

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)

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1975

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 491](#)]

CONTENTS

Franchise Dealers Protection Act, 1975 (Bill 35). Mr. Bennett.

Introduction and first reading — [491](#)

Royal Roads Military College Degrees Act (Bill 12). Mr. Gorst.

Introduction and first reading — [491](#)

Oral Questions

Payment of ICBC agents' fees. Mr. Bennett — [491](#)

Errors in ICBC vendor cheques. Hon. Mr. Strachan answers — [492](#)

ICBC error on renewal form. Mr. Curtis — [493](#)

Education department dismissals. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [493](#)

Effect of CUPE strike on schools. Mr. Wallace — [494](#)

Vehicular damage to farm property. Mrs. Jordan — [494](#)

Purchase of Minnekhada stock farm. Mr. McGeer — [494](#)

Advertisements supporting budget. Mr. Gibson — [494](#)

Budget debate (*continued*)

Petitions

Residents' petition. Mr. Wallace — [524](#)

Speaker's ruling

Accuracy of Members' statements during question period — 524

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure today that I introduce the new director of cancer for the Province of British Columbia. We've been most fortunate in this province to attract one of the top oncologists, one of the top cancer people in all of North America, and his name is Dr. Tom Hall. He's sitting right behind me in the House, Mr. Speaker. He's from the medical campus of the University of Southern California, and we're very fortunate indeed.

Along with Dr. Hall is Dr. Don Williams, who was the chairman of the cancer ways and means committee that set up a cancer agency some time ago. Mr. Gardner, now the chairman of the cancer control agency of the Province of B.C., is also here. Right behind me is Dr. Julia Levy from the BCMC and also from UBC. Mrs. Hall is accompanying Dr. Hall. I would ask the House to join me in welcoming Dr. Hall and the rest of the group to B.C.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today are all of the presidents representing the 48 constituencies and the 55 seats representing the Social Credit Party of British Columbia. I would ask the House to welcome these concerned British Columbians. (Laughter.)

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): That explains why great space is available in the galleries today.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I have people here from the colourful Cariboo in your gallery, the Speaker's gallery. Today I'd like the House to welcome the chairman of the Cariboo Regional District, Mr. Harry Moffat. Two of his directors are with him, Dr. Testimao and Director Russ Jones, as well as a lifelong resident of Anahim Lake, Mr. Andy Christensen.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, seated on the floor of the House today we have the pleasure of welcoming one of our federal colleagues. He has stated that he is a contender for one of the Conservative leaderships — I don't think it's mine, but you never know. The Member I'm about to introduce is travelling through the province and through the country in search of.... (Laughter.) If it's in search of support, he comes to the strong source first, Mr. Minister.

I would like the House to welcome Mr. Heward Grafftey, who is the Member for Brome-Missisquoi in our federal House.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a personal welcome to the Member. He has made a national reputation beyond his own party — which, of course, we all identify in terms of our bias. But I want to recognize the Member's excellent work some years ago in terms of automobile safety. It was a great service he provided the Canadian people by bringing automobile standards to the Canadian public. I appreciate that very much.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Seated in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon is a principal from North Peace Secondary High School, Mr. Austin Raham. He's in Victoria on business for the school and I would like the assembly to welcome him.

Hon. Mr. King presented the annual report of the Labour Relations Board, 1974.

Introduction of bills.

FRANCHISE DEALERS

On a motion by Mr. Bennett, Bill 35, Franchise Dealers Protection Act, 1975, introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

ROYAL ROADS MILITARY COLLEGE DEGREES ACT

On a motion by Mr. Gorst, Bill 12, Royal Roads Military College Degrees Act, introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

Oral questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Member for Victoria wanted to ask about this question he had raised on Thursday.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): I just want to confirm, Mr. Speaker, that we will at 6 p.m. today be getting a judgment on the question of privilege which I raised last week.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, indeed — at the end of the day.

PAYMENT OF ICBC AGENTS' FEES

MR. BENNETT: To the Minister of Transport and Communications. Have commissions for independent insurance agents writing Autoplan policies in 1974

[[Page 492](#)]

been paid in full?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): I presume so, but I would have to take that question as notice.

ERRORS IN ICBC VENDOR CHEQUES

HON. MR. STRACHAN: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question that was raised by the Hon. First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) on Friday. He asked about a cheque which he had received upon which he had no claim. He asked a number of questions: first, how did his name get on the list of vendors for the Insurance Corp. of British Columbia?

First of all, the list was supplied to ICBC by the Automotive Retailers Association of British Columbia. The minute the list was received a number was allocated to each name on the list.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Got friends there, eh?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: In December, 1974, a cheque for \$254 was sent to the Morrison Chev-Olds in Victoria. Subsequently, Mr. Morrison phoned the Victoria claims centre and spoke to the manager, indicating that the cheque had been sent to him in error. On checking, Mr. Bell discovered that this money was owed to National Motors. National Motors advised us that they, in error, had written the Morrison Chev-Olds vendor No. 3072 on the estimate instead of their own number, which is No. 3075.

In other words, there was a mistake by the private company...

HON. MR. BARRETT: Private enterprise — they're always messing up everything.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: ...thereby indicating to the computer that the cheque should be issued to vendor 3072, Morrison Chev-Olds.

The other question that was raised — he said he had three on his file — was that on March 5, 1975, Mr. McKenna of the claims division was called by Mr. J. Chabot, MLA. Mr. Chabot said he discovered — that was

March 5 — that ICBC had sent a cheque to Reid's Towing and Auto Wrecking, Golden, B.C., and this company had not been in business for two years. He asked Mr. McKenna to confirm this.

An examination showed that the estimate sheets had been completed by Jim Jones Towing in Lac La Hache, and they had correctly entered their vendor No. 4687. This was incorrectly keypunched in data processing to 4637, and a cheque issued to the vendor. This cheque was recovered and the proper party paid in June, 1974...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: ...nine months before the Member asked the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I want to tell the House that there have been 16,000 cheques issued to vendors and there have been two wrong. I don't expect perfection from any human organization. I think that two out of 16,000, when one of them was certainly the fault of the vendor, is a pretty good record, and I'm not ashamed of it.

Interjections.

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): I'd also like to thank the Minister for his explanation, because I resigned from the automobile company and the business in 1969. I was not a member of that association after that date.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You should resign your seat.

MR. MORRISON: My question is: do you not bother checking the information which is given you? In other words, you just took a list and didn't bother any more about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Would the Hon. Member pursue his question, if he has one?

MR. MORRISON: I am inquiring as to what his procedure is for checking people such as this.

The second one which I brought up was for a lady who is driving a vehicle in Sooke. She is still driving the vehicle in Sooke, and yet was paid a cheque by ICBC to pay off that vehicle as a wreck. It was a wreck that she paid for, and she paid \$11, Mr. Minister. I'd like to find out how many other people are like those.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: We believe in giving people a choice as to whether they get the car fixed or take the money. She chose the money.

MR. MORRISON: She did not choose to take the money.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You asked what is being done about it. Let me tell you. We accepted this list from the Automotive Retailers Association in good faith as they presented it, but because we discovered this we are checking and we have since checked right

[[Page 493](#)]

down the lists to be sure that every one is in order. We've added to the number of letters related to the firms so that even if the firm makes a mistake we can catch it. There is something else — I forget what it is now — in order to make sure that Morrison Chev-Olds never again gets a cheque they are not entitled to, or anything else.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): On the same question, the Minister made a statement here that this matter I had raised with ICBC had been settled in the month of June, and that a firm, I believe by the name of Jim

Jones, had been paid in June, 1974. I wish the Minister would check the accuracy of this information because the cheque, which is in my possession, was issued since that time. So it appears that your information is erroneous.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The information I have is that the cheque was paid to the correct party in June of 1974. I'll check it out.

ICBC ERROR ON RENEWAL FORM

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): On the same subject, to the same Minister with respect to ICBC: in view of the fact that he is very proud of two errors out of 16,000 individual transactions, has the Minister encountered many instances such as the one I can file with him or with the House of a new driver who purchased an automobile in the summer of 1974 and received her Autoplan renewal form just a few weeks ago containing no premium amount shown on the insurance form — no dollars whatever — and an automobile which she has never heard of, never owned and never been near? In other words, the only thing correct on the renewal form was her name and address. Are there many instances of this, to the Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'll find that one out of the 1,150,000 vehicle registrations that we have. I'll find it. You send it over to me so I can check it out.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DISMISSALS

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: To the Minister of Education. In recent weeks the two terminated members of the former research and development division have expressed fears about a B.C. educational blacklist. I wonder whether the Minister could assure the House that there is no such blacklist in the Department of Education or in British Columbia.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): Mr. Member, I would never, as Minister, condone any blacklist in the department.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I take it, Mr. Speaker, from her answer that there is no such blacklist, and I thank her. Could I ask the Minister whether she has ordered or conducted an inquiry into the allegations of harassment by employees of the department who formerly served in the research and development division?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I am satisfied that there was no such harassment.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Was any inquiry started or entered into?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Member, the people who made those allegations publicly chose the opportunity to go public; they have had the right to go through the proper procedures as they chose. I said earlier when I spoke in this House that I do not intend to indulge in a public debate on this issue when there is a proper route which could have been taken.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, they were probably following the example set by the Premier in announcing the dismissal of Mr. Bremer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That is not a question.

MR. McGEER: I have a question, though. I couldn't refrain from that comment since he was prompting the Minister.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education: if these dismissed members followed the procedures suggested by the Minister and are successful in their appeals, will they be reinstated in the research and development division of the Department of Education?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Mr. Member, I'm sure you know, if you have studied the Public Service Act and the

present collective bargaining agreement, that that decision and recommendation would come forward following the due process. You asked me to comment on something that hasn't even reached that point.

MR. SPEAKER: I would point out that it is also a matter of law, not a question of interpretation.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: As a supplementary on that, I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) when he is going to appoint people to the public service grievance board so that due process of law can be followed.

[[Page 494](#)]

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): The Member was referred to this before, but if he cares to read the Act carefully, particularly the repeal and transitional sections of the Act, he will find out that due process of law is being carried.

EFFECT OF CUPE STRIKE ON SCHOOLS

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education a question on another subject. In view of the continuing fact that the children in district 61 are not receiving adequate education, and as it's quite clear, depending on the length of the strike, that children will be failing grades later on, could the Minister tell the House what attempts she is making to provide alternatives to prevent this sorry outcome?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the assumption that the students will fail grades, I think, is basically an assumption of the individual Member.

MR. WALLACE: It's the assumption of a lot of parents.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: It is concern. If you follow past history I don't think you would find that this is always what happens; but I said before in this House that I am concerned also when there is any stoppage of the service to school children.

I shouldn't be asking the Hon. Member a question, but I must in some way use a question to answer you. I wonder if you have discussed with the Greater Victoria School Board their concern and what they are planning to do. I think the Member who asked me espouses the local autonomy principle under which our system works, and to date I have not been asked by the Greater Victoria School Board to interfere. I would suggest that the Member take his direct concerns to the school board.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WALLACE: A supplementary, if we have to have this kind of discussion. I've talked with the chairman and the vice-chairman of the board. I would ask the Minister if it is her attitude, then, that regardless of what happens, she will take no initiative whatever so that if the school board doesn't approach her, she won't approach them. This is the point.

HON. MRS. DAILLY: You completely misinterpreted my answer. I said that until the local school board comes to me.... The fact that they have discussed it with you is most interesting, but they have not come to me as Minister and asked for any specific assistance, or even to discuss it.

VEHICULAR DAMAGE TO FARM PROPERTY

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I would like to address my question to the Minister of Transport and Communications and ask if the Minister would confirm that hit-and-run accidents to farmers' property, such as

broken fences and the killing of cattle, are not claimable through ICBC unless the offending driver files the claim, even though that offending driver is identified.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'll have to check that one out. I would doubt if that's the case.

MRS. JORDAN: While the Minister is taking this question as notice, would he be prepared to make available the number of incidents like this which have taken place and have not been settled by ICBC?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I can't possibly have that information anywhere within the records, either at the motor vehicle branch or ICBC. We don't know how many happen.

MRS. JORDAN: I can give you some examples.

PURCHASE OF MINNEKHADA STOCK FARM

MR. McGEER: With regard to the purchase by the government of the Minnekhada stock farm in Coquitlam, announced by the Premier, could the Premier tell us the price paid by the provincial government to Daon Development Corp. and what price Daon Development paid to the former owner, Mr. Clarence Wallace?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice and file the answer for the Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose riding is that in?

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier also file the agreement of sale?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Member, I will take the question as notice.

ADVERTISEMENTS SUPPORTING BUDGET

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): Mr. Speaker, to the Premier and Minister of Finance with respect to the ads placed by the Premier with public funds promoting the budget from the government's point of view. I want to ask the Premier

[[Page 495](#)]

if he will be fair and pay for ads for the opposition parties to express their view on that budget in the same way.

HON. MR. BARRETT: They already have the editorial pages in *The Vancouver Sun* for the Liberal Party.

MR. GIBSON: Nonsense!

HON. MR. BARRETT: And they have the editorial pages of *The Province* for the Socreds. I am only carrying on the very good practice of the former Minister of Finance (Hon. W.A.C. Bennett).

MR. GIBSON: On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance endorsing the tactics of the former Minister of Finance in all these respects?

HON. MR. BARRETT: There are things that the former Premier did that were good and one of them was buying ads on a budget. (Laughter.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. F.A. CALDER (Atlin): Mr. Speaker, now that the first stage of the honeymoon is over, I wish to return to the affairs of my constituency and those of the province.

It is my pleasure once again to take my place in a sessional debate on behalf of the people of the historic riding of Atlin, but in particular to participate in this budget debate in terms of how it affects or benefits the people of the Atlin constituency and what it means to northern development.

In speaking about northern development, I do not wish to include the Prince Rupert, Terrace, Hazelton, Smithers, Vanderhoof, Prince George and Jasper lines. Such lines have already been developed, or are still under development, since the days of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Of course, this railway was completed in 1914 and taken over by the CNR in 1921, but the economic development has continued from those dates. In those days the term "northern development" was baptized; the people took the term "northern development" during the development from those dates. I don't wish to talk about northern development north of the Yukon boundary or north of the boundary of the North West Territories.

I would prefer this afternoon to talk briefly on northern development between the Prince Rupert–Jasper line and the boundaries of the Yukon and the North West Territories. In between these two lines is a distance of 300 miles. I am briefly relating my statements to this particular area because in the budget I do not see too much earmarked for this particular area. This, of course, concerns me, and no doubt concerns the rest of the northern Members. I cannot speak too much on the North Peace or the South Peace because they have been developing for quite a number of years. But the North West Territories has not developed as much and as rapidly as perhaps the interior, southern British Columbia or the Peace River area.

We had a night sitting on March 5, so none of the Members saw the programme on Channels 2 and 6 under the "PacifiCanada" programme.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): My wife saw it.

MR. CALDER: The Hon. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and myself appeared on that programme for half an hour. It was a coast-to-coast hookup. The name of the film was "Baby, This Is for You."

Interjection.

MR. CALDER: It wasn't his statement; it was my statement over a year ago. Since then there have been one or two cartoons circulating in my constituency, done by one of the editors of the three little papers published in my constituency, in which there is a whole page with a little peanut in the middle. On top it says "Northern Development," with the Little Chief's statement underneath: "Baby, This Is for You." I don't quite like the idea. I am stating this because the budget is a beautiful budget. But if I have the opportunity to plead, I will do so in terms of what is in it for the Atlin constituency.

When I spoke in that programme, I spoke as a Member of the government, and I was so enthused at that time that I was just saying: "Anything you want, boys, you can have." So, at the end of my remarks, I said: "Baby, this is for you." So this is the title of the show.

I wish you people had seen that because I think the National Film Board may have used it to ridicule the north in terms of my statement. I really don't know what the purpose was. I still have every hope that this budget is going to be of some benefit to the people in the far north.

The No. 1 item, of course, is housing. As we all know, housing is one of the most outstanding problems anywhere in North America. I believe it is critical enough to warrant daily debates even in our own front yard. The question is: what are we going to do about it? What is the government doing about it?

I think the answer was given in 1973 in the fall session when the government took a major step in

[[Page 496](#)]

establishing the Department of Housing. Last year, as we all know, there was a \$50 million budget. This year, of course, we have pretty close to \$70 million earmarked for housing.

I'm hopeful that quite a bit of this money would be earmarked in a programme which I hope to see. In a study of the throne speech and in looking over the estimates, I don't find very much in the way of a programme for housing in remote areas or in unorganized territories, and I think this is a serious matter. I do hope when the Minister's estimates come up for consideration, that a programme will be placed before the Members and the House to let us know just what plans are for the far north or in the 300-mile gap that I'm talking about.

I am a little concerned, though, about the criticism on housing. As I say, it's just only about a year and four months ago that this department was established and there has been a sizeable budget in each year, but it seems that we're expecting a little bit too much. This expectation is before us; this housing expectation is in the north also, particularly in my riding.

The northerners, Mr. Speaker, actually believe that the concentration of housing plans, as we see today, in the lower mainland, in the metropolitan areas and in other large municipalities, particularly in southern British Columbia.... To the northerners, again, it is not fair. We believe there has to be some equality throughout the province because the northerners believe housing is part of northern development. I have so stated on several occasions on the floor of this House that housing is definitely a part of northern development — again, particularly in the gap that is receiving very little attention.

In this request I am hopeful that the government and the northern people will commence consultations with respect to locations for housing, the type of homes, and to consider the areas where housing is in need and in a critical state.

There have been one or two occasions on which housing has been brought to the attention of the government from the Atlin constituency and from the B.C. northwest. The government has taken emergency substitutes such as used house trailers.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that this is the answer to the housing problem in the north. The introduction of trailers may alleviate certain individual situations but certainly does not answer the housing problem in the north. In this respect, again, there have to be consultations with the north. Consultation, again I must say, is part of northern development. I think that in any plans whatever, consultation with the northern people is necessary.

So I'm asking the question: what does the budget have in store for housing in the B.C. northwest, in such places as the town of Atlin and the communities bordering the Stewart–Watson Lake highway? What are the plans for senior citizens? It was senior citizen homes that first started the criticism in the north. I've never heard since what the government has done, and I'm very much concerned about this. Again, I'm very hopeful that the Minister will lay the plans before us during the discussion of his estimates and just let us know what is in store for senior citizens in the B.C. northwest.

We've had many task forces operating in the province. I do hope that in this particular instance we add another task force to study housing in the remote and unorganized areas. In considering northern housing, I would also request that the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) work closely with the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams), because we also have the problem of the high cost of land in the north such as you have in municipalities. The new townsites, particularly those earmarked along the Stewart–Watson Lake highway, the Stewart-Terrace highway and the Stewart-Kitwanga highway, are definite parts of northern development as well.

We have witnessed the development of two so far — namely, at Dease Lake and also Meziadin Lake. No doubt there'll be other little communities springing up along these three new highways.

I believe that the government plans in all of these should be constructive in terms of meeting the needs of the northern people. It is on their behalf that I am on my feet at this time — in terms of their housing needs. Favourable and inviting townsite property prices should be made available to the northern people and the cost of lots should be set up to their means.

In the townsite of Dease Lake, about 10 years ago when the subdivision took place, the land value then was about \$400 to \$500 per lot, and the commercial lots ranged, say, from \$1,000 to \$1,500. I'll admit that land values have increased in the last 10 years. Today, after a rehash from the Department of Lands in that subdivision, we now find that the residential lots are \$2,000. Nothing has been said about the commercial lots. We find now that to lease one of these lots it will cost you \$100 annually, and you must build on it within one year. If not, you lose the lot.

This \$2,000 mark to the people in the south sounds quite favourable, but to the northern people it is quite a steep price. Don't forget that there isn't too much employment up in that northern part of the riding. Ever since mining exploration has declined and the big game guides are hiring fewer people in that profession, the only employment available is with road maintenance and road construction. Most of the road construction is sometimes under contract and the contractor usually brings in his own men, all union members. The local people, who are very concerned about taking part in northern development

[[Page 497](#)]

and securing a job so that they can pay for lots or whatever, find that they cannot find placement. The only time they can find placement under the contract projects is when both parties to the contract say that there is room available and, by their agreement, a local person may be hired.

How do these people fit into this programme? They just don't at the current time, and it concerns them. I've seen some letters going to the department that are quite hot. I do hope that the Ministers, when they read such letters, don't just say that the authors are fanatics. They're not. These people in the communities are not fanatics; these people are very serious about this thing. They just find that they cannot get into the programme. To them, the \$2,000 mark is quite a steep thing.

How about the development of this community? The programme now says — in terms of who buys the lot — that it's only for local people. If David Anderson, for instance, wanted to buy a lot at Dease Lake, he will not be considered unless he is employed in some project in that area. So they are barring the outsider, and the local guy can't afford it because he can't get work. He hasn't got the money to pay this high cost. So the development of a townsite, which, as I just said, is part of northern development, is at a stalemate.

I do hope that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) would consider the local people when it comes to setting prices. It was okay to go up there with the department. The officials went up and talked to the people about the size of the lots. But when it came to setting out prices it was just laid before the people. I think that in all phases of northern development local people will have to be consulted, even to setting prices. If the department had some definite reason as to why X thousands of dollars was picked and laid the cards on the table, the people might see and accept. But when you just throw a price before them, then there is bound to be a criticism. They say: "Why didn't you consult us?" They want to tell the government how they can fit in and how they cannot fit in. So this situation is quite serious at the moment.

I have always maintained in northern development that it's not so much road development or railway development; it's people development as well. People making decisions is all part of this northern development, the result of which will be people benefit.

Housing, then, is a critical problem in the north. We would like to see programmes; we would like to know how much of the budget is earmarked for programmes, if any, in northern areas.

In poverty areas and housing for the senior citizens we've yet to see a programme. I do hope that I will be able to go back after the prorogation of this House and outline to the local people just what we have for them this year.

I'd like to say a little bit about mining. The Atlin constituency is in a mineral belt — we all know that. That constituency is well established in the history of mining development in this province. It was all part of the Klondike — when someone yelled "gold" and people streamed into the north. It was not long afterward that the Atlin constituency was considered a historic riding.

Mind you, the constituency has seen many ups and downs. If markets are bad, of course, business declines; if markets are good the business becomes profitable. Right at the moment there are doldrums in this 300-mile gap I am speaking about.

Of course, everyone blames the government. But I am happy to say that quite a number of the well-thinking people whom I have met in the constituency, particularly in the mining area, have considered the high cost of operation, considered the high salaries that exist, considered the low market value, considered the high cost of construction, considered the government tax levies — and all this had added to what has happened today.

In the Granduc, which I visited just a few days ago, I found at least 500 people have been laid off and about 380 remain. They are hopeful of continuing right on until fall. There is a great possibility that they will continue to operate. Like anybody else, we are hopeful that the market value will increase so that perhaps Granduc would increase again in its operation.

In any event, in talking about employment in the riding, we find for the first time that Atlin has no mineral exploration in this past year. It's nil. Of course, this is the one area in which the local people took part; they joined the many exploration teams each year. Now it's no more. It all relates to a number of things which I have said have caused a decline everywhere, not only in British Columbia but also in other parts of the world. The whole thing has just declined. Looking at the situation in copper in South America and Chile, you can see that they are in a most unfavourable situation there. It's a world problem.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): You're being too kind.

MR. CALDER: I noticed the other day a newspaper account of several delegates meeting with the cabinet. Then we see: "B.C. Mining Men See New Ray of Hope." This is great; I do hope they keep coming over. I do hope the government door is open because consultations mean a lot to the mining people.

I'm very much concerned about this, because I can remember when my colleague, the Minister of Mines, and I sat together on that side. The two of us used to

[[Page 498](#)]

take turns in leading off the debate on mining. Leo was always getting the headlines because he asked for a royal commission on mining every year that I can remember.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): He's not asking for one now.

MR. CALDER: My good colleague is now on this side and I don't hear anything about a royal commission. Yet I believe that when any industry is in trouble, the government's duty is to listen to that industry.

Mining made this province. Everybody knows the history books, and I think we should give some little priority and listen to these people. We agree that some of the laws didn't look too good. I'm one of the guys who used to be critical because there hasn't been too much going into the revenue and into the people's coffers down here in Victoria. I've been critical because services, or something in kind, does not go back to the north. But just the same, I have my heart out for the mining industry.

If this is going to lead to something — which I hope, just by looking at this... No doubt they felt quite good just after they left the Premier's office or the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources' office — whatever office they were in — that they would consider the long run. I know that this year, it says, they have been requested to jot down some of the things they don't approve of. That is fine; that is great.

When these briefs come back in, say within a year, I'm quite sure that most of these mining people will say that they do approve of the principle of royalties. I think they will. I think you will find that quite a number of them will approve.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): No way!

MR. CALDER: I think, though, that almost 100 per cent will disapprove of the super-royalty. So if we are going to work together on this, I wouldn't mind seeing my colleague again asking for a royal commission — or at least opening up the standing committee on mining — and giving these mining companies a chance to tell the elected Members just how to go about alleviating the situation. This is all I ask on behalf of my people. This is not Frank Calder talking. When I was in Stewart they said to just say it. And, you know, I like to say it.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Give them hell. Don't be so soft.

MR. CALDER: I look at highways and what the budget is doing in terms of highways in this gap I am talking about. Just the other day my neighbour, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Dent), remarked about the increased traffic on the Stewart–Watson Lake highway. He mentioned the tourist trade; he mentioned it being the shortcut to the State of Washington. He didn't say "the State of Washington" but I think we can read the message. You heard me time and time again predict before the opening that we should concentrate on the completion of that highway because it meant a route 1,000 miles shorter to the States from the Alaska Highway, and that one day it will take away 50 per cent of the business from the Alaska Highway. This is what is happening.

Those of you who have gone through that highway will find that it is a good highway. We have had some pretty good road builders on that programme. Some of those sections are just absolutely ready for paving. It is just too bad that if there is no paving we are going to start spending money, money and more money repairing the roads that are going to be damaged. If they were actually paved I think we would save money, because this is going to be a major highway.

I am a little concerned about the bridges, the hundreds and hundreds of bridges that span the many streams and rivers. They are not much to look at. I think that if we are going to concentrate some of our efforts on maintaining a good road on the Stewart-Cassiar road, we should spend money from this budget improving all those bridges.

I am also concerned about extra money being allocated towards keeping the Stewart-Terrace highway and the Stewart-Kitwanga highway open all year round. They haven't been. I remember that we promised this when I invited the Premier to be my guest speaker at the last election. He promised that they would be all-weather roads. I am glad the Premier is hearing this. I hope he whispers into the Hon. Minister of Highways' (Hon. Mr. Lea's) ear about that promise and keeps that road an all-weather road.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): He didn't say when.

MR. CALDER: In relation to that highway connection between the Stewart–Watson Lake highway and Highway 16, I would like to say something about the B.C. Ferries. Again, my constituents have asked me to say this on the floor of the House: they would like to see the British Columbia coastal ferry system extended to Stewart. Prince Rupert, of course, would be just one of the stops. The ferries would continue on to Stewart to join with this major highway to connect Stewart with Watson Lake and the Yukon and the State of Alaska.

I have met quite a number of tourists who would rather get off at Stewart than wait and go all the way

[[Page 499](#)]

to Haynes and take their cars on and off. They would like to see a beautiful section of the country and take off from Stewart and move northward. It is the same thing moving south.

I wish that people down here behind their fancy desks would see the advantage of this and extend that. I

wrote a letter to the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) last year. He did say that he was going to look at it this year. After my speech I am going to be dictating to my secretary another letter to remind him that he is supposed to be studying this possibility of extension to Stewart this year.

The Stewart–Watson Lake highway has been kept more of a logging road. Like the company, I suppose the government doesn't like to see the public too much on the logging road. I would imagine that the attitude of the operators of Can-Cel now would be the same as the private company: they don't want to see the public on a logging road. So this is one of the reasons why I bring it to the attention of the government to consider this ferry connection.

I suppose that if there ever was a connection to Highway 16, it will be going through Kitwanga, where a bridge is under construction and a road is nearing completion — that is, from Stewart to Kitwanga. So I would request the government to consider the extension of this ferry system.

I'm very lucky with the Premier.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Somebody has to stay over on that side of the House. I'm very lucky with the....

MR. CALDER: Again, we're talking about the B.C. Railway and, again, the people in Stewart in my recent visits told me to remind the government and the Premier that when the Premier was in Stewart he did say that they'd look into the possibility of serving Stewart as a terminus of the B.C. Railway.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Frank, they can't run it anyway.

MR. CALDER: It's a great responsibility. I remember I got the Premier, and we stood on the high level of the road that was previously used and indicated to him a road down at the base of the pass which would be suitable for a railway due to the fact that the Bear River glacier is now in recession quite rapidly.

It is a great possibility. We see great hopes for the seaport of Stewart so far as the railway is concerned. All we're asking is that the government provide a feasibility study. I don't think it will involve too much in public funds to spend money and find out whether or not the extension of that to the seaport of Stewart is possible. That's all we're asking.

MR. FRASER: Make your mine speech again. The Minister (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) just came in.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): I heard it.

MR. CALDER: I was going to say something about the proposed dam on the Atlintoo River near Atlin. I understand that the power company in Whitehorse is planning to dam up this river by the Atlin lakes. Apparently, they're dealing with the federal government, and the provincial government is standing by to see what may happen. I and the people up north are quite anxious to know what will be done in this particular respect, but I will wait until the estimates of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) and bring this to his attention.

I notice I'm just about going on to 35 minutes. I would just like to use up the remainder of the time to say something on behalf of the Indian organizations...

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Take your time, Frank.

MR. FRASER: Lots of time, Frank.

MR. CALDER: ...in their request for some provincial government action on the land claims.

The provincial government is not deaf to this request. As a Member on this side, I am really hopeful that one day soon, I hope, the government will announce some participation. I just cannot see for the life of me how the provincial government can stay out of negotiations. As one of the negotiators with the Nishga case, I found out after at least four meetings that these negotiations cannot be successful, or cannot reach any conclusions, until the

provincial government has come into the picture.

I think the province should realize the fact that the major portion of the Indian lands claimed is outside the bounds of the reservation system, and that these lands are Crown lands.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Cutoff land.

MR. CALDER: No, no. Cutoffs are a different question altogether, These are land claims — the Indian people are claiming all of British Columbia.

The word "reservation" is not in the dictionary of an Indian who lays claims.

Interjection.

MR. CALDER: Anyway, under the British North America Act, the province has jurisdiction over these major portions of the lands that are under claim. It seems to me that any time one of the present

[[Page 500](#)]

Ministers would say: "Well, look. If it involves your reserves, cutoffs, additions or what not, we'd like to hear about it."

But those are parochial statements. We're not talking about reserves or cutoffs — cutoffs are just a side issue completely. The land claim is the aboriginal title: who owns it, you or me?

I think that three-three split decision answered that question because there is no appeal in the highest court, and so it is a victory. It has been quoted in other parts of the world. It just so happens that we find out now that it's the only case that went before the courts. Africa may be quoting it, and we understand that the Hawaiians may be quoting it as evidence in asking the United States to pay for the islands. So it was a great decision.

We understand the federal government's position. Before the formation of the provinces, naturally, they were in charge of the native question, lands and what-have-you. But then the provinces entered the picture after they were formed and became part of Confederation. They became involved in this because they were given jurisdiction over the land. Why they've been using this whole question as a football I can't understand. Perhaps they are afraid that it'll cost them money.

I think if the three parties sit down and discuss these things, they will find that they can come up with an answer.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: They tried that, Frank.

MR. CALDER: The precedents have already been set by the federal government and the Province of Quebec in that James Bay case, with the involvement of both levels of government — and it's a happy situation. At least I'm happy about it because the precedent has been set. I don't know if sufficient money was paid to those people, but at least the principle was set for the participation of the province, and I think it would be a real feather in the hat if the provincial government would announce that they would take part. I certainly hope so.

I also was glad to see the Indian people asking for independence. I see where Musqueam, Sechelt and North Vancouver are asking for a certain amount of autonomy and to have a say in practically everything in their communities. Good for them.

