

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

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 317](#)]

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain.

MS. P.F. YOUNG (Vancouver–Little Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon we have in the gallery visiting with us today the general business class, grade 12, of Sir Charles Tupper School, with their teachers, Mr. Holman and Mrs. Heivey. I would ask the House to give them welcome.

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

**AN ACT TO AMEND
THE MINERAL ACT**

Mr. Curtis moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 79 intituled *An Act to Amend the Mineral Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 79 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.

**AN ACT TO AMEND
THE PLACER MINING ACT**

Mr. Curtis moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 80 intituled *An Act to Amend the Placer Mining Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 80 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.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

(continued)

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

MR. E.O. BARNES (Vancouver Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues, the Hon. Members for the various ridings in the Province of British Columbia for that warm and gracious welcome to me, one of the tenderfoots who will be making his input for the initial time during the 30th parliament and this most important debate.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I deliberately neglected to participate during the first short session because I'm somewhat of a deliberate type and wanted to find out what was going on before I opened my mouth. (Laughter).

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): You'll find out now.

MR. BARNES: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think I have got the tiger by its tail because now that I've found out what is happening, I can't renege on the deal. I think I'm stuck here for quite a few years and I'm going to have to do something. (Laughter).

I understand, from observing the behaviour of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that it is in order and customary to congratulate persons such as yourself who are assuming positions for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: That is in order. (Laughter).

MR. BARNES: Well in that case, Mr. Speaker, may I extend my congratulations to you...for being successful in receiving what I believe was a unanimous election by all Members of the House.

I would like to state to you, Mr. Speaker, that I'm here on official business. (Laughter). I know that comes as a surprise to some of you, but I am here on official business.

I would like to bring a message — you've heard that before — but this message, Mr. Speaker, is official only to me and I would like, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this House, to make it official to them; to try to express to you some of the things that I have been asked to carry out during my tenure in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to request of this Government that it look beyond the short-term gains and the quick political victories that so many of us opt for; although we must admit that to survive, you sometimes have to be expedient. But we should make these secondary in our overall considerations, because we do have a pretty immense task ahead of us.

I am asked to suggest to the Government, Mr. Speaker, that it use wisely the time it has in trying to develop constructively the energies that it has put into policies, and to make these policies more cohesive and useful to the people of British Columbia as a composite package — one that is not going to be disjointed, but one that will comprehensively reap benefits long after most of us are gone.

Mr. Speaker, the message is direct and it is no more than a recapitulation of what we already know. Simply put, it means that this Government is to end make-do, expedient administrative practices respecting the people's affairs. It means the emphasis should

[[Page 318](#)]

be shifted to a more equitable balance between people things and material things.

Now if there are those here who disbelieve this to be the message, then I urge them to recall the night of

August 30, 1972 — just a little than six months ago. The mandate received on that evening, Mr. Speaker, was not an exclusive mandate from the socialist elite; it was not just a mandate from the tried and the true of the party; it was a mandate, Mr. Speaker, of the people of British Columbia — people who have been referred to by many of the post-election analysts as the "protest" voters and "those who are looking for alternatives" types.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should just call them the people of British Columbia; the ones who made the choice of what should be done, August 30, 1972. There are still those who doubt the magnitude of the mandate — remember, the New Democratic Party is one of the most publicized parties in the country. For generations the New Democratic Party and its predecessor, the CCF party in the province received enormous publicity — most of it free — coming from antagonistic opponents who sought to use the power of the media to discredit us.

In fact just at this very moment, I believe this party is in fortunate receipt, Mr. Speaker, of corporate publicity assistance. It is rumored I understand a certain group with a budget of something like \$100,000 is out there diligently trying to promote one of our up-coming programmes. (Laughter).

So with this kind of exposure, Mr. Speaker, how can there be any doubt that the people of B.C. knew quite well for which they voted? They were aware that we were a reformative and innovative programme party dedicated to providing programmes for the people of this province first, and for "things" second.

Mr. Speaker, I have chosen my words quite carefully for what I am about to say now and I feel that I should be afforded the opportunity to do a bit of philosophizing. As we get on into this session and subsequent sessions I am going to, I'm sure, have to buckle down and get to certain details but I don't want to confuse you with details right now. I want to give you some broad views on what is important because the people out there, Mr. Speaker, are talking about things that they understand. Fundamental things. They're not that complicated. We have to be complicated because we somehow have been put in the role of administrators of the public affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should take cognizance of what we are about because I suspect that we are starting to lose faith. I believe we are losing faith in each other. I think we're becoming quite possibly, skