and this winter. Why? — because he knew how to handle his fill material and he never let his burrow pits freeze down. He worked his equipment around the clock, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and he had the men to go along with that equipment on a regular basis and on regular hours. The grade that was constructed came through the winter in good shape. True, a few places had to be reconstructed this spring where he had a few slide problems but, on the whole, it put him months ahead of schedule as well as provided winter jobs for people who were desperately in need of steady employment.

If we truly wish to tap all of the potential of the north, we must now turn our attention to the one large remaining missing link in the transportation system — an all-weather road from Fort Nelson to Port Simpson. The need is already established and so is the tonnage, flowing in ever-greater volume down the Mackenzie to the Delta and to the high Arctic. Just to give you an indication of what happened last winter: there were the following drilling rigs working in the area north from Port Simpson: Cascade No. 21; Regent 3; Centex 1; S. and T. 4 and 5; Beaver 3; Tri-City 3; General Petroleum 12 and 20; Commonwealth 12; Peter Baden 16; Team No. 2; and Neighbours No. 6. All those rigs employed people all winter long, most of them drilling two holes which they completed during the winter. It takes approximately 1,00,000 gallons of diesel fuel; it takes 100 tons of drilling mud, and 50 tons of casing to service each one of those rigs for each well. It takes 35 large tandem trucks to haul the rig alone into the location, just to haul the rig and the equipment that goes with it, to make one trip in and one trip out. This provides work during the winter months for people who otherwise would be thoroughly pressed to find a job for their equipment and their trucks and the people they employ. For every ton that today goes by way of British Columbia, 100 tons goes into the area through northern Alberta. We are limited to access, for a few months in the winter, by a tortuous bush trail winding and turning through muskeg, and over rivers on ice bridges and, to a few months in the summer, by barge from Fort Nelson into the Liard and from the Liard into the Mackenzie River system.

With all the oil and gas exploration taking place in the area north and east of Fort Nelson, it would seem to me that the Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources has not only a right but an obligation to find funds for a resource development road. We allocate funds in the forest industry for that purpose because we have found it prudent to do so. Is not the development of our gas, oil and mineral industry just as important to the economy of the Province? Mr. Speaker, I think it is. Check the records in terms of net revenue to the Treasury. You'll be surprised at the contribution, particularly for the past 10 years. The most profitable years are certainly still ahead of us in the petroleum and natural gas business.

Soon the tracks will be in Fort Nelson. They will bring a great influx of people, new business, social and economic problems which that community is presently not equipped to handle. I would like to use Fort Nelson as an example, because I believe it represents the type of "people problems" that this Province will experience in many new communities throughout central and northern B.C. People today want schools, hospitals and recreational facilities, and they want them right now. It takes huge infusions of new capital to provide these services. Communities will be expected to grow from small villages to a booming town and then to a city in a space of less than 10 years. We must, if we are to continue expanding the north in the way in which it is capable of being expanded, find ways of putting substantial amounts of development capital into communities, without imposing an equally unbearable tax burden upon the people who reside there. Fast-growing communities will provide all the municipal and socially-oriented services that other cities have been able to acquire for their citizens over a long period of time. The problem is one for which we must find a solution before the great influx of people becomes part of the fabric of our northern development. There must be a co-ordination of effort, purpose and direction at the local,

regional and Provincial levels in place of the often disjointed efforts I see unfolding today. It is my firm belief that we need a Minister of Northern Development whose prime responsibility will be to direct and co-ordinate development of new industry in new areas so that we realize a good return from the resource space which is being developed and, at the same time, provide modern communities with the same type of service that most British Columbians take for granted today.

I am convinced that many Government departments, all concerned about some segment of development, obtain either poor or no results from their efforts merely because they are not properly co-ordinated. In the past year, this is the type of development we are experiencing in the north in the mineral, forestry and petroleum industries. I spend a good deal of my time trying to unravel the problems created and, if I may use the expression and I do it kindly, because of too many cooks stirring the broth. How much easier the solutions would become if all energies were channeled in one direction.

I am aware that a closely co-ordinated and hard-working committee of Cabinet Ministers is presently trying to overcome the multiplicity of problems involved in land use; however, this is only one of the problems that we have to face in these new instant towns and rapidly expanding areas. All I can say for a person who, like myself, is caught squarely in the middle of these problems, is that we still have a long way to go in providing the solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly concerned about the conservation of many of our wildlife species. I am glad to see that in the Throne Speech the matter is mentioned on page 8. I'm sure that the Minister has something definite in mind in this regard. What type of legislation the Minister is preparing to introduce, I do not know. I would like to make a comment, though, at this time, basing my remarks on my own experience as well as that gained from talking to many outdoor sportsmen, conservationists and big-game guides. You know, Mr. Speaker, whenever we tamper with the balance of nature that was intended between flora and fauna we are, at best, clumsy and inept. We seem to destroy more than we preserve. For instance, early in this century, it was decided to protect the mule deer that browsed in the Kaibab Forest, near the rim of the Grand Canyon. Domestic cattle were removed and all predators systematically killed. The deer received exclusive grazing rights to the whole territory. In less than twenty years their number had risen to an estimated one hundred thousand. But here's the sad part, more than half of them were close to or died of starvation. Why? Because a mule deer in that environment needs more than 60 acres of browsing area on which to live and the overpopulation had reduced the area available for animals to something under 12. Not until vigorous steps were taken to bring land and animals into proper balance did the herd thrive again.

In more recent times, a small herd of about a hundred and

[ [Page 73](#) ]

fifty moose was introduced into Newfoundland where previously there had been none. Newfoundland has no wolves and thus the moose, untroubled by their principal enemy, quickly multiplied to an estimated one hundred and fifty thousand. They foraged so heavily on the tops of young spruce that they became a serious economic problem for the greatest wealth producer of the island, that is, the pulp and paper industry. Obviously they had made a mistake in allowing that many moose into an area where there were no natural predators to take care of keeping the herd in check.

Both of these examples illustrate man's desire to improve on nature and both examples resulted in near-chaotic conditions. Fortunately, we have learned through our mistakes so that today the technique of game management is greatly improved. It goes, however, almost without saying, that our management technique will only be as good as the information which we have continuously flowing into the department. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to see the very inadequate budget with which the Minister has to work. We do not have enough conservation officers and biologists doing the job which is most important if we are to conserve our natural game resources. This is the job of keeping an adequate check on the inventory that we have, so that we know without question what game animals we have and, what's more, where they are thriving the best and equally where the danger spots are.

Just as sure as the sun rises in the East and sets in the West, we cannot continue to harvest, in ever-increasing number, our bighorn sheep, mountain goat, cariboo, elk, grizzly bear, moose and deer without putting serious,

devastatingly destructive pressures on our game herds. The laws of nature provide a large enough challenge for game animals without compounding their unfortunate position by allowing ever-increasing numbers of hunters into the field with the advantage of high-powered rifles, boats, aircraft, helicopters, Hondas and, now, the biggest threat of all, Mr. Speaker, the snowmobile. In my mind, there is no legitimate reason for allowing either resident or nonresident hunters to go into some of the game management areas and harvest as many different species of animals as they have acquired tags for before they decide to go on their hunting trip. Mr. Speaker, the people that do this in my opinion are game hogs and, in the end, these same people will have to assume the greatest amount of responsibility for the day when some of our prime species cease to exist. Mr. Speaker, it is time that this great resource receives the personnel and the allocation of funds that is required to maintain the resource in perpetuity. The Minister of Lands and Forests maintains it is possible to harvest our forest resources in perpetuity, provided we do it on a sustained-yield basis and I agree with that observation. If we can do it in forestry, we can do it in management of our big game resources; however, it will never be done on the paltry little budget allocated to that Department at this time.

I am convinced that to continue to develop in the direction we are headed today will only perpetuate the type of problems that result in ever-decreasing numbers of big game animals. It will be a sorry day for us all if, through lack of funds, we allow any of the species to be lost in their battle for survival and, believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is a battle for survival.

I wish now to raise a matter which is certainly not a new issue in this House but one which, in my humble opinion, must be solved and solved quickly if we desire to retain the goodwill of the people of this Province. It is a matter of taxation of land, in particular, the amount of taxation the property owners must assume to help pay for the costs of social services within the Province.

Our present system, in my opinion, is unfair inasmuch as it bestows gross advantages on certain well-defined segments of our society at the expense of other segments, with no real regard for one's ability to pay. Should it not be the first criteria of any taxation system, particularly taxes for the support of services such as schools, hospitals and recreational facilities, that these facilities be paid for according to everyone's ability to pay, not according to who happens to own a piece of property? We cannot continue, on one hand, to condone large salary increases of 6, 7 and 8 per cent a year to many skilled, and sometimes not-so-skilled, industrial employees, civil servants, school teachers and service industry employees (to name a few) and, at the same time, disregard the plight of the farmer, the senior citizens and other low-income groups.

I categorically state, Mr. Speaker, that the present system of taxation is inequitable, unfair and imposes many a heavy financial burden on those people who are least able to pay the tab. It is unfair to farmers, and I intend to give you some proof of this; it is unfair to older people dwelling, because of family ties, in rapidly developing areas of the Province. At the same time, however, it gives preferential treatment to all people owning and living in mobile homes, many apartment dwellers, particularly those in large high-rise types of dwellings, to transient workers and to many specialized businesses. Now just let me review the reasons why the present system is unfair.

First of all, farming: For some unknown reason every assessor in this Province has come to the mistaken conclusion that farmers are rich. They're rich, at least, in assets. So they have been going about their business which, incidentally, is immune from any outside interference, assessing all farm land accordingly. I'd like to illustrate this point, particularly in my own riding. I conducted a survey just before coming down to the Session this year distributing a questionnaire to several hundred farmers in my area. I was pleased with the response because I received back almost a 40 per cent return on the questionnaires that I sent out. These people were concerned... (interruption) I'll give you the questions and I'll give you the answers. These people were concerned enough to reply and when you have 40 per cent of them replying I think this will outdo any type of survey that anyone has conducted that I know of.

The average farmer up there has, in cultivated land, just over a section on the average. As a matter of fact, the average farm is about seven hundred and fifty acres of cultivated land. True, he may own or have title to at least a thousand acres or more but the average amount of land today in cultivation on an average farm in the north is 750 acres. The tax on his land, as a percentage of gross revenue, has increased in the last three years from an average of

7.2 to 11.6 to 13.8 per cent. That's right, almost double in a short period of three years. They can't stand this kind of pressure, particularly when the incomes of farming have been going down and not up, and the input cost that they are faced with is continually increased. You add to the percentage that he pays out of his gross income in taxes an equal percentage or greater than that percentage for other supplies that he has to have on his farm and you find that no business can survive. Is it any wonder then that people have conducted a very forceful and effective campaign to defeat any and all referendums put before them that would increase the tax

[ [Page 74](#) ]

burdens on their land? They've conducted this campaign regardless of how badly the facility was needed. All I say to you in this House is to put yourself in their boots and then ask yourself what you would do.

Many older people prefer to spend their twilight years in the company of their family and friends. Many also prefer to spend those years in their own home or on their own farm, depending on their past vocation. But in a fast-growing town or a relatively new farming area, even with the help of the home-owner grant which is a tremendous help, it often becomes an impossible task. Why? I'll tell you why. Every community with which I am personally associated in the north is growing so fast, and adding new debt for water, sewer and local improvements so fast, that the older people on fixed incomes haven't a hope of retaining the properties they own. As a matter of fact, they haven't a hope of living long enough to really enjoy the advantages of some of these things, because all of us have had to be concerned with paying for them right now. We didn't start 30, 40 years ago to pay for them. They were all dumped into our lap immediately. They are beaten before they start, Mr. Speaker, because they are faced with paying for improvements which they will never live long enough to enjoy properly. In Fort St. John, the mill rate for debt retirement, and debt retirement alone, has increased almost four-fold in the last five years. Now you tell me, if you will, who is getting caught in the crunch? Well, it's certainly not a family living in a mobile home. Even though many of these people tell me they are willing to pay their fair share of tax to provide schools, hospitals and recreational facilities, at the present time, most of them contribute very little. It's not the apartment dweller, quite often one of the newer citizens in our new community with his wife and, on an average, two school-age children. Sure, he pays rent but, in relation to the home-owner next door, there is still a fair margin of unbalance. It's not the transient skilled workman who moves in for a six-month or one-year job at a high salary and brings his family with him. And it's not the specialized type of business of which we have many in the north, operated out of a hotel room or a mobile unit, that pays the shot. I submit that it is the long-term, permanent resident, with or without children, who today is picking up the tab payable by the local communities for these services. Frankly, he is getting pretty tired of that obligation when he sees so many people around him who are not contributing at all.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the largest percentage of the costs required to provide the services I have mentioned is generated from consolidated revenue. I not only recognize this fact, I commend the Department of Finance for the job that they have done; however, as long as we operate a system which requires a direct contribution by land-owning citizens in the Province, let us, in all fairness, include on an equitable basis those people who today are enjoying the benefits without paying any of the price.

I would suggest a "motor-vehicle type" tax on all mobile homes, payable annually at any motor-vehicle office in the Province, a license that would allow these people to make a financial contribution towards the services which I have mentioned. They would be taxed regardless of whether they were in or outside a municipality and we would get rid of this problem of where they were situated and whether or not they should pay a tax on just a double wide or some other type of unit. It would seem to me that perhaps an increase in Provincial income tax would be necessary, with a corresponding decrease in the tax levied against property owners for social and educational services. In that way, everyone, regardless of who they were, would help pay for some of the services which I have mentioned. Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is growing late. I appreciate the attention that I have received this evening and I'll be happy to participate again when the Budget Debate gets to the floor of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member from Nanaimo.

**MR. F.J. NEY (Nanaimo):** I think we should consider the economy during the next ten years on Vancouver Island. I think we're all very happy to see how tourism is booming ahead on Vancouver Island, record figures right across during the past year. There's no doubt about it that the products and the tourist industry on Vancouver Island



will jump from at least 125 million dollars this year to 250 million by the end of this decade. In this regard, I must compliment the Government on the great job they've done in encouraging so many groups on Vancouver Island to do all they can to participate and promote tourism. Some parts of the Island would take a front seat to anywhere in Canada today, if not in North America. During this period, too, we're going to find the passengers on the B.C. Ferries are going to jump from three and a half to six million.

There are one or two factors which I think we should consider. All the automobile traffic, because of the geographical characteristics, must funnel up and down our Island Highway on a short area, which means we are having ever-increasing traffic in this area. Because of the population growth, industrial growth and the tourist growth in the next 10 years, with the automobile traffic doubling, and it will, now is the time to seriously consider a four-lane highway. Now, I know, this is an expensive proposition but I think it's something we should be aiming for, particularly because on Vancouver Island, with one seventh of the population of British Columbia contributing almost a third of the forest products and tourist activity of British Columbia, we work in a different economic climate. If we can't have a four-lane highway immediately, I respectfully suggest that we should try now to bring in a series of passing lanes right up and down the Island Highway, which would be relatively inexpensive and, at least, would make a start on what would eventually turn out to be a four-lane highway. We are going to need it for the great increasing tourist traffic which is going to come along in the next few years. If we put one cent a gallon tax on gasoline, it would bring in five million dollars a year. This could be spent on various parts of British Columbia and escalate the highway programme in which the Government has done such a great job in the years past. I'm saying this because the dollar is getting watered away by inflation year by year and the quicker we do it the cheaper it's going to be in the long term.

Talking about the ferries, which I mentioned a minute or two ago, last year on the Nanaimo–Horseshoe Bay run we had 1,400,000 passengers travelling back and forth. The figures now indicate that, by the end of the '70's, there will be three million people running on that short service between Nanaimo and Horseshoe Bay. Victoria-Tsawwassen has jumbos and Nanaimo should have jumbos or even superjumbos now because we're moving quickly on that run. If jumbos or super-jumbos aren't feasible then we should get to work and consider the feasibility of a bridge to Gabriola and a shuttle service.

I feel that wildlife is important in attracting tourists to our Island. At this particular moment, there are approxi

[ [Page 75](#) ]

mately two thousand elk on Vancouver Island. Fifteen years ago, for the first time for many, many years, they opened up hunting of the elk. Unfortunately, because of severe winters, reduction in the winter range, forestry and hunting, we've had to close off the south end of the Island this past year. I suggest respectfully that we should shut down elk hunting for 1971 completely, north and south right across the Island, until there has been a proper survey done on the diminishing elk and we come up with a plan which will assure the perpetuity of the magnificent herds of elk on the Island for all time — even if it means we have to purchase range land in the valleys in order to make sure these animals live for a long time; otherwise, they will become extinct. This is a challenge. We should face it. If we don't, we can't expect the logging companies to save the land if we don't set the guidelines. It's no use saying these things aren't important. I think it should be disturbing to all of us when a person can shoot a trumpeter swan for a penalty as low as \$10 or a sea otter with a penalty as low as a one-dollar bill, even bears and birds with penalties of \$25 and a maximum of \$100. With inflation, surely, we should be making stiffer penalties and having stronger enforcement.

We have a lot of water in abundance on Vancouver Island but it flows off very quickly and although we have a lot of water, in lake water, we place eighth in the Dominion. Even Saskatchewan has more lake water than we do. Vancouver Island is growing very, very quickly and man, the greater polluter, is coming in and our fisheries face a threat. Irrigation: the municipalities are taking more and more water from the storage dams, and industries are moving in; these are all creating a reduction in the water coming down the creeks. We should be deciding right now which rivers are going to be for spawning of the fish in the future, and which rivers are going to be for storage in the future. We need jobs for this new labour force coming in and if we don't have the proper storage and the right places, how is industry going to have a chance to come onto Vancouver Island if we don't set the guidelines where industry

can go, and where the fish should go? The same applies to municipalities because, even in our own city of Nanaimo, we're putting in more dams, at least we hope to. We're concerned also about the elk in the valleys below. I suggest that the time has come when we should do a complete survey of all our water resources on Vancouver Island so that the Government can set the guidelines for the fish and industries of municipalities during the '70's, a proper analytical survey. This will speed up industrial development on the Island because we should be the ones that set the balance between economic progress and preservation of our environment. If we set the guidelines now, I'm sure industry will work with us. It wants to work with us but we are the ones who have to give it that chance; otherwise, there will be a tragic waste of water and our fisheries in the next few years because water is an essential ingredient in the economic and environmental pattern of Vancouver Island. If we don't, we're just burying our heads in the sand.

There is logging taking place now in some rivers that, in the future, we may be sorry we didn't preserve for spawning. Here, again, you can't blame industry if we don't tell it where it should be going. This will probably mean a bigger budget for conservation and recreation. They are doing a good job but, as the population grows, it is going to be mandatory for us to put more money into this sector. The people will have to pay, that is true, but I think this environment thing is not a fad. I believe that for the small expenditure we'll get it back a thousand-fold because more industries will be able to come in.

I have just two other little items before I close. One is the liquor laws of British Columbia because, at the present moment, the way the laws are set during voting days it would appear that in the city of Nanaimo we can't handle our liquor as well as the people on the outside. Why is it that when we have municipal elections we have to close down all the liquor outlets in our city and yet, when they have Regional District voting or School Board voting which quite often has a bigger budget than we do, they don't have to close down the pubs or the liquor outlets? I say we should have uniformity of liquor laws on the outside and the inside. There shouldn't be two (interruption). Well, I would say that the percentage of votes for the schools are certainly the same. I wasn't talking about Provincial. I was talking about the city elections. I'm saying that the number of people that vote for the School Board are most often more than those in the city.

Last, but not least, many people in our city are quite upset that the B.C. Forest Service is considering shutting down its local office in Nanaimo. Nanaimo has the fastest growing population in the area between Comox and Ladysmith and yet it is pulling out. It has three men in that whole area and, although the plant in Parksville is most essential, we feel that the plant in Nanaimo is also essential. If people have to phone long distance to Parksville to report a fire in our area, we're breaking down the lines of communication. People are going to have to go to Parksville now to get fire permits; they're not going to have fire equipment in Nanaimo. We have that beautiful Newcastle Island right across from Nanaimo Harbour. I think we should sit back and think twice, in consideration of the growing population, and see if something can't be done to keep that Forest Service in Nanaimo open. Vancouver Island's great treasure is its water land and forest beauty. These are things that in the '70's we should guard zealously.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Delta.

**MR. R. WENMAN (Delta):** I had hoped that I could wait until the Budget Speech to present these few ideas but I know that the Premier is going to want to get them into his Budget Speech. I thought I should give them right now and give him a chance to get them in there. I'm going to give you these ideas so that you can support them, and all the Members from the lower mainland, including the Member from Vancouver East, I'm sure, are going to be with us on this one.

At any rate, population projections show us that the population of British Columbia will be over seven million by the turn of the century, probably three million of these living in the lower mainland, and the population of Delta is an example of this growing, doubling itself every 10 years. As the area becomes filled in with bricks and mortar, those of us who live in that area can see it is becoming a less and less desirable place to live. Open spaces must be found and must be preserved. It was thought that perhaps they could be held in the form of agricultural land but this has proven to be impractical and so we must take further steps. All of us know about the open space area, we all talk about it. I have a plan to make it effectively practical. I am suggesting that we hold this land in another classification other than agricultural, because of the intensity, the pressure of industry and the pressure of housing on the area. I would suggest that we hold this land as "agricultural parkland." Under this concept, the land could be used