A lot of these communities are just beginning to realize the recommendations I've been making all these years. I'll repeat again, for the third time on the floor of this House, that the provincial government should automatically recognize that the Indian communities are municipalities. This is almost word for word what I said last session. The Conservative government recognized them as such in Ontario. The United States has given that recognition also, with no strings attached and no conditions — just an automatic recognition.

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but I note that his time has expired.

MR. CALDER: I'm just about finished.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall leave be granted?

Leave granted.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. CALDER: The wife says I talk too much — I told her I was going to go over 40 minutes. (Laughter.)

So in any event — just give me five minutes — this unconditional recognition is a great thing. Eventually it is going to come about. I can see it. What the governments are afraid of is that, if you give this recognition, the money matters would be in the hands of the reserves.

This is my recommendation. If they ever read the Stanbury-Fields report, it recommends this. They can lease out and receive money. As of now the province gets that money. Maybe they don't want to see the Indian people get that money to use in improving their lot, I don't know. If that's the way they are looking at it, I think it is a stupid outlook really. But this has been my recommendation.

That recognition would give two things. They could handle all their land situations and taxation and everything. Let them handle it. The municipalities handle it. Also by this recognition the road will have been provided by which the provincial public services could go aboard. Of course, if the native people don't want it they can just say so and they won't get it.

This is how Ontario handles it. In Ontario, the Indian communities use the Indian resolution forms. If they want a water supply system or a sewage disposal system in their community, they use this form and, instead of sending it to Ottawa, they send it to the Government of Ontario and they get that public service. They are taxpayers; they are entitled to it. Why not?

Thank you very much.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): I rise to take my place here today and support this budget introduced by our Minister of Finance.

I was surprised — indeed I was — at the volume of it. In fact, as I looked over to the benches of the Social Credit Party, I noticed smiles on their faces. I think they were actually quite pleased at first. The only thing is that they are told to resist or fight back.

For example, a budget of that proportion had so much more than anyone had ever dreamed of that, indeed, they couldn't really believe it at first. I think

[[Page 501](#)]

the Liberals were in the same boat.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: We still don't believe it.

MR. KELLY: Of course, ever since that time the opposition have been talking about inflation and how inflationary the budget is. Well, it doesn't matter what you look at today — and every one of you is involved — the cost of consumer goods, no matter what they are, has gone up. I think that is just as much reason to explain why the budget had to be higher — to accommodate the demands of the people for the things they want. They want a better life, and it's going to cost money to give that life the way they want it, including the wages they're going to demand. In fact, a few years ago I can remember when I was being criticized on the floor here by opposition Members about how much money I was making. I said at that time: "If any of you have any left over, please pass it down this way

because I'm telling you, right now, I'm a little short."

Companies in my riding have found things inflationary. In fact, do you know what they're doing? They're laying off men. You know how they're doing it? They buy big machinery. Where there used to be 20-ton trucks and 30-ton trucks, there are now 100-ton trucks. So for every truck that has a 100-ton carrying capacity, that was either three or four trucks, each having a man driving that truck. They are out of production now because they now have these giant machines. Although they cost a lot of money originally, they save in the overall term of paying wages because they produce more and cost less overall to operate.

They do this to cut down on their costs — not altogether unreasonable in some instances. But I suggest that when they try to do these things they do, in fact, create unemployment.

The same with their shovels: they used to have five or six very large shovels in Endako Mines, which is only five miles from where I live. Each one of those shovels had an operator and an oiler on it — that's 10 men working. Doesn't sound like very much, but when you take different units of an operating open-pit mine, and you take these people and then introduce very large machinery.... For example, the last two shovels that went in were at a cost of \$1.25 million and almost \$1.5 million for the next one. There's only one man working on either of those shovels now — they're radio-controlled. There are eight more people who were put out of work. In fact, it's going that way all the way down the line — automation. In any part of the mechanical operation, if they can get something bigger, faster and better, they'll introduce it because it cuts down on their costs.

In some cases I think they're defeating the very purpose they're here for in the first place: to create an industry which will, in turn, serve the community, will give a payroll and at the same time earn a profit. I think for all their scientific knowledge, they're sometimes defeating the whole theory of the thing.

My riding, you know, is the north-central riding. I can hardly believe that I live in the same part of the province as some of the other Members because, basically speaking, there is a general shortage of manpower in my riding — especially the trades. If you want a tradesman to come and do a job for you, you better order that man a couple of months ahead of time or you're just not going to get him. It might be a plumber or an electrician or a masonry man. In fact, sometimes you can wait several months for a man to come, but he won't come to the more isolated areas because he needs half a dozen orders at one time. If he's going to do six houses, fine, he'll come. But if you're building a new home or a building, you may have to hire a contractor from one of the main centres — maybe from out of Vancouver or, at least, out of Prince George — and most of the contractors there are rushed right off their feet.

Even as far as the working people in the sawmills and what-have-you, there has been a very high turnover because people will stay long enough to get themselves a bit of a grubstake. I mean by that that they might get a couple of thousand dollars in the bank and then they're away because, of course, not everybody likes to work in a sawmill nowadays, even though they're a lot easier than they were years ago. I worked in a sawmill 25 or 30 years ago when it was strictly all bull work, and nothing like that happens today. A man isn't required to lift heavy weights or develop any blisters any more. Well, just about, anyway.

We have sawmills under construction now or designed to go into construction within the next month or two. May will see the start of the addition to the Plateau sawmill. There are about another 350 men going to be hired and required in that operation. I just hope that we can find the men to operate it. You talk about all the unemployment, but we just don't seem to get people up there. The fact is that people don't want to work too hard any more. The other thing is that they may not want to go to the rural areas of the province.

Housing has been a part of it; there has been a lack of accommodation. Not many years ago, as long as a man could get a job, he would do anything. He would live in a tent if necessary. That's ridiculous in this day and age; I realize that. The fact is that the average fellow who wanted a job would make out somehow or another. He'd live in some accommodation even if he had to haul a trailer in on site, or something like that, to live in until at least he could get himself a house going.

There is a complete shortage of different services up in my riding right now. For example, the town I

live in has 1,500 people and we can't get a barber. If you want a haircut, go to Prince George, 100 miles away. A shoemaker is practically unheard of in the north. If you have a \$40 pair of shoes on and you have a hole on the sole or a crack in the top or something, you throw them away, They're no good to you any more. You will have to buy a new pair because there isn't a shoemaker in the country to repair your shoes. There are all kinds of opportunities for small business people, but do you think we can get them up there? Not on your life. There are openings for just about everybody. In fact, even the vocational schools have been going full swing to try to provide the people who are required in the local scene as it stands right now.

As you know, the Babine Forest Products mill near Burns Lake is practically ready to open and go into production. Once again, although there has been a tremendous effort to get all the local people around Burns Lake trained to work in this mill and to be the servicemen, journeymen mechanics, operators of equipment and what-have-you, I am kind of confident that there is going to be a shortage. Once again there will be long lists sent in to Canada Manpower and to other areas to try to get men in to accommodate the jobs that will be there.

Certainly this government has had a lot to do with it. After all, if it hadn't been for planning by our forest branch and by other departments of government — Municipal Affairs, Housing — these things would not have come about. But, you see, my riding was a prime riding for such an experiment as this because no riding in this province was in as bad condition as mine was under that former regime. There just wasn't a job in the country, There were very few sawmills left. The ones that did go in there were poorly managed, and many millions of dollars were lost by the private sector in trying to operate mills in that part of the country. Certainly this government is to be given all the credit in the world for having had the foresight and having seen the opportunities that were there and the people who needed jobs.

If you could have seen the people, especially the native people, and the problems that were there in terms of numbers of people and numbers on welfare, it was certainly the place for a programme like this to be instituted. When you can see 50, 60 and, in some cases, 70 per cent of the residents of those local reserves who were on welfare, with no chance in this world of getting started on a job anywhere, the programmes that we have going there now are a real blessing.

I would like to say a word or two about the mines. I heard my comrade here from Atlin (Mr. Calder) speaking just a minute ago, and he was quite concerned about what is happening in the mines in his riding. I have had an association with the mines for quite a few years. I used to prospect in placer gold when I was a young fellow and I worked in a couple of mines, the last one for five years. I have been a driller, I have worked in the mill and I have done all kinds of things. But these were big mines and are quite boring jobs when you have been on them for a while. It really was not experience that would let me know what really is going on in the mining field, I would admit that.

But I have a couple of hundred acres of land where I am living, and there are claim stakes all over. I go up and try to read these claim stakes. In fact, year after year the claim jumpers will come along and put their tag on top of the original claim stake or the tag that was on the previous year. I've been hearing about how the staking of claims has declined in the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. KELLY: Well, I'll tell you something, Mr. Member. You could put a million claims in the province if you wanted to, and there is nothing productive about that. There are people running around the country, waiting until February 28 with their Skidoos. Here they go scooting out in the middle of the night — they're parked right in my driveway. As soon as the last year's claims run out, they are running around the country slapping tags on top of the other fellow's claim stake.

This goes on year after year, Because there's an operating mine within five miles of my place where I reside, the whole country is staked. It's an unproductive thing. I wouldn't get very excited about somebody saying: "Well, you know that we don't have nearly as many claims staked this year as we did last year."

Interjection.

MR. KELLY: But they're not finding anything, Mr. Member. They're walking around the country, putting their original stakes up, and all they are waiting for is some company that might jump at the bait and come around someday with their drill rigs to run some test holes down.

MR. GIBSON: It costs them money every year to keep those holes open.

MR. KELLY: Well, that's right, it does cost them. But it doesn't cost them very much, really, because if you're near an existing mine the chances are that you might have something there. It's a bit of a gamble.

What I am suggesting is this: because the claims have gone down in 1974 to 10,000 claims from a high in 1972 of 53,000 claims.... A very good friend of mine was a very large contractor for one of the

[[Page 503](#)]

biggest mining companies in Canada, and he had a couple of million dollars worth of heavy-duty equipment that he did exploration work with — Cats for trenching, and all kinds of other equipment — and had large mobile camps that he moved right out into the hinterland.

The start of the decline of actual mining exploration in British Columbia, was 1969. Since 1969, the dollars have decreased in numbers per year invested in mining exploration in British Columbia. So it's not a new thing that mining exploration has decreased. In fact, some of those major companies haven't done any exploration in the province for the past two or three years, except in a very minimal way.

MR. GIBSON: Two or three years?

MR. KELLY: That's right, two or three years. Well, it's been advantageous to them to decline their exploration because, after all, you can only explore a piece of ground for so long. If it has been tested out with all the modern methods of checking for ores and if there's nothing there, there's not much use going back over it again. Let's face it, for 100 years now men have been prodding this Province of British Columbia looking for mines. The ones that are known are pretty well discovered now, even though we know that there are large reserves of copper and other minerals in certain areas of the province. Even if they aren't being developed, they will be when the time comes that communication and transportation is available to these existing ore bodies.

I do take exception to the opposition Members referring to how these number of claims tell just exactly what the story is in the mining industry. I could easily go out and stake 10 claims a night, and so could everybody in this room, and it wouldn't mean a thing. It's quite unproductive.

Last year the mining industry did have a record year. Gross sales were \$1.256 billion, up another \$140 million over 1973. I think the January issue of the *Northern Miner* tells you: the headline was "A Record Year." Yet on the opposite side of the page they're suspecting this and they're suspecting that, and God knows what else, So they've decided that they're going to cut back.

I don't really believe that the mines are being all that truthful. In some instances, we do have mines.... There are good mining companies, and I have them right in my riding — excellent corporate citizens. I don't think they mind one bit — oh, it might hurt a little bit. But, after all, out of all this profit last year, we received approximately \$13 million in royalties. I don't think that's an excessive amount out of those kind of sales. So that's about all I wanted to say about the mining section at this time, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to speak to my Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Radford). I don't know whether he's in the House. No, that's not him over there; that's another big man.

You know, of course, that he took over that portfolio when we became government, although it was several months after before he actually was appointed. His portfolio was in a pretty rugged mess. There had been no real

money spent in recreation or conservation in this province for many years. So I must give him credit for what he has done up until now. It has been an excellent job.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Spend-a-million Radford!

MR. KELLY: Well, at least I can say this: I spoke harshly to the Minister last year on something that was happening in my riding, and that was, of course, the open season on cow moose and doe deer. Lo and behold, what happened? The season was closed last year for about 170 miles along Yellowhead 16. You bet it was terrific, Mr. Member, because I'll tell you: there weren't 200 moose out of that whole country this last fall when, previously, they would have shot them off till there wasn't a thing left. And because of the excellent winter we've just gone through, the signs are, I believe, that they have survived the winter well — and because of the restriction on hunting — which has been a blessing.

I would have gone even further. I would admit that I only asked that the cows be closed and that only the bulls be open. I think, after seeing what happened this last winter, especially in the breeding season, it probably wouldn't have been a bad idea if we had also closed the bulls for a couple of years at least until we get those numbers built back up to where we're really safe. The railroads, for example, a year ago in a heavy winter with snow killed off a lot of moose on the railroad. Several were killed on the highways. They were killed this winter too. I just felt that for the few moose they kill this fall, if we had saved them, too, they would have had just that much better a time to stand off all the elements they're up against. Those elements include, of course, the poachers, the bad weather, highways and railroads, and also the predators.

We didn't have a lot of complaints about predators this fall. I think that I'm a disciple of Mr. Jack Miner, the famous conservationist. I really believe, as he said, that every time you take an animal you should also take one of every one of the predators that expect to live on that animal. That isn't being done in this province. I know that that's a pretty broad statement to make because you just can't go out and destroy one wolf and one fox and one of whatever other predator they might be. But at least if the game laws were such that more of these predators could be taken, then there wouldn't be so much pressure on

[[Page 504](#)]

the few moose that we do have left.

Also, Mr. Minister, I think that the biologists in your northern region made a mistake this fall in not allowing the season on grouse to be closed. There wasn't a grouse within miles of my home and, in talking to other hunters throughout the riding, there was a real shortage this year. What it could be blamed on I don't know. We did have two very serious, heavy snowfalls in two preceding years, and this could have been part of the responsibility. It seems incredible to me, when a hunter can go out and hunt all day and not see one grouse and people complain throughout the area that there are no grouse, that the season is still left open. If there were a pocket of grouse in one particular area or another that could easily be shot off, this would only make it all the harder for the grouse to multiply back into the areas that are uninhabited with grouse in the first place.

I think that any species that for some reason — even an emergency situation — is in shortage for that particular year, then the local director should have the authority to go out and say that the season is closed. And that's it.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Right on!

MR. KELLY: I have discussed the situation about the sustenance permits before, and in most cases, although I know that a good percentage of those permits go to the native people of the province, they're basically handed out to people on welfare. I don't believe that we should be supporting our welfare branch with game. It's a known fact that if you kill an animal and have to start eating it — especially in the middle of winter when it will freeze in a matter of hours and can't possibly age properly — what do you wind up with? You've got a hunk of tough meat. And we've put considerable value on our moose. The guides' association values a moose at \$1,000.

I would suggest, seeing that there is a tough time in the cattle industry, that we should have the welfare branch supply the needy person with a quarter of beef, and let's save our moose. I don't think we should be allowing the moose and the deer to be shot off just to support the welfare bunch.

In fact, the moose is having a tough enough time as it is trying to survive without issuing permits — although I believe they've been cut back this year. For example: last year 1,200 of these sustenance permits were issued in the name of food for needy people. I don't know whether 1,200 moose were shot, but in some instances more than one moose was shot on one permit because there's nothing on that permit to say that after you've finished killing an animal you have to punch the permit or do like you on a regular hunting licence where you have to notch out the day and the month on which you killed your animal.

The native people have been supporting me on this issue. Everybody says: "Oh no, you're taking their rights away from them." But I don't believe that they really, truly believe themselves that, the first thing you know, there's going to be no moose left. Even they agree with this.

I had two meetings last year, and at both meetings natives got up and said that this is what should be happening.

I would only agree to this too — that if there is an area in the province where there is an abundance of animals, certainly make those animals available to the people who need them. But to go into an area that's been over hunted, such as along Highway 16, I would say: "Let's stop it, and stop it now."

I also spoke last year on the leghold trap. I know that the Minister has been doing considerable work on the leghold trap, but because of the lack of positive things in the press.... Sure, there are committees around, but you don't really hear much of them. Rather than let this thing go into dormancy of a sort, I would just like to say a few words about it.

I think we've got to keep on top of this situation, practically on a daily basis. Two years ago the association that was pressing this issue were attracting the attention of all the MLAs, both opposition and government, and the Ministers, in attempting to have the leghold removed as a trap and have a humane trap instituted. I think one thing that everybody should understand is that they are not trying to stop trapping — no way. They know that it's a very necessary way of life for some of our people, especially in the far north. Trapping is a way of life, and economically we do need it.

But the fact is that a humane trap hasn't been designed. There are several quite humane traps on the market, but either they're so awkward or so heavy or so costly that nobody will buy them. There has been money provided by the government and by other agencies for research, but there doesn't seem to be too much being done.

I was told the other day that there are 20 traps available right now for testing, but they've been waiting for eight months to be tested by someone. So we've just lost another season because the trapping season is soon drawing to a close. I would urge the Minister to really get his committee going on this issue because it certainly is a motherhood issue if I ever heard of one.

People have been trying for years to have a humane trap introduced. I think that if we are capable of flying to the moon or building a bomb that can blow this country apart in seconds but can't develop a humane trap, then, indeed, there's something really wrong with us.

I see the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) isn't in this afternoon, and I wish he had

been here. I am, of course, very pleased with what has happened with agriculture in this province. Just listen to the reports out of the Department of Agriculture or out of the federation, and talk to farmer groups, the institutes — basically, they're happy. They're happy with Bill 42; they know what it means. They're happy with the farm income assurance plan and other money that was made available to them to make their lives a little happier and, certainly, a

little more productive. This last year, income in British Columbia was up about 25 per cent for farmers, and that's a pretty good average. Certainly, they're the ones who really needed it.

The people I would like to refer to are the beef people — the cattle ranchers. My riding has quite a few of them. I think there are about between 10,000 and 15,000 head of cattle in Omineca, and all the ranches are small — 150, 180 or 200 animals. So they are all family farm units. If you go and shake hands with one of these fellows, they've got hands on them like hunks of iron. They have worked so hard all their lives that they are just like rawhide, most of these fellows. In fact the ages of them are getting higher and higher; there just aren't young ranchers moving in, as there should be, to accommodate that industry. If beef were to go out of existence we would be a pretty unhappy population because, boy, I love my steak and roast and what-have-you.

I would urge that the farm income assurance programme be made available to them. In fact, there is a committee right now negotiating with the cattlemen, attempting to find out what the cost of production is.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): It was negotiated and cut in half.

MR. KELLY: No, they're negotiating right today, Mr. Member. I have some figures here on what the cost of production is.

MR. PHILLIPS: For chickens.

MR. KELLY: No, this is for beef.

If the people in this province were being realistic, we could see a 50-cent-a-pound increase to the farmer right today for his beef. He really requires that today to be at a level where he could consider that what he was working for was paying off.

History has shown that cattlemen have worked like the blazes to make a dollar. They work five times harder than the average working man.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's a lot harder to lift a cow than a chicken.

MR. KELLY: I'm anxious that this committee that is working on this cost of production programme for a cow-calf or any other type of a cattle ranch look at some of the costs that ranchers are running into.

For example, I have news item here. I haven't got a date on it, but Mr. Whelan is the man who is making the quotation, and I would like to quote from this. It is from Ottawa: "Agricultural Minister Eugene Whelan blasted fertilizer manufacturers Thursday for more than doubling their prices in the past two years." I only wanted to quote that little bit because it shows you that, for example, in the last couple of years the price of fertilizer has doubled, and cattle ranchers use a lot of fertilizer. They all order it by the carload. They usually do it on a cooperative basis so that they can afford to get it in as cheaply as possible.

When costs are going up, doubling within a couple of years, it is no wonder that these people are being driven right into the ground with inflationary costs that they just can't match. They are getting less for their beef today than they were 10 years ago, when there was no inflation such as we see today.

I think these are some of the things cattlemen are going to have to do. Cattlemen are going to have to band together and they are going to have to sell their beef through one agency so that they will have control. That's about the only way they are going to do it because today every little town....

They had a sale, I believe, in Kamloops just a couple of days ago, and they said it was tragic to see what was going on there. You see, they are at the mercy of whoever wants to buy. If the prices aren't any good, they either have to give them away or take them back home and suffer the cost of transportation, the charges that are put on them by the stockyard and what else. So it is a real bad deal.

I'm anxious that this committee will be sure to look at all the costs involved. Seed costs have gone up —

skyrocketed — so if you are going to do some seeding, it doesn't matter. There are a lot of other costs that people don't understand, as far as I'm concerned. The public at large sometimes criticize farmers and say: "Oh, look, they want more than the animals are worth." They don't understand that every man loses about 2 per cent of his cattle a year just through mortality, through one means or another. Hay which was \$30 a ton two years ago or so is now \$60 and \$70 in my area. Grain is \$110 a ton.

There is no doubt that the cattlemen have to have their cost of production. They're only charging their own labour in at \$4 per hour. Really, they're not asking for very much.

Other things that people don't understand is that, like any other business, there are maintenance and repairs, bookkeeping, insurance, taxes. Then they have to have operating capital that they pay interest on, and trucks — all that kind of machinery — building fences.... The average farmer, I see here, has about 15 miles of fence at \$2,000 a mile. When you think of the depreciation on that, it certainly

[[Page 506](#)]

amounts to a lot. Yet people are not too fussy about paying any more for their beef than they are right today.

When I said that the farmer needs another 50 cents a pound, I don't say that because the farmer got 50 cents the packing house shouldn't add their share on. I think the packing houses are getting their fair share. At least, they seem to be in good order.

Anyway, I'm anxious that we should see that the cattle ranchers all over this province are well looked after in terms of their industry. If we don't have these cattle ranchers, we're in trouble. If they go out of business, the price of beef will skyrocket, and then we'll really have something to be sorry about.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to participate in the budget debate today representing the great riding of Cariboo.

Before I get into it, I just want to make a remark or two following the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly). I'm sure that up in his riding they will be happy to find out that, prior to the coming of the NDP government, all the sawmill operators in that riding were inefficient. I can't follow him in that criticism due to the fact that his government bought out Plateau Mills. At the time, they said they bought it because it was an efficient operation, and I'm sure it was. So I'm sure that the people of Omineca will be pleased to hear they were all inefficient operators up there.

As far as his remarks on the beef industry are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think you know that the Cariboo is probably the largest shipper of beef in the Province of British Columbia. I might say, in reference to the Member for Omineca, that they have been negotiating for a long time and they haven't arrived at any agreement. But they should have, because the negotiations should have been long over, and the beef farmers should have been put into the assurance programme before now. It is my information that it probably won't happen because the government hasn't provided the funds for it to happen — which is very unfortunate.

MR. KELLY: They're still negotiating.

MR. FRASER: As I said I'm happy to take part in the budget debate today. I've been listening with intent all through the budget debate and the amendment on it. One thing that becomes crystal clear to me is the touchiness of all the government Members regarding participation in the budget debate and the amendment. We've had, oh, a dozen cabinet Ministers up here and, believe me, I've never seen, since I've been here, so many irritated people. They're certainly on the defensive.

The thing I got the biggest kick out of was that the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) here Thursday night had to resort to a criticism of the press. He was really incensed about that. I just have a message for him, Mr. Speaker. Most all of the press — the Fourth Estate — see things and report them as they see them. Of course, the Minister of Transport doesn't like to see the facts of life before him. The facts are that the press

are changing and finally coming around; they smell a little change in public opinion in British Columbia which causes them to show the bigness and the arrogance of this government and bring it out to the light for the listening public and the reading public. I want to assure you that the Minister of Transport and Communications shouldn't get too excited about that. This government was elected in 1972 with a 39 per cent majority of the people who voted. I would say that should an election be called now, they'd be lucky to get 25 per cent of the popular vote.

MR. PHILLIPS: The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) doesn't even stay in the House to listen to his own debate.

MR. FRASER: This government will never learn by their errors. They keep on repeating them and, of course, because the press relates these instances, why, they're all touchy and jumpy and twitchy.

Interjection.

MR. FRASER: As a matter of fact, they're so big and so arrogant now that they have an average attendance in this House out of 38 Members of about one-third that amount — not more than about 12. They always make sure they just have enough to cover the opposition Members. I think it's about time that we went to the people and cut them down to the size they operate at in this House.

MR. PHILLIPS: Where's the Minister of Finance?

MR. FRASER: We've been on the budget debate now for 10 days. The Minister of Finance, who, I will say, up to this session has been a pretty good attendance, hasn't been here to listen to the budget debate any more than half the time this budget debate and the amendment to it have been going on.

MR. PHILLIPS: Shocking, shocking! Where is the Minister of Finance?

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, leading into the budget, last year this time we had a phony budget put in front of us. It turned out to be so because we now know that budget was underestimated for revenues by around a half million and overspent on expenditures by March 31, 1975, of another half million. There's a half million either side, so it adds

[[Page 507](#)]

up to a \$1 million error they made last year. That's why I look as skeptically as I do on this budget before us in the amount of \$3.2 billion.

I wonder how much authenticity there is in this budget to provide funds for the public service for the year 1975-76, starting on April 1, and to look after the public service until March 31, 1976.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this budget is, of course, the largest in the history of the province at \$3.2 billion, and I want to now point out a few things that I see about this budget.

The income from resources has dropped — I will go into the details — but the taxation from people has greatly increased. To be specific on a few instances: in this budget there are salary contingencies in excess of \$80 million. I repeat: salary contingencies in the 1975-76 budget. In other words, there are already salary provisions for the public service in here, but a contingency item of about \$80 million over and above that is in this budget. I want to repeat that because it is a staggering amount of money....

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): You can't read a budget.

MR. FRASER: I would say to this Minister of rubber hammers over here that if he could read what is going on in his department, we wouldn't have so much trouble in the question period with him.

Interjections.

MR. FRASER: The Member behind has mentioned that he can't read or write one, so he has a lot to be talking about.

In this budget, on the revenue side, the gasoline tax is up 2 cents a gallon to provide a further \$60 million. Mr. Speaker, this 2 cents a gallon tax increase is not political talk; it's a fact. It went into effect the day the Minister of Finance brought in the budget. As one Member said here recently: "I say to the citizens of this province, particularly the motorists, when they drive into a gas station they should be asking for so many gallons of collision insurance." In effect, that is what is happening. ICBC, or Moscow Mutual — whatever you care to call it — this year is being subsidized by the gas tax by 10 cents a gallon.

MR. PHILLIPS: Give me five gallons of collision insurance.

MR. FRASER: So it is definitely a good saying that you should order collision insurance rather than gasoline when you go into a service station.

The end result of this, what caused the increase of the 2 cents a gallon, is to reimburse the general revenue where ICBC has raided it to the tune, this year, of \$100 million. They are now going to replace it by an increase of 2 cents and replace in the general revenue \$60 million which will be derived from that.

The people of this province are going to pay \$175 million extra in personal income tax this year because of the inflationary part of this budget. As a matter of fact, people's taxes are up in this budget in the amount of \$445 million.

Interjection.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would call that Minister to order. He has lots to say now, but during question period he can't answer any questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You just don't like the answers, that's all.

MR. FRASER: I mention an increase of people taxes of \$445 million. The breakdown on that is approximately this: property taxes, \$5 million; sales taxes are estimated up at \$155 million; personal income tax up \$172 million; gas taxes, as I mentioned, up \$60 million; hotel taxes up \$3 million (that is the tax on rooms); and liquor income is budgeted to be up \$50 million.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

It appears that the citizens of the province can't stand it; the government is anticipating that they will drink themselves to death. The more they drink, the more the government makes. That is a great, sad state of affairs.

I would like to deal with the resource side of this government. When they campaigned in 1972, they said they would get more out of the resources of this province and there would be less for the people to pay in the form of taxes. In this budget before us, we find now that the forest resource taxes are budgeted at \$135 million, and I am going to have something more to say on that shortly. They are down \$125 million in the estimates of the taxes from that resource.

Mining, of course, is down \$6 million. We all know the reason for that. The mining taxes are down. Mr. Speaker, in this budget, in people's taxes alone there is \$1.525 billion, or an increase, as I mentioned earlier, of \$445 million over last year.

I say to you and to this House, does job security — as the Premier and Minister of Finance called it in introducing this budget — mean a real effort to have everyone in this province work for the government? Is that what the Premier means when he calls this a job-security budget? Provincial employees have increased from 29,000 in 1972 to approximately 44,000 today, and more keep on coming in to the

service.

This budget does nothing to provide immediate relief to the average British Columbian from inflation. Why didn't the government take a look at another option that was open to them in drafting the budget? That is, why didn't they give a personal income tax deduction to all our citizens in this province? Our citizens are caught between taxes and inflation, and nothing is left of their pay cheques. Let the individual have more to spend this year. They should do this rather than have the provincial government do it. We believe the government already has too much to spend. The individual British Columbian would do a better job of spending the extra revenue, through tax cuts, than the provincial government would do in spending this money. This approach would also assist employment through the increase in consumer spending by the citizens of the province.

As the representative for Cariboo, all I can see in this budget is higher taxes for the people that I represent and all the rest of the people in the province through increased property taxes, income taxes, gasoline taxes, sales taxes, hotel room taxes, cigarette taxes and liquor profits. This government, in other words, will take more from the people than they will receive in return.

The economy of the Cariboo riding depends mainly on the forest industry, the beef cattle industry, the mines industry, and the travel and tourist industry. Because of this, the economy is not as good as it has been in the past. The market for the products I have mentioned has declined sharply. I might say that a great deal of that is caused by world markets. Dealing with the forest industry, which is the largest industry in the Cariboo, because of world markets being down, and mainly the U.S. market, it is difficult for the forest operators to continue to operate. However, to maintain payrolls most operators have been able to continue operations, but under very difficult conditions.

One of the greatest difficulties for the forest operations is the very unreliable transportation they have to depend on. I refer, of course, to the provincial government's British Columbia Railway. Mr. Speaker, this railroad is unreliable. It did not operate for seven weeks because of a work stoppage. It is operating again since the work stoppage but it cannot supply the necessary cars to move lumber, plywood and chips. This government has been aware of this. We have been talking about this for over a year, but things get no better. Even though it is owned by the people of this province, and the Premier as the president is the big boss, and the vice-president of the railroad is the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King), and the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of northern affairs (Hon. Mr. Nunweiler) is a director, I don't know why they can't find out what is really wrong with the operation of this railroad.

The Hon. Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) mentioned here earlier today something about hoping that this railroad would get extended to Stewart. I say to him not to hold his hopes up too high. Even if they do get the money and get it built there, it is another job to see any trains running on it after it is built.

This railroad, in my opinion, due to its operating problems in 1974, will have an operating deficit for the year 1974 of at least \$10 million. That is one thing. That deficit comes out of the pockets of all the people of the province. But far more than that amount of money has been lost because of the inefficient operation of this railroad.

I refer to all the shippers on this railroad who are continually confronted with the fact that they can't get cars to move their products to market. They, in turn, have to pay high interest charges — 10, 11 and 12 per cent — on the inventory that they can't get out. They must continue to operate to maintain their payrolls, so they have to go and borrow money. I am repeating, Mr. Speaker, that they are borrowing money in the millions, right today, to maintain their inventories and maintain their payrolls because this railroad doesn't seem to be able to get around to operating in the way a railroad should operate.

Another thing this government did late last fall at two different times, if I recall, was that they reduced the price of stumpage — in the interior, at least, I am talking about — to \$1.10 per 100 cubic feet for Crown timber.

This, by the way, reduces the statutory minimum and definitely has been a help to maintain the operations in some shape or fashion up to this point. Then the price of chips was set at \$35. That came later, if I recall, around the

end of the year. Anyway, that is the situation today, Mr. Speaker. When these announcements were made by the government, they said that this arrangement would expire on March 31. There are millions of dollars involved here in investment and payroll.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to determine what is going to be the price for stumpage and chips at April 1, 1975, because this arrangement is only good until March 31. I think that, in all fairness to the industry affected, the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) should be telling them now so they can do their planning.

I'm very surprised that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources hasn't given them more notice than he has because he understands planning — he's a planner himself. Here he is with a \$100 million, \$200 million, \$300 million, \$400 million industry, with three weeks expiring on an agreement that will affect their future operation dramatically, and he hasn't had the decency, I'll say, to tell them what is

[[Page 509](#)]

going to happen then. I think it's about time that he did. Some planner!