area recreational concepts such as golf courses, Government campsites and park areas. I would suggest, not that the Government acquire more land in Delta (you have already taken 4,000 acres and we don't want you to take more) but that you take it on a resale basis. I would suggest the land should be acquired as it becomes available on the market and at reasonable market rates, then the land would be zoned "agricultural parkland in perpetuity." We would zone it "in perpetuity agricultural parkland" for these functions. The land would then be resold at agricultural value to farmers who, in turn, may only resell for further agricultural parkland purposes. As developers fill in the commercial and industrial land of the lower mainland, and particularly of Delta, they should pay a special tax that would pay the difference between current market value with perpetual agricultural parkland zoning and agricultural value with perpetual zoning. That way we could absorb much of the cost. We're talking, again, not about the total cost of the acreage, but only about the difference between the sale and resale with perpetual zoning. I would suggest that this might be done by all levels of Government. The Federal Government has talked long and loud about assisting the cities, making the cities livable. I've seen our Premier quoted as saying that our cities are becoming less and less livable. We have to act now because five years from now is too late, four years, three years, it might be too late now. We have to act in this Session of this Legislature, in some way, to try to acquire this land. I would suggest the Federal Government should put the money up for 40 per cent of the economy, the Provincial Government 25 per cent, the regional 25 per cent and the municipality 10. The municipality could gain their share by special tax; in other words, as the land is covered people will preserve open areas and the municipality could obtain this from a special tax on new industrial and new residential areas. The Province could gain their portion from leases or fees or an initial levy on occupants in the Roberts Bank superport area. The Federal Government could get their share from what they saved on the Bonaventure and the F104 and F105. Wasn't that 7.8 billion or something like that? There should be lots of money there now to help out the cities in the lower mainland of Vancouver.

Just very quickly, another major problem we face in my area that I hope the Premier will bring into the Budget Speech is a meaningful gift for our senior citizens. Our senior citizens are being taxed out of their home and I think now we need to make a meaningful Centennial gift to them (interruption). That's right, let them keep their homes. The Federal Government in Ottawa, through their capital gains taxes, is threatening to take their homes but, in British Columbia, we don't follow that policy. We have a policy of home ownership for the citizens of the Province of British Columbia, that's why we're going to support this idea. I am suggesting that, for retired citizens, we should freeze the taxation levels at 1970 levels and defer 1971 taxes as a charge against the house when it is resold when that person dies or passes on. Each year thereafter a nominal interest fee on unpaid taxes would cover handling charges. I'm suggesting to the Premier an opportunity for him to establish another perpetual fund that could be found here. I would hope he would establish another five million-dollar perpetual fund, whose interest payments would provide the initial pool of capital that would be required to finance this project. The pool would be replenished with the repayment of deferred taxes, therefore allowing for the population growth factor. I know this is in keeping with the policy of British Columbia, I know that the Premier thinks and feels for our senior citizens and I am sure he is going to come in with this accepted proposal in this Session of the Legislature.

To conclude, in our Centennial Year, the economic ties with the Commonwealth should be extended but political privilege should be re-examined. The great Loyalists came to our Province of British Columbia, and they're with us today in the name of our Premier. We appreciate the contribution that he and others like him are giving to us. We appreciate the contributions of the Member from Columbia and of the Member from Richmond, the French heritage that we have in Canada, but I want to say also that we appreciate the Member for Vancouver South, the great Ukrainian heritage that we have. We appreciate the Attorney-General, the great Swede, they have given to our country.

**HON. L.R. PETERSON:** Withdraw that allegation, I'm of Norwegian heritage.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think the honourable Member must withdraw that remark (laughter).

**MR. WENMAN:** My ancestry happens to be Swedish and the Attorney-General's such a good man that I figured he must be a Swede. We note, all of us sit here, and enjoy the great contribution from Lebanon, the Member

from Dewdney. I think that all of these great cultures... The Members of the House also appreciate the great Italian from Vancouver Centre. In all seriousness, the point that I wish to make today is that, while we should extend our ties with the Commonwealth, I would like to see an equality among all of the founding races of the Province of British Columbia and the country of Canada, I would suggest that it is time to withdraw the political privilege of one of these classes. I would suggest that the right to vote and hold office in Canada without Canadian citizenship be withdrawn. In public debate, we use the argument and say, "Oh, yes, but this is the time in the world when we should not be narrowing citizenship, we should be broadening it." If we are to broaden citizenship, it should be done through the closest thing we can get to world government, that is through the United Nations, and if we are going to extend it to one of our cultures we should extend it to all of the cultures in our country. I would suggest that we might consider this during this great Centennial Year and I intend to propose a suitable amendment later during this Session.

The House adjourned at 11:15 p.m.