MR. CHABOT: Where is he now?

MR. FRASER: Something else I think will come as quite a shock to citizens of the province, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, again regarding the interior forest operations: because of juggling done by the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, and with all the hardships the interior operators have had with market conditions, shortage of railcars and so on, the Government of British Columbia owes the interior forest industry \$90 million as of today. They have owed it to them since 1974.

I want to read a few excerpts. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you'll be shocked to hear this and I'd certainly love to hear the Minister's opinion on this. After all the struggle they've had — and they're still struggling, borrowing money — here is the Government of British Columbia. . . . I know it came up last fall that they weren't paying the \$1,000 or \$2,000 bills, but I didn't realize they had bills outstanding at this time of \$90 million.

At the present time, the government owes between \$80 million and \$95 million to logging companies, mainly in the interior, for roads already built. It's \$80 million to \$95 million; I averaged it out at \$90 million. The exact figure is not known because the Forest Service is still trying to catch up to a runaway expenditure. I don't know whether that was by the road builders in the private sector or by the Forest Service but, knowing how they do things, it would probably be both sectors.

The point that I want to make here, Mr. Speaker, is the debt that is owed these interior operators for road building probably exceeds the stumpage available to the Crown for the year 1975-76. The money owing to the operators, unless paid promptly, denies them funds urgently required to build roads for log production in 1975-76, which, if not produced, will create massive unemployment in this year, 1975-76.

The government says they're coming out with an employment programme in the Forest Service. I guess so! I guess they have to. I believe the programme announced was \$15 million or \$20 million. Well, I can see why they have to come out with that. It's because \$90 million that the operators should have so they can re-spend on roads in 1975 has not been paid by the government, while the government, I guess, feels they owe some obligation to take up the slack.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this situation results from political tinkering with resource policies, which in turn is aggravated by administrative bungling. Any statement of stumpage revenues and Barrett's budget must be reconciled to this stumpage offset. Mr. Speaker, in this budget the revenue section for stumpage shows up at \$135 million. I say to you that the Forest Service owes these operators \$90 million and I suggest to you that that should be subtracted from this budget of anticipated revenues. We then come to \$45 million that will come in from stumpage from the interior in 1975-76, and that isn't even going to come in because of the low rate of stumpage that has existed and will exist at \$ 1.10 per 100 cubic feet.

The point of all this — the reason I'm mentioning this in the budget debate — is the fact that the \$135 million in revenues that this government has in these estimates and turns around and spends will not exist this time next year. If they pay, it has to be debited against the anticipated revenues. If the government doesn't pay, well, there's no end of troubles.

I really think this is a disgraceful situation, particularly in reference to the operators the money is owed to, who are struggling so hard. I understand that when they go to their bankers for advances on inventory and show as an asset outstanding debts from the Forest Service, instead of borrowing collateral that they had under prior years, the bankers say: "That's no collateral for borrowing; that's a bad debt you've got." They can't get any advance on that. I think that's a very shocking thing to happen.

I am sure that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, who is so fast making public statements outside of this Legislature, will come into the Legislature and answer this. I'm sure that he'll have an answer. I can tell you that the operators and the citizens of the interior and the north would like to know when they can expect their money.

In this same department, Mr. Minister, I have raised in the House residential Crown leases in past times. This government decided to increase by seven or eight times the fees per year charged for rental. I've had personal experience with the rentals going up nine times.

I will say that last fall the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources agreed to reduce these exorbitant increases in rental fees. If they had gone more than double what they had had in the prior five years then he ordered his department to make refunds back to double from the five, six, seven, eight or nine times they had gone up.

MR. LEWIS: That's a fair government.

MR. FRASER: That satisfied the complainants. They realized they have to go up, but double was a rational figure.

But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, he's come in with a new wrinkle. Where these people have paid \$400 and \$500 in advance rental fees last year so that they wouldn't lose their lease, he has calculated the revenue.... One that I saw was a refund of \$276,

[[Page 510](#)]

but it should have been \$400 and something, and the difference was made of advance rental fees till October, 1976. What kind of way is that to treat the citizens? He has no right taking advance rental fees ahead till October, 1976, he should be satisfied with that and refund any money paid ahead of that date. The least he should do is pay interest on the money that he has withheld from these worthy people.

I heard the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) and the Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) talking about mining. I want to tell you that B.C. started when they hit gold in the Cariboo. I know you're aware of that, Mr. Speaker. So it's certainly historic there. But there's not much history left to mining in the Cariboo now, thanks to Bill 31 passed in this Legislature.

Interjection.

MR. FRASER: Somebody has just mentioned here that the only mining going on up there is the government mining the people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Undermining.

MR. FRASER: To this Minister responsible sitting across from me here, do you know what they're saying all through the Cariboo now? They're saying that they're afflicted with "Nimsickitis." They're pretty mad at Bill 31.

We have 5,000 people out of work — I'll take the B.C.-Yukon Chamber of Mines figures on that. We have

another 10,000 predicted that will be out of work, so we're well aware of everything that's going on in mining.

I might tell you that there would be another gold rush today in Barkerville, where gold was originally discovered in the 1850s, if it weren't for that Minister and that government. There's loads of gold up there. You should go up there, Mr. Speaker, sometime. I'll go with you and show you how to pan for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He used to be there — they ran him out.

MR. FRASER: There's all kinds of gold but nobody will touch it because they know that under Bill 31 and this government's policies, they'll take it all away from them. And gold is \$175 an ounce.

I can remember when they worked day and night and were glad to mine gold for \$25 an ounce. Today it's \$175 an ounce. Because of Bill 31, there is no activity at all.

We have a ghost town up there. I think you're aware of it — Wells. Barkerville has been restored for historic reasons, but Wells is a ghost town. It wouldn't be today if it weren't for Bill 31. Go up there and ask and see.

Interjection.

MR. FRASER: You certainly haven't done anything to rejuvenate it, Mr. Minister.

I'd like to tell you about another thing. There was talk of a copper smelter in this province during the last provincial election. These old smokescreen boys over on this side went running all around and said: "Oh, they just want to pull out and it's going to do this." Mr. Speaker, they were looking at a spot in the southern Cariboo for a copper smelter. They counted all the votes — and you know how shocked the people of the province were when they did that and we got a new government. But we haven't heard anything about a copper smelter.

I realize the Minister has set up a task force to look into a copper smelter, but again this Minister is wrong. He's wasting public money doing these things because nobody is going to invest in a copper smelter in this province under the conditions that exist here today. I can assure you of that.

HON. G.V. LAUK (Minister of Economic Development): Would you resign?

Interjections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Order!

MR. FRASER: Oh, we're going to hear from the little guy, the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk). There'll never be a smelter under this government, and you won't be here to ask me to resign because you will be long gone.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

MR. FRASER: You're a one-time shot. You'll never be back.

HON. MR. LAUK: You're just a big talker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I would remind the Hon. Members that they are....

HON. MR. LAUK: A big talker from the Cariboo.

MR. FRASER: Another basic industry in the riding of Cariboo that really made history — made this province in the first place — is all chaos up there.

Gibraltar mine is an operating mine. Go up there and find out. I hear, by the way, that the Premier is going there on Friday. I'm glad he's going up there to Williams Lake and Quesnel. He'll find out the facts. Instead of calling

us the doom-and-gloom boys, I'm sure he'll come back here and say: "Fellows, those fellows were right." There have been over 100 people already laid off in Gibraltar of a 400-man payroll, and

[[Page 511](#)]

more to come. Believe me, they would have kept them on the payroll if it hadn't been for looking at that Bill 31 in the future.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): What happened to Gibraltar in '66?

Interjections.

MR. FRASER: I haven't time, Mr. Speaker, to....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Cariboo has the floor.

MR. FRASER: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate it. You'd never know it.

HON. MR. LAUK: Well, he's misusing it.

MR. FRASER: That cabinet Minister is all twitchy — and I love doing that, you know.

HON. MR. LAUK: Well, you're beyond twitching.

MR. FRASER: I want to discuss for a minute the beef cattle industry as it applies to the riding of Cariboo. As I have said, we ship more beef to market than any other place in the Province of British Columbia. We're known as the biggest bull-shippers in British Columbia. Last year there were 35,000 or so head of cattle shipped to market from the Cariboo.

HON. MR. LAUK: That's a lot of bull!

MR. FRASER: Again, because of world and international and national events, the beef cattle industry is in bad shape. They are selling their cattle at below cost of production, and I, of course, was disturbed the other day to hear that there's a good likelihood, because of lack of money, that they won't get into the farm assurance programme.

But what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that a grazing report was commissioned by the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) over a year ago — 1973 — and it was brought in late last year or early this year by a Mr. McLean, I believe his name is. I want to comment on that. I consider that an excellent report, and I think the beef cattle industry considers it an excellent report.

The only disappointment I have in it is the fact that the Minister has now received the report and sent it out for public discussion. I suggest that he should act on most of the report now, because it has had the public discussion, and we certainly need a new grazing policy. This gives 10-year tenure, in this report with review every five years. That's all I want to say about that, although I now expect, in view of the Minister's actions, that we won't see any changes in the grazing for at least another 12 months.

But I would say to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources and to this House that I think that this year, rather than charge the beef industry a grazing fee per month as you always do, because of the depressed state of this industry they should give it to them for free for 1975 — that is, grazing on public land.

I want to refer to another...task force, I guess we'll call it. This government has got so many task forces that nobody will ever be able to keep track of them. But this is a task force looking for a marketing area for cattle. It was publicized in the *Vancouver Province* on February 27. They said that they wanted to locate stockyards and so on — I believe they came out with a report — in the Kamloops–Cache Creek area to serve the Cariboo and, of course, the Merritt–Nicola Valley area and so on.

I just want to say here that I think they haven't found the location. I don't think that it should be anywhere near Kamloops. They've got lots of economic activity there. I understand the stockyards there have got to get out anyway, so I would like to see them look in the Clinton–Cache Creek area of Cariboo for this stockyard. I realize that no decision has been made.

I also want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not advocating that government do this but only that government finance this. The cattlemen of this province are independent people. They probably need some long-term financing, but they want to operate this thing and eventually own it. That is the only part I'm saying here today. I congratulate the government for looking at this problem, but I hope they are looking at the problem in a way that they will do the capital investment and be repaid back by the industry as cattle sales and feeding and so on go on. There are definitely places available.

Again we're back to British Columbia Rail. This government announced the northwest agreement in 1973. Somebody criticized me the other day for shooting in on that. In that agreement, which this government has done nothing about, is the extension of the BCR from Clinton to Ashcroft, which is very important not only to the BCR but also to the mainline railroads. If they can get this alternate, it's an alternate route other than the Fraser Canyon for the mainline railroads. Again, nothing has been done; not one spike has been driven, and I don't know when it is going to be driven. So, as I say, it's tied into that, and somebody has to go on certain subjects.

I realize that I'm running out of time, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to touch on one of my old favourite subjects for awhile — municipal affairs and property taxation in general.

I assure you that with this budget we have in front

[[Page 512](#)]

of us property taxation is going to advance to the municipal taxpayer a minimum, of 30 per cent this year. It won't advance if the municipal councils take the other option and cut services 30 per cent. Otherwise, because of lack of support by this government this will happen.

Another thing I'd like to mention, which really disturbed me, is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer), as mentioned the other day, is going to take the big provincial club to the municipalities that oppose impost fees. This is the government that was going to look after local government. Now he says he's going to bring in legislation, probably, to nullify impost fees.

The only reason they're there in the first place is to generate revenue, and they have to do this to get revenue because of the lack of fiscal support from this provincial government. It's very disturbing, to say the least.

Before I close, and in view of the fact that some regional district people are here, this government has practically nullified their role. I refer to their main role of zoning and planning. They can't get by the land commissioner; they can't get by the Highways department or somebody. But, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, it's not the Municipal Affairs department where they have the trouble — it's in the Highways department or the Land Commission.

You know, I'm getting fed up with the Highways department, just like all municipal and regional people and all citizens. Their role is to build roads. But do you know, Mr. Speaker, the chief role they're taking today? They are the department in charge of birth control in this province. That's what they are because they don't want anybody to live anywhere near any highway in this province because it might add a Volkswagen, or some little vehicle like that, to their traffic. It's ridiculous!

Our people have to live somewhere. They keep coming in here. It's not our fault that we have an increase in population, either by immigration or locally managed. (Laughter.) The fact is, we have an increased population and they all must live somewhere — and the Highways department says that they can't live.

All I want to say in closing.... I know you're going to love to ring that bell on me, Mr. Speaker. I never voted

for that bell, by the way, when that legislation was put through. I voted against that closure bell — and that's all it is.

Anyway, in closing now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of municipal and regional government in this province: take the highway control away from those people and put it in municipal affairs where it belongs. Then maybe we'll get some highways built where they won't be so concerned with zoning and planning, and that Minister over there will have time to build some roads instead of just singing fancy songs. Thank you.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to take my place in this debate after some very fine and enjoyable speeches from Members of the opposition and the government this afternoon.

This is a very interesting budget and debate. It's a \$3.2 billion-budget — roughly \$1,300 expenditure and taxation for every man, woman and child in this province. There are some very good parts in this budget, and I commend those parts.

But in the debate in this House we're trying among us all to gather a perspective as presented by the government spokesman so far has tended to overlook some of the unfortunate parts of this budget.

Right at the beginning the Premier gave his perspective of British Columbia. I'm suggesting that the government is not being honest with itself in giving this economic perspective; I suggest it's misleading the people of British Columbia and, indeed, misleading their own backbenchers; and painting a picture that's not real.

In the past year we've had inflation of somewhere around 12 per cent. In this past year we've had growth in this province of somewhere around 3.5 per cent. Keep those two figures in mind, Mr. Speaker, as we go through the various figures given by the Premier.

The Premier suggested that growth would be somewhere around 3 per cent in 1974 — that's economic growth I'm speaking of now. If population growth were 3.5 per cent that means we have slipped backwards in economic growth in this province per capita. The Premier suggested that average weekly earnings were up. If you adjust that for inflation, average weekly earnings were down, and that's before the tremendous taxes that this Premier is taking out of the employment earnings of this province.

The Premier suggested that mineral production rose 12.8 per cent in this province last year. That certainly doesn't apply to mines. The production of every mineral in this province, with the single exception of coal, was down in 1974. The Premier didn't mention that.

Capital investment. The Premier made great mention of that — capital investment up 18.5 per cent in the province. He neglected to mention that the material index for construction inputs for non-residential construction was up 23 per cent in the year, and construction wages were up for the year. So I wouldn't be surprised — I don't have the exact figures for this — if capital investment overall, on a real basis, was down. It certainly wasn't up very much.

Now we have some confirmation of these worrisome thoughts. We have a press release by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) who was

[[Page 513](#)]

referring to the amounts of money available for, I believe, it was the pupil/teacher ratio programme; I'm not sure. That press release mentioned that money was scarce because British Columbia is in a recession with rampaging inflation. The Premier didn't mention that in his budget address. He didn't mention the word "recession."

We've had Members of this opposition repeatedly say in this debate that unemployment in this province at the moment exceeds 100,000. The Premier didn't mention that. In January, 9.6 per cent unemployment. That wasn't mentioned.

Mining investment is down in this province. That wasn't mentioned.

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: How much is it down in this province? I'm going to have a few words about Ottawa later, Mr. Member, because this government hasn't been doing its duty in getting what we need out of Ottawa either.

No new mines have started up since 1972, Mr. Speaker. I think you know that from the riding you're in. Claim staking dropped 80 per cent.

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: The Hon. Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly), earlier on in this debate, told us that it doesn't matter that claim staking has dropped because, after all, what good does it do to put a few posts in the ground. Mr. Speaker, if you don't find it, you can't mine it. That's the difference it makes.

Interjections.

MR. GIBSON: Development expenditures on new mines — not on existing mines but on what's called declared mines in the statistics of the annual report of the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) — dropped 98 per cent from 1972. In other words, people are just not doing development work on those many properties in this province that could be brought into production. That's the kind of economic perspective that, if the Premier were trying to paint a factual picture to this House and to the people of British Columbia, he would have mentioned in his address in those ads that he took at our expense all around this province to puff up the budget. He didn't mention those figures, Mr. Speaker.

In the forecast section, the Premier was equally vague. He said: "The pulp and paper sector of the provincial economy will continue to expand." What does he mean: "continue to expand"? I'm quoting now from an official of the Council of Forest Industries, *The Province* of February 28:

"British Columbia, with half of Canada's softwood reserves, has only \$168 million committed to expanding production in the pulp and paper industry in the three-year period up to 1977, as against comparable spending of \$1.35 billion in Quebec and Ontario during the same period."

Sixteen per cent of the Quebec and Ontario expenditures here in British Columbia, and we have an equal amount of softwood. I don't really call that a very satisfactory continued expansion.

The Premier predicted that real growth again would be around 3 per cent in our province for the coming year, and, once again, that is falling behind our population growth of 3.5 per cent. This means that, on the average, with this budget as proposed now, British Columbians are going to be again a little poorer in 1975 than they were in 1974.

Then the Premier moved on to another section, on federal-provincial relations, and he had this to say. He spoke of the grand agreement he made with Ottawa — and I'll get to that agreement later — but he said: "As a result of this agreement, the producers commenced exploration, drilling and development in accordance with their previously-announced expansion plans."

Well now, what are the facts? *Nickle's Daily Oil Bulletin*, March 7: There have been two gas wells in British Columbia so far this year. That compares with six discoveries in January and February, 1974. *Oilweek* of February 17: There were 43 drilling rigs active in B.C. on February 9, 1974. That compares with only 15 drilling rigs active on February 8, 1975, Surely that wasn't the programme of the oil and gas companies — they were going to cut back to about a third of their performance last year. Is the Premier proud of that?

Look at the wells completed up until March 3 or 5 in the *Oil Bulletin* of March 3 or 5, since 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 — 67 wells completed in that period in 1972; 46 in 1973; 130 in 1974; 35 in 1975.

The footage drilled shows the same kind of picture. In 1975 to date, there were 177,000 feet drilled versus

370,000 in 1972. That doesn't seem to gibe with what the Premier had to say. I would say, in short, that the assessment we were given of the British Columbia economy hasn't exactly been a frank one.

The Premier went on from there to speak of various what he called "policy" items in the budget. He said: "We are aggressively seeking to ensure that more of our resources are processed in British Columbia." Mr. Speaker, where is that happening? I invite the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) to take his place in this debate later on and tell us exactly where that is happening. I hope he can give us some cause for cheer, because it is so important in this province that we upgrade our resource products more before we ship them out of this province.

[[Page 514](#)]

The Premier later on in the policy section says that steps have been taken to increase the supply of housing. That is a cruel joke, Mr. Speaker, when the number of new houses being built in this province each year has been going down for the last two years and is continuing to go down in 1975.

The Minister says: "This job security budget provides for further relief from school taxes." That is another cruel joke.

HON. MR. COCKE: Oh, come on.

MR. GIBSON: Forty dollars per home. The average increase in school taxes on homes in my riding is going to run from \$120 to \$140. Forty dollars doesn't begin to keep up with it.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: What is the average worth of a home in your riding?

MR. GIBSON: You'll see by a GVRD report, Mr. Minister, that it is not that much above the Greater Victoria average.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: What is the average home worth?

MR. GIBSON: I'll find that figure and send it across to you. Forty dollars doesn't begin to keep pace.

We have this statement: "Housing continues to be a high priority." How can we tell that housing continues to be a high priority? It is very easy to tell, Mr. Speaker. We can tell because 1974 housing starts were down by 8,000 from 1973; 1975 starts look like they are going to be even further down. We can tell because there is a vacancy rate of 0.4 per cent in rental accommodation in this province. We can tell because home prices in 1974 rose by 41 per cent over 1973. That is how we can tell that there is a priority on housing in this province. And what happens? The budget of the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) is up by 29 per cent compared to the overall 48 per cent. That is some priority, Mr. Speaker.

Listen to what the CMHC in their review of 1974 housing has to say: "The units under construction in the province at the end of the year, at 22,861, was relatively low." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, for the Greater Vancouver Regional District it was down 18 per cent. That is what has happened with the priority of housing in this province.

We move, on to another section, where the Premier says: "Provincial-municipal matters have a high priority in this budget." A high priority. You can tell that that has a high priority too: not one cent increase in the per capita grant, Mr. Speaker, which is such an important part in the municipal budget; pie-in-the-sky on supposed natural gas revenues; no tie of municipal revenues to general provincial revenues although they are faced with the same kind of cost escalation; taxes up an average of 25 to 30 per cent around this province. Who pays those taxes on property? The people. The average homeowner. That is who pays it. That is the priority that has been given to provincial-municipal matters.

We heard a great deal during this speech about this budget being a job-security budget. One of the great items for job security was the \$15 million which the Premier has allocated for a special employment programme in the forest industry. I want to put that little bit in perspective. There are 15,000 men out of work in the forest industry at

the moment. You can keep a man employed in the forest industry for maybe \$1,000 a month. I think that is a little low when you consider expenses and equipment costs in addition to wage costs, but let us say it is \$1,000. This government, in its munificence, has presented the unemployed in the forest industry with one month's worth of work for each person unemployed. What a marvelous special employment programme, Mr. Speaker! One month! One month for 15,000 people out of work!

We have heard a great deal from NDP backbenchers during this debate about how this government really knows how to create jobs in this province. The single word that has been used in speech after speech is "Can-Cel." What a wonderful thing Can-Cel has been! The jobs would all have been gone, according to the government, if it hadn't been for this little government over there.

HON. MR. COCKE: Right on! Now what have you got to say?

MR. GIBSON: Does the government honestly believe that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes!

MR. GIBSON: Then I don't think that the government can understand things very well.

Listen to these pulp prices. For the first quarter of 1973, Mr. Minister, pulp was selling at \$162 a ton. That's about the time the government made an offer for Can-Cel — \$162 a ton. Then: second quarter, up to \$175 a ton; third quarter, \$190; fourth, \$265; \$295, second quarter; \$325, third quarter; \$355, fourth quarter. It's now up around \$370 a ton.

HON. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services): How come they sold? Why did they sell?

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, do the Members of this government mean to say that at those pulp prices people wouldn't be working at Can-Cel? That's

[[Page 515](#)]

absolute nonsense, absolute rubbish! As a matter of fact, if you want to talk about jobs, the jobs that this government should be worrying about are the jobs that haven't been created in this province — the jobs that haven't been created because mines haven't opened, and the jobs that haven't been created because new pulp mills haven't been built, when there are at least eight locations in this province where there's room for a new pulp mill on a sustained-yield basis and when around this world there are 12 newsprint machines under installation and not one in the Province of British Columbia when we have half the softwood in this country.

HON. MR. COCKE: Quote the price of copper like you did the price of pulp.

MR. GIBSON: I'll quote the price of copper when I get onto the mining section, Mr. Minister. I just wanted to make the point that Can-Cel did very well from pulp prices and they have a product mix which gave them about 80 per cent pulp, as opposed to many of the other forest firms. I want to see the government be as quick to take the credit for the financial results when the prices go down.

This budget basically, when they call it a job-security budget, reflects the belief that sloshing money around generally makes jobs in British Columbia. What makes jobs in British Columbia is investment in productive enterprise in this province. Just sloshing money around makes jobs in central Canada and in the United States, because we import so much of our needs. The expenditures go right back down there and they don't create jobs here in British Columbia. It's that investment here in British Columbia that has to get that priority.

Let's move on to the tax changes, Mr. Speaker. Two cents a gallon on gasoline is a good idea. We're supposed to encourage people to shift from private motorcar to rapid transit. That's a good idea, but what's this going to generate? There are various estimates — about as close I can get is perhaps \$20 million that two cents will generate.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: He said \$60 million.

MR. GIBSON: I know he said \$60 million, but that's my best guess, Mr. Minister. My best guess is \$20 million. That won't even balance the ICBC subsidy. I wish the Minister would stand up and tell us what's going to be needed to subsidize ICBC this year. It's going to be a lot more than \$20 million.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Under the law you know I must submit a report.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member address the Chair, please?

MR. GIBSON: It's a very interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, that as the Premier went through this budget with a great deal of pride, and the Crown corporations, he didn't give us a single financial figure on ICBC — not a single one. He was able to give us nine months' results on Hydro; he wasn't able to give us nine months' results on ICBC. So I'm suggesting that there's going to continue to be an incentive, through the subsidies of this government, for people to drive the private motorcar in this province.

There was a mining tax change, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what the effect of that mining tax change was? When companies are in the super-royalty range now, before the effect of that mining tax change on each additional dollar of income, they were to pay in 104.5 cents in taxes. After the effects of the Premier's mining tax change, they only have to pay on each dollar 99.5 cents taxes. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that that's a change that's going to do a great deal for the industry in this province and the jobs that should come out of that industry.

Now, what are some of the positive things that should have been done in this budget? On our energy side, on our oil and gas resources side, we should have a start to further refining and petrochemical industry facilities in this province, and for that you have to have supply. On the gas side, we can't even meet our commitments to our American customers. We had the head of the B.C. Petroleum Corp. say the other day that he didn't see a petrochemical industry for some time off because of our gas supply problem. So what's needed there is drilling incentives to at least equalize the opportunity of drilling in B.C. with the opportunity of drilling in Alberta.

On the oil side there was an opportunity for much greater imagination. This province should have invested in the Syncrude deal, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. COCKE: Oh, brother — along with the rest of them!

MR. GIBSON: I'm interested to hear the reaction from across the floor, Mr. Speaker, because the NDP has been wringing its hands saying: "My goodness, the thing isn't public-controlled. Isn't that awful?" If this province had invested in Syncrude it could have been publicly controlled. If we put in the same share as Alberta (which we have the money to do), if we'd encouraged Ontario to double their share from 5 per cent to 10 per cent, if we encouraged Saskatchewan to go in for 5 per cent, that would have been majority public control right there, Mr. Speaker, and the New Democratic Party wouldn't have had to worry anywhere in this country about the big, bad oil barons profiteering out of Syncrude.

What else would it have done? It would have given British Columbia a secure supply of oil. If we really want to build up our petrochemical industry and our

[[Page 516](#)]

refineries, it would have given us a supply of oil overland instead of the tanker routes that the Premier is so concerned about.

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: That would have been a good thing to do instead of wringing your hands. Of course, governments have to develop and encourage the development of the oil sands in this country, and do it now. There are 300 billion barrels of oil locked up in there. That's a resource worth to the people of this nation, at present prices, \$3 trillion. This is a government that's made up of big businessmen who understand money, so they say. Where were they on that one? That was a great opportunity they let go by.

Something that was gravely missing in this budget was a mention of Indian affairs. There was no enlargement of the First Citizens' Fund. But much more importantly, that fund was not transferred to the management of the Indian people. That is something this government should go ahead and do right now.

There was no mention of major housing measures. The main problem with housing in this province is that the municipalities are dragging their feet, and they are dragging their feet because growth costs them money. It is a simple thing for this government, with its enormous resources, to share a little bit of that with the municipalities and make it profitable for municipalities to expand, to accept new people, so that city councils can gather together and say: "Here is a subdivision which will put in another 100 houses. We will get this much from the provincial government per building permit we issue, and that will make it profitable for us to put in the necessary services and not increase the load on the citizens already in our community." That is the biggest single step this government should have taken to encourage housing in this province.

I have said before that they should have taken the rent control off as well in three years and, as a part of that package, negotiated limited-dividend rental contracts with developers to get a lot of rental housing on the market now — when it's just not happening.

There should be tax measures in this province to encourage housing over the kind of luxurious office space that's going up around this province, Mr. Speaker, subsidized at a 50 per cent tax rate by the taxpayers of this province. There is an encouragement for the investing of money in plush offices that ought to go into residential accommodation. If we had our own corporation tax, as we should have, we could put exactly those kinds of incentives to the corporations of this province and divert some of that money into housing where it could be much more wisely used.

On another subject, we need a clear statement of forest policy to encourage long-run investment in this province; and in the short run we do not need just that \$15 million special employment programme. We need something more like \$60 million, which could be productively employed in the building of extra roads in advance of need and in reforestation of something like 10 million acres of non-sufficiently-restocked land.

We need an end to mining royalties in this province and Ministerial discretion in the mining field, to be replaced with a profits-tax system, a supertax on windfalls over the increase in mining costs, a government share of the loss on the down side if you are going to take that supertax, plus an exploration cost-sharing to get exploration going again in this province. I commend that to you, Mr. Minister: an exploration cost-sharing between the government and private explorers, to be paid back, Mr. Minister, out of profits with interest. But we would get the exploration going.

HON. MR. NIMSICK: You get 100 per cent deduction on exploration now.

MR. GIBSON: They'd pay it back, Mr. Minister. That's the point. The exploration isn't happening now.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You don't know what you're talking about.

MR. GIBSON: This isn't a risk for governments. This is a big province with a lot of mineral claims in it. The government on the average is going to do very well on financing exploration. We are going to get back much more than we put out. And, remember, that's part of our basic bread and butter, Mr. Minister.

I want to say something about British Columbia resource revenues and the sharing of these with the national government, because I very much fear that our Premier, in his negotiations with Ottawa, has sold out British Columbia's negotiating position. British Columbia is the only province in this country which, through our Premier, has admitted the proposition that the federal government has a right to take tax revenue from a provincial Crown corporation.

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

MR. GIBSON: That's perfectly true. He sold out our bargaining position. What the federal government

wanted to do was to take the money from the private companies. The Premier said: "Oh, no, we can't do that; the private companies would launder and shrink that revenue." It's a lovely phrase, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't mean anything because we would know

[[Page 517](#)]

exactly how much went in and exactly how much would come out, and it would just be a pass-through. Instead, what the Premier decided to do was to have the B.C. Petroleum Corp. remit money to Ottawa.

This was a great victory for British Columbia, as the Premier described it. That was some victory. That was a sell-out of the negotiation position of this province and of the west, I should say, in terms of resources.

What do we see Alberta trying to do now? Alberta is instructing their oil-producing companies not even to report to Ottawa the amount of royalty paid to the Province of Alberta. They say it's none of Ottawa's business. They say: "We own that oil. It's in the ground. You as companies simply take it out. You act as our agents. You give a share of that oil to us. That's none of Ottawa's business. Ottawa can tax you on what you take out and keep, and the rest is ours. You're just acting as our agents." This is the position taken by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, which is similar to our B.C. Petroleum Corporation.

Here's an officer of that commission. Dr. Minnion said: "Under no circumstances could the marketing commission become liable for royalty payments to the federal government." That's the Alberta position, Mr. Speaker. We've given that position away already — given that away.

He talks about private producers — what do they believe? They believe that Premier Peter Lougheed wants to use the commission and its moves on the sale of oil and payment transactions as weapons at the First Ministers' energy meeting in April. We don't have that weapon any more, Mr. Speaker; we've given it away. Our Premier gave it away when he was down in Ottawa. We needed that negotiating weapon because, while I believe that in the long run it's fair that our resources should be shared with other Canadians, in the short run there's a battle to be fought, and that's one of our big negotiating weapons.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair.]

The federal thinking is okay in principle if the deal is fair all around. Until then we should keep that negotiating weapon we've given away. It's not fair all around right now, Mr. Speaker. Fair all around means such things as federal payment of the subsidy to the British Columbia Railway that they pay to all the other railroads in this country and that's been delayed for years and years and denied. It means federal payments of the subsidies to the B.C. Ferries that have been denied to us — millions and millions of dollars. It means generally a fair share of federal expenditures in British Columbia. Right now I think that only 4.5 per cent of federal procurement is done in British Columbia.

It means such things as a genuine Canada Development Corp. head office in this province instead of that phony token they've got down there at the end of Granville Street.

It means such things as the Senate of Canada composition being changed to reflect the legitimate aspirations and place in this country of the west. It means a lot more western senators, and it means that senators should have a lot more influence on what goes on in this country in regional terms. It means, among other things, that we should have distinguished provincial representatives of all parties in the Senate who could argue the provincial position there. That's what part of a fair provincial deal in this province means.

It means port development. It means a fair share of federal jobs. But, above all, it means tariff policy. British Columbia in this country is a tremendous net loser on this business of tariffs.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): Why don't they change it?

MR. GIBSON: I'm saying that we should change it, Mr. Minister of Highways. I'm saying that we've got to

use western power to get a change; and we've given half that western power away with this natural gas situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GIBSON: Tariff policy: what does it mean to this province? Customs and excise receipts in this country, I think, are in the neighbourhood of a couple of billion dollars a year. British Columbia pays at least 10 per cent of that, and I'd say more — I'd say it's more like 15 per cent because of the particular composition of things we buy and where we buy them from. If that's the case, we're paying \$300 million in this province and maybe more for the privilege....

HON. MR. LAUK: More.

MR. GIBSON: I agree with you, Mr. Minister, it's more — I wish I had the figures — for the privilege of living under the Canadian tariff policy.

And what good does that Canadian tariff policy do to the citizens of British Columbia? It allows us to have the highest cost of living in this country; that's, what it allows us to have. All we ask is fair treatment. If we're going to pay high prices for our goods to protect the central Canada manufacturers, is it fair on the other hand that we should be asked to provide our resources to the rest of Canada at a low price? Is that equitable? Not for a moment.

We have to get the facts on what's going on financially in this Confederation and how British Columbia stands. We should have, Mr. Minister of

[[Page 518](#)]

Economic Development, a commission of inquiry into the financial position of British Columbia in Confederation. How do we stand? What does it cost us? British Columbians are fair and generous people. I suggest that we don't really mind, if we can raise the standard of living of people in the Maritimes, if it costs us a little bit of money. But let's know what it is, and let's make sure that the deal all around is fair and not one that's going to cut our productivity, because then we can't help those other parts of Canada as much.

So I say: No. I don't give away that principle, that all the resource revenue accrues to the province. Point No. 1, and that's been given away.

Point No. 2, make internal arrangements, as Alberta has done, to keep the resource industries in each province healthy. You don't have to make a deal with the federal government for that, the way the Premier did with the B.C. Petroleum Corp.

Next, work with other western governments, because the other three western provinces share a lot of our problems in this resource revenue field. Indeed, some of the eastern governments do too.

Then, next, we have to develop the arguments and facts that we need to make our case on a sound, rational basis. You have to pound the table a little bit to win these kinds of arguments, but you have to have your facts behind you too, and we don't have them yet. This government should develop them.

HON. MR. LAUK: Wait until I give my speech.

MR. GIBSON: I'm looking forward to it, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. LAUK: I was going to provide slides, but they're not ready.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, because of a relative weakness of this province, and, indeed, this whole end of the country since Confederation, and because, I would suggest, of not really very forceful or helpful federal-provincial relations for the last generation, British Columbia has had the short end of Confederation, It is time for that to end. We want to be good Canadians in this province, as good Canadians as anywhere in this country.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver–Little Mountain): Send a copy to Trudeau.

MR. GIBSON: But, in return for that, we want our fair share of our productivity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): I am indeed pleased to take my place in this debate. To start off with, I would like to say that I am certainly going to support the budget. I think it is a good budget. It's a budget for people. It's a budget that is not for corporations. The corporations will be treated fairly, but they are not going to get the preferential treatment that the Members at the other end of the House are screaming for. I think people are now starting to realize that they have a place in the sun and that this government is here to represent them.

I would just like to touch on a few of the things in the budget that I feel relate to people and the benefits that the people will derive.

Before I start, I would just like to say that it is surprising to me to witness the opposition down there who have been screaming and hollering about the costs of education, saying that the Minister (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) was short-changed, that education wasn't getting its fair treatment. All of a sudden, they had to change their tactics. They had to change to housing and municipal affairs. I think that they went out into the ridings and got the reading from the people out there and realized that they felt adequate money was being spent on education, that the Minister was doing a first-class job with it, and now they find it is not popular as a cat to kick around their ridings.

MR. CHABOT: They don't say that, and you know it.

MR. LEWIS: There was \$712 million spent on health in this budget, up \$139 million from a revised 24.3 per cent increase over the revised budget for last year. Out of that budget, there was \$11 million for ambulance care. The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) has left now. He said that there should have been a reduction in income tax and we should have cut back on the spending. I would submit that if he wants to cut back on ambulance care, he does it in his own riding, not in mine, because the people in my riding are happy with ambulance care.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LAUK: Right on.

MR. LEWIS: Human Resources. You know, one Member stood up in this House the other day and tried to indicate that \$ 5 16 million was being spent on welfare. He was totally misleading this House. The number of projects that are there for Mincome, Pharmacare, for the mentally retarded, and all the other good programmes, he tried to lump into welfare to try to make it look as though this government was wasting money.

HON. MR. LAUK: Shame. Twisting words.

MR. LEWIS: In housing, we have \$90 million in

[[Page 519](#)]

the Housing budget. That party down there has been doing everything it can to try to degrade the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson), not just the Social Credit Party but the Liberals as well. That Minister is doing a good job. He's a new Minister in his department. He's trying to get housing for senior citizens and people who need it, and that party down there is the kind of people who would try to delay this type of project from coming through.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: That's complete nonsense.

MR. LEWIS: It's not complete nonsense. You know it's true. If you had to go out....

HON. MR. LAUK: You hit a sore spot, Don. Keep going.

MR. LEWIS: Agriculture is up 130 per cent from last year. That's the revised budget. It's about 300 per cent from last year's budget. That Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) is doing a first-class job in trying to assist as

many components of agriculture as he can. The process is slow, but it has been extended to dairying, tree fruits, the hog farmers, and I understand it is also going to some of the vegetable growing areas.

Sure, there are problems in beef. When agriculture is up I'm going to be speaking on the problems in beef because they are very severe, but I believe that this Minister has shown that he is willing to try to resolve some of these problems.

Recreation and Conservation. Another area where there has been a dramatic increase — 42 per cent. This is an area where I think everybody here realizes the money is being well spent.

A lot of money is being spent for park acquisition, parklands that were let go by the previous government into private hands, ideally situated along lakes, rivers, beaches along the ocean — some of the best land we had for recreation. But they didn't conserve that land; they sold it.

The Department of Lands, Forests and Water Resources had an increase of 40 per cent in its budget. I am telling you that it was long needed for the replanting of trees in this province. A considerable amount of that budget is going toward new trees in the province. Through neglect over a number of years, the programme even now isn't sufficient with the money that Minister (Hon. R.A. Williams) will have. It should be double or triple that. But at least we are making a move, and a significant move, in that area.

The Department of Transport and Communications is increased 49 per cent. That is an area that was totally neglected in the past. It is a sign that the government is concerned about things such as the telephone service and other services we have under Communications.

Consumer Services. I don't believe there is any Member down there in that end of the House who would do away with the Consumer Services department that this government has brought forward. I am very pleased to say that I am very impressed with the Minister (Hon. Ms. Young). She is doing a very fine job in this area.

Highways: \$275 million, a 41 per cent increase. I would like the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) to stand up in this House and say: "Mr. Minister, I don't want my share. We will cut back on the budget. Give it to Shuswap." Shuswap can use it.

MR. CHABOT: I thought everything was good up in Shuswap.

MR. LEWIS: Everything is good, but we are making it better — much better.

The type of thing that the opposition and the press (I'm not going to leave the press out of it) can come up with is amazing. The opposition can stand up in this House and ask a question that has no foundation to it whatsoever. The press will cover that question. On the next day, or maybe the second day after that, there is a retraction. It is that big on the last page. If that is fair treatment by the press, I don't agree with it.

The past government down there feels that all they have to do is run around the province saying anything they wish and the people will believe them. Well, people are much smarter than that. They think twice before they believe politicians.

I would just like to give you an example of the type of thing that was being said in this province a little over a year ago. "Socialist Hordes Must Go. Join the Holy Crusade Against Socialists, Bennett Urges." That name rings a bell because his son has taken over since.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: What year was that?

MR. LEWIS: They had people convinced that that was a holy government that could do no wrong. Many of my friends, when they used to go past Kelowna, used to look out on the lake, expecting to see one of the Bennetts walking across it. But they had lead shoes.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I like to get up early in the morning. I only walk before

5 a.m.

MR. LEWIS: I would just like to read you some of the things they said around this province, trying to smear this government and trying to make the people believe that we were terrible animals.

We'll start out with Mr. Campbell — I think most

[[Page 520](#)]

of us know who he is. This is my own home town of Salmon Arm. He almost convinced some of the people up there he was telling the truth. "Campbell launched his attack on Bill 42, the Land Commission Act, saying it was not necessary as a means of preserving farmland...." I would like him to go there and say that today and see what kind of reception he gets "...but only a first step towards socialist takeover through destruction of the right of ownership." Has anybody lost his farm? Has anybody lost his property? He can't even name a Social Creditor who lost his property.

"The New Democratic Party is destroying fundamental freedom and the sense of security,' he said. 'It is part of the move away from local control and individual choice. These are to be replaced by total, centralized state control.'"

We hear this in the House just about every day, but I dare them to show us where it is. There has been more moving away from centralized control with this government than there ever was in the 20 years prior. He says: "Contracts are useless. Titles to homes are not sacred any more. They are just scraps of paper." That is the type of thing they expect the people to believe out there.

"Campbell outlined what he termed 'dangerous trends in B.C. today.' First, I he said, there are under-the-table dealings. 'Under Social Credit,' he said, 'all the books were open and everything was open and above the board.'"

Can you believe that? Did you ever try to get a look at those books?

MR. BENNETT: Which board? The Egg Marketing Board?

MR. LEWIS: "'But the NDP government,' he said, 'is dealing in secrecy, giving contracts to their friends without allowing anyone else to have the opportunity to bid.'" Outright lies! But they feel that they can go around the province and make these kinds of statements and that the people are gullible enough to swallow it. I will tell you that the people are a lot smarter than that.

Then we will carry on to our dear friend, Gracie. "'No freedom,' says McCarthy."

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are you, Charlie?

MR. LEWIS: She says: "The NDP legislation since August has shocked the nation, shocked the world and shocked the people of British Columbia." Legislation such as Mincome, Pharmacare, such as the right for the opposition to have a member as chairman of the public accounts committee, such as *Hansard*, such as question period in this House — really shocking! That is the kind of freedom that I would like to lose, my friend.

MR. CHABOT: How about an answer?

MR. LEWIS: She goes on with regard to the elderly:

"The elderly were fooled into thinking they'd get higher pensions, but are actually worse off than they were under the Social Credit. If Social Credit had been re-elected, pensioners would be getting at least \$50 a month more."

Can you believe that just once, before we were elected, they overruled their own Speaker? They overruled their own Speaker when he said that the motion to pay \$200 a month was properly on the books to be debated. They overruled him, and now they have enough nerve to say they would be receiving better benefits.

Oh, and then we have a heading: "Secret Police." Have you heard about those?

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): They haven't caught up with me yet.

MR. LEWIS: Every night I go out to walk around Victoria, and I can't even find a policeman who is not secret.

MR. WALLACE: We haven't got enough of the open kind, never mind the secret kind.

MR. LEWIS: "Under the Act," he said, "the government got the power to establish a secret police that could just march in anywhere it wishes. There's never been such a thing in this free western world." Terrible, terrible, terrible.

Then there are quite a few statements by Big Daddy, but I'm not going to read them all.

Anyway, one of Mr. Bennett's statements was: "Bennett told his audience that it's not necessary to tell those things to people from Europe." He's talking about communism. Communism! Can you imagine me being a communist? (Laughter.) My party is trying to tell me that Gary Lauk and I are Conservatives. You know that?

MR. WALLACE: Come on over. Come on over.

MR. LEWIS: One of those farmers had had his land sold to "save the dangerous socialists moving in on my 196 acres." Terrible! He says it's not necessary to tell those people who came from Europe, who have seen socialists take over power and know that what is happening here is following the classic pattern. First, he said, they destroy ownership and seize control of the land.

[[Page 521](#)]

Next comes education, like abolishing the strap. Terrible socialist thing — abolishing the strap. I never heard of that being called socialism before.

That's the type of thing that's going around this province, the type of thing that's not true. They are outright lies. It's libelous, and yet it's being said about a nice bunch in this House (laughter.) That's terrible.

HON. MR. BENNETT: That's two years old.

MR. LEWIS: No, that's only a year and a half old. But that same type of thing is being said today. Grace McCarthy is still packing her six-guns on her hip around this province.

HON. MR. LEA: Just point her in the right direction.

MR. LEWIS: I'd like to move on now, and I'd like to speak about a few things that I feel are of concern to me in my riding and throughout the province.

You know, the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) spoke in the House the other day. He expressed his concern about the new speed limit he instituted and the fact that a percentage of the people are not obeying the law. I have the utmost respect for the Minister, and I think that he's read the situation correctly. I drive back and forth to my riding often and I see more infractions on the road, more people's lives nearly lost... I support the Minister of Highways in saying that something has to be done on our highways, and soon, to see that people have the right to drive on that highway and are safe in doing so. I commend him on his action in bringing in the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit.

I have to say that it's being abused in many areas of the province, and some of the biggest abusers of the highway speed limit are commercial vehicles. Often when I'm driving down from my riding — staying to the 55-mile-an-hour limit, which I try to do most of the time — I'll have freight trucks passing me. Sometimes the conditions are a light blowing snow. When that freight truck passes you — you're doing the legal speed limit of 55

— you're absolutely blind for a matter of seconds when you can't see a thing. One night, coming down last winter from my riding, I thought I'd count how many times a truck passed me from Cache Creek to Hope — and going the legal speed limit. I had one truck pass me five different times. I'd catch up to him on a hill when he slowed down and I'd pass that truck. In a few miles — I was still doing the legal speed limit — that driver would be out and passing me, often where it was very unsafe and putting many people's lives in danger. That happened with three cars along that trip.

There were many trucks that passed me that night three times. I think that this is very, very dangerous, and I don't think that the enforcement for commercial vehicles is adequate — the enforcement for all vehicles, really. But I think that often officers turn a blind eye to commercial vehicles, feeling that they're more adequate drivers, that they know the road and that they're not going to cause any harm.

You know, I had complaints, even filed with myself, about a commercial transport truck getting up close to a car at night in the dark and following that car at the legal limit for several miles blinking its lights. When that driver wouldn't pull over onto the shoulder of the road, the truck driver then turned off his lights and followed in the dark. This is the type of thing those drivers are doing out there. Many of those drivers are excellent drivers and have respect for other people on the road, but there's a percentage of them that are really abusing our highways. I would hope that the Minister of Highways, the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald)....

AN HON. MEMBER: You're against his union.

MR. LEWIS: I'm not against anybody, but I think that everybody has a right to that highway, my friend. I would like to see these Ministers and the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) get together and see what can be done in regard to the adequate number of men on the road and the best possible equipment on those cars. A lot of people say policemen shouldn't be in a position that they can take off the red dome on their cars so people can't tell they're policemen. I say that those policemen are out there doing a job for the public, and if it's necessary for them to be out there in ghost cars, then there should be far more of them. You know, the type of thing that's happening on the highways right now is people playing with cars. I think this is very, very dangerous.

A real indication of what can happen happened in my riding last summer when three vehicles were proceeding up the highway abreast of one another, taking up that total highway, came over the edge of a hill and met a camper truck coming the other way. The occupants in that camper truck were killed, and one of the drivers was killed. Two innocent people who weren't playing the game were killed. I think we have to have far stricter enforcement and a more severe penalty for this type of crime. I say it's a crime. It's not an accident. That's a crime, when you get three people out there abreast on a public highway going against the traffic. The penalty that was dished out was three months in jail, and the loss of the right to drive a car for two years. I say they shouldn't have driven a car for 10 years.

There are people on that highway who have a right to protection, and I'm looking forward to the Ministers doing everything they can to see that tire law is enforced on the highways and that people feel

[[Page 522](#)]

safe out there. I know that they've moved a long way in this direction, and the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) is concerned about the lack of police officers and is trying to correct it, but we need much more in the line of enforcement on the highways.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to move on to a little different topic, and it doesn't entail expenditure of money. The Member for Comox (Ms. Sanford) spoke the other day in regard to foreign ownership of land, and said that she hoped the Prince Edward Island case was successful and that they won the case that the federal government is appealing. That's in regard to them having some control over foreign ownership in their province. Mr. Speaker, this is one thing that's really of concern to me: through the ranching community in the interior, and also on recreational properties in the interior, we see large numbers of people coming in and purchasing land. They're not willing to come here and live. They're buying it as an investment, but they still reside outside the province.

MR. GIBSON: It's a shame.

MR. LEWIS: It is a shame, and I think that it's time the federal government took some steps to see that there is adequate legislation to protect Canadians.

MR. GIBSON: We should do it ourselves, Don.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, and then the federal government would challenge us, and you'll stand up in the House and say they're right.

MR. GIBSON: Take them to court. (Laughter.)

MR. LEWIS: Anyway, it's not a one-way street, as we found out when we had a meeting with Washington legislators last fall. We found out that they're very unhappy with us, with people from here going down across the border, buying their prime land. Once the land bill came in here, there were developers who saw they could still go across the border and buy that nice flat farmland down there, and subdivide it. They're just as unhappy with the type of thing that's happening as we are. I think that when the decision is made in the courts with regard to Prince Edward Island, and if it's favourable, I would hope that this government moves very fast in regard to similar legislation, or tougher legislation, to protect British Columbians — to see that they don't become serfs in their own country.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Hear, hear!

MR. LEWIS: I don't mean just British Columbians, but Canadians, because it's happening all across Canada. You know, when we talk about domination, it isn't just tied to the land, but I think the land is one of the most severe because it's one of our most basic commodities. If foreigners get the control of our land, I believe we've lost everything.

It goes into other areas too, you know. It's into foreign ownership in regard to industry and foreign ownership in regard to marketing in the province. I'd just like to give you an idea of the type of thing that's happened in Canada and the amount of ownership that is held by non-Canadians.

You can go into the petroleum and coal industry, and it's owned 91 per cent by people from outside Canada; the automobile industry, 97 per cent; the aircraft industry, 92 per cent; rubber products, 93 per cent; computer industry, 93 per cent; tobacco products, 90 per cent; transportation equipment, 83 per cent; mineral fuels, 81 per cent...

MR. SMITH: What are you quoting from?

MR. LEWIS: ...chemicals and chemical products, 79 per cent. It doesn't matter, my friend, what I'm quoting from, but you'd better listen if you want to remain a Canadian and have some say in this country.

MR. SMITH: Where are your statistics from?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Sock it to them!

MR. LEWIS: Machinery industry, 76 per cent. You know, there's two-way trade between Canada and the United States, but most of that trade takes place between subsidiaries and parent companies. The parent companies ship into Canada, but they ship to subsidiaries; subsidiaries ship into the United States, but they ship to parent companies. They're in a position where they can work the profit picture for their best deduction of income tax. I think it's disgraceful. You know, 73 per cent of our exports from Canada go to parent companies — 73 per cent! I think the B.C. Telephone Company is a prime example of that. They sell to their own company here at one price and sell on the world market at another. And 76 per cent of the import is from parent companies.

Here are companies that are 100 per cent owned outside of Canada where no Canadian can even buy shares in that company; they do not even have the right to buy a share in Canada. Some of these companies make some major decisions in regard to marketing of different products throughout this country and across this province.

Interjection.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, you've got it right at the top. General Motors is No. 1, then Chrysler, IBM,

[[Page 523](#)]

International Harvester, General Foods and Continental Can. These are all 100 per cent owned by non-Canadians.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are you against Chrysler?

MR. LEWIS: I am against Chrysler if there isn't the right for us to buy into that company. A classic example of that is in regard to our trade with other countries in regard to a decision that was almost roadblocked to Cuba a while ago, where a parent company in the United States says: "You shall not sell to that country." I say that is total interference in our rights.

Interjection.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, furniture. They were afraid that Cuba would take one of those chairs and shoot us. (Laughter.) Dow Chemical, Firestone, RCA, Standard Brands, Lever Bros., American Motors, Proctor and Gamble, Coca Cola, Sun Oil, Chevron Canada, Mobil Oil, F.W. Woolworth, Kodak...and here's old Safeway. You know, Safeway makes many decisions in this province that affect consumers and farmers, often detrimentally. I can go to the time when Canada Safeway wouldn't buy British Columbia lettuce when it was on the market.

MR. CHABOT: When was that?

MR. LEWIS: About two or three years ago. They were in a position to tell Safeway here in Canada that they must buy their lettuce from California. I think it's disgraceful when a company that affects the livelihood of farmers and businesses in this country can make that type of decision.

In Canada we have more non-resident owners than all of these countries put together: United States, Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Italy and Japan. Now, we are real Canadians; we've really looked after our interests in the past. But I'll tell you this government is going to look after them in the future. If our Liberal friends down here will have a few words with their friends in Ottawa...

HON. MR. BARRETT: They're not friends.

MR. LEWIS: ...and request some changes there, at least until we can become elected federally, I would sure appreciate it.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Those federal Liberals will scuttle you in five minutes.

MR. LEWIS: No, there are some good Liberals.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Where are they?

MR. LEWIS: I haven't found them but I have heard about them. (Laughter.)

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): The dead ones.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, there are other areas that concern me in regard to our resources, such as what happens to our watercourses in the province. That's not just the inland lakes but the watercourses around the shoreline on the coast here, too. This government has made some progressive steps in regard to seeing that the forest industry cleaned up some of their acts and has moved a long way, but there is a long way to go yet. I speak in particular to the fresh watercourses and the problems we face with the number of boats, the number of people who build around those lakes, and the abuses that take place by industry and by farmers.

I would like to say at this time that I was very pleased last week when the Hon. Jack Radford (Minister of Recreation and Conservation) said that the first pumpout station for boats would be built on Shuswap Lake. That is a very progressive step, but there are many, many more to be taken before we are assured that our water systems will stay clean. The number of boats that are on Shuswap Lake at times almost make up a small village or town, and some of the practices by some of these boats are terrible. The people around that lake — the people in Kamloops and Chase — draw their water from that river system, so I think it is very important that we keep those lakes and those river systems clean and that we do everything we can to see that we leave this country in as good a shape as we found it, and improved from when the Social Credit was in power.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's those chicken farms on the hills.

MR. LEWIS: There's that Member down there picking on me again, Mr. Speaker — it's not fair! He reminds me of a watchdog I bought. I thought I had made a real good deal — he was a great big husky dog; he barked like everything. But when I got him home I found out he had no teeth. (Laughter.) It was a terrible investment.

MR. CHABOT: How about your rooster?

MR. LEWIS: There are many other problems within my riding and I feel they need more attention. I believe they are gradually getting the attention they deserve, but I am looking forward to many good things to happen in the future. There are a few areas where I feel Shuswap has been neglected. When I stand up in caucus everyone says: "Oh, not again."

I would like to say to the Minister of Housing

[[Page 524](#)]

(Hon. Mr. Nicolson) that Shuswap is in B.C. (Laughter.) I say that the Minister of Housing has done an excellent job and that he can't build houses in all of B.C. at the same time, but I just hope that Shuswap has moved up the list a little bit.

MR. PHILLIPS: He wants some henhouses up there.

MR. LEWIS: You know, the opposition stand up in this House and almost curse us. They don't curse us, but they call us everything under the sun. But I look in the neighbouring ridings and see all the good things happening. Now, in fact, I think we're being too good to the opposition, and they're giving me the shaft.

Mr. Speaker, there are other areas of concern. One of the areas I'm still not very pleased with is in marketing of products in B.C. I'm hopeful now, with the superboard and the board now being named, that we'll see some improvement in this area. But it's still of great concern to me.

I'd like to say just a few things in agriculture while I'm up — and seeing that a Liberal wants to say something here. It's in regard to the beef industry. The beef industry is in real difficulty. I think that every one of us had better seriously look at how bad these problems are. I know that a lot of people say: "Oh, they're capitalists; they've got large tracts of land." But the thing is that they're producing beef now at a loss, and they can't do it for very long. They're taking a real loss at the present time.

I would just hope that we are able to come up with some programme that will assist the beef men. The beef people are some of the most independent in this province and have said that they want nothing to do with the socialists. But they need some sort of assistance to keep the beef industry in some sort of workable shape. Like the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly), I think that everyone in this House should stop and take a look at what's happening to that industry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Levi moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Presenting petitions.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce a petition in keeping with article 73(2) of the rules of the House. I just wish to state that this is a petition signed by two groups of people, taxpayers in Oak Bay and parents in the greater Victoria area, outlining the fact that taxes have been paid for the education which is not being provided. The petition includes the following prayer:

"That your Hon. House may be pleased to develop a temporary alternative mode of providing educational services to the school children of School District 61. "

Hon. Mr. Strachan files an answer to question 60. (See appendix.)

MR. SPEAKER: I have something I wish to bring up at this time. I promised the Hon. Member for Victoria that I'd look at the question he raised on March 4 in regard to what he alleged to be a breach of privilege of the Members of the House. In that he was citing the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) as having misled the House — and I'm quoting from his own statement. He says: "Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be a prima facie case of contempt." I would cite *May*, page 138, where he says: "The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt." Further on he also says: "It appears to me to be a breach of the privileges of the House."

The Hon. Member stated:

The Minister claimed at the time, however, that he had not misled the House. One might have accepted this, except that examination of the statement he made during question period yesterday and the supplementary information he gave the press outside the House indicates that his clarification was as inaccurate as the original statement.

So it appears there's a dispute between two members here as to what the alleged facts are in a dispute between them as to a statement relating to questions that were asked in the House and answers given. In view of this, I have to look at it according to the rules on privilege. Claims of breach of privilege raised by Members relating to the veracity of statements attributed to Members continue to plague the records of *Hansard* in Ottawa, and the numerous claims of privilege to be found there have consistently been rejected by the distinguished Speakers of that House whenever they occur.

I'll quote from the reasons given by the former Speaker, Mr. Lamoureux, on June 8, 1970, which I think is a classic example of this problem. It was a question of privilege having been raised to the effect that certain statements, which because of their nature ought to have been made in the House, and that replies given in response to certain questions in the House, had misled and deceived Hon. Members. That was the complaint, and Mr. Speaker said:

"Perhaps we should not get involved in the substance of the matter referred to by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the Hon. Member for Peace River, Mr. Baldwin. The decision to be made on the subject before the Chair is purely procedural."

He goes on:

"If the Chair were to accept the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg

[[Page 525](#)]

North Centre and if the matter were sent to the committee on privileges and elections, what would be under consideration there except the conduct of the Minister?

"I suggest that this would have to be done and it would be under consideration, and that this could be done only by adopting the procedures and measures which have been suggested on a number of occasions by the Chair, particularly by Mr. Speaker Michener in the ruling to which I have just referred."

He refers to page 584 of the *Journals* of 1959.

He goes on:

"It does seem to me that implicit in the question raised by the Hon. Member for Peace River is a dispute or misunderstanding arising between Members as to allegations of fact. The Minister of Finance has interpreted the situation as he sees it. Obviously he is in disagreement on this point with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Hon. Member for Peace River. As stated in citation 113 of *Beauchesne*, fourth edition, 'a dispute arising between two Members as to allegations of facts does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.'"

He goes on:

"I have to rule in the circumstances, that the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre does not fulfil the requirements for a prima facie case of privilege, and I cannot accept it to the extent of putting it to the House at the present time. I have to rule that there is no prima facie case of privilege on the basis of our rules."

Now, I can catalogue for the Hon. Members, for the record, some of the more recent examples to be found in our federal *Hansard* on these claims of breach of privilege on similar grounds. To give you an idea, if you look in the 1972 *Hansard* you will find on pages 409, 993, 1593, 1965, 2541, 2976, 3268 and 3598 examples of that. In the following year, 1973, you have precisely the same result on pages 3047, 4802, 5775, 6279 and 6745. In 1974, to bring it fairly up to date, see pages 721, 168, 547, 585 and 1537.

That's all the time I had to look, but you could go back for years and you will find precisely the same problem in relation to disputes between Hon. Members on questions of fact related in the House.

Speakers have consistently refused to consider setting aside the order of business of the House to take up these differences. The order paper is available to every Member who seeks to carry his difference of opinion over any facts any further by regular notice.

In view of that I must rule as other Speakers have done.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I take it from your ruling, all of which referred to rulings of the federal House in decisions of Michener and Lamoureux, and the text being *Beauchesne*, that *May*, 18th edition, is no longer to be our guide in cases of this nature, and that we will be using federal precedents?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I would point out to the Hon. Member that the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener (as he was then) that I've already referred to quotes from *May* directly, and they gained their guide from *May*, just as I do. I found it more expedient for the simple reason that there have been many, many instances in the federal House where this has happened, and so few in this House where it has been raised to this point, that I felt it was a matter that would justify a full explanation of the rule as it is understood.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Again, for clarification, may we take it then that the rule put forward in *May* on page 138, 18th edition, which states, "The House may treat the making of a deliberate misleading statement as contempt" — and the reference is a British citation of 1963 would no longer be operative in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: No. Because the case to which the Hon. Member refers was one where the Hon. Member concerned confessed to the House that he had lied deliberately to the House and tried to mislead the House deliberately, which is quite a different matter than someone alleging, as the Hon. Member has, that there seems to be a prima facie case of contempt. It is quite a different matter.

As I point out and as Mr. Speaker Michener points out in his reasons, it would take a great deal more. The Member would have to actually prove a prima facie case to go about it in this manner because it involves a substantive motion that should really be done on notice, and that appears to be the intent.

MR. PHILLIPS: Resign! The Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) should resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

[[Page 526](#)]

APPENDIX

60 Mr. *Gardom* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

Concerning the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia —

1. What is its monthly salary payroll?

2. What is its salary schedule, furnishing full particulars of job position and rate?

3. Are any employees of the Public Service engaged in any work connected with any requirements set forth under the *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act* or the *Automobile Insurance Act* and, if so, how many employees, where have they been employed, and what has been their remuneration?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* stated that, in his opinion, the reply should be in the form of a Return and that he had no objection to laying such Return upon the table of the House., and thereupon presented such Return.

90 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following question:

With regard to Autoplan during the year 1974: What percentage of all policies purchased was bought directly from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

"The percentage of new and renewal vehicle policies for the 1974/75 licence year issued direct by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia for the period January 1974 to February 1975 was 1.31 per cent."

91 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to the financial condition of ICBC at the most recent date for which information is available —

1. What cumulative total revenue had been received from (a) the Provincial Government, (b) investment, (c) the sale of certificates and insurance policies, and (d) all other sources?

2. What cumulative total of expenditures had been made in respect of (a) capital outlays for physical facilities, (b) salaries, (c) purchases of supplies and services, (d) payments to insurance policy-holders pursuant to insurance coverage obligations, (e) repayments of Government advances, (f) investments, and (g) all other allocations?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

"1 and 2. The *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act* requires that 'The financial statement shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly on a date within sixty days next following the end of the year (February 28, 1975) for which the statement is made if the Legislative Assembly is then in session, otherwise on a date within fifteen days after the opening of the next following session.'

"We intend to comply with this requirement."

97 Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to land purchases for ICBC —

1. Which lands purchased were classed as agricultural land?
2. What were their legal descriptions and classifications?
3. What is the approximate size and the total cost of each?
4. What is the current use of each?
5. What were the dates of purchases of each?

With respect to land options of ICBC —

1. What lands, presently in land freeze, does ICBC have options on either directly or indirectly now?
2. What is the location and legal description of these lands?
3. What is the date of expiration of options?
4. What is the total price of these lands?
5. What is the option price of these lands?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

"With respect to land purchases for ICBC —

"1. A site located at No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway, Richmond, B.C.

"2. E. ½ of SW. ¼ of Sec. 3 1, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., NWD, W. ½ of SW. ¼ of Sec. 3 1, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., NWD; save and except Explanatory Plan, Parcel A15048, Parcel B15251, Parcel C15250, and the part subdivided by 36037 and 37254; Lot 56 of Sec. 31, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., Plan 36037, NWD. Classification ALR-2.

"3. Size, 20.8 acres; cost, \$550,000.

"4. The Corporation is permitting the Department of Agriculture to use the property for allotment gardens. Since the purchase of the property we have permitted the previous tenants to remain on a portion of this property. The previous tenants occupy a house and utilize a barn on the property and lease them from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia on a month-to-month basis at a cost of \$130 per month.

"5. November 1, 1973.

"With respect to land options of ICBC —

"1. *Nil*.

"2, 3, 4, and 5. Not applicable."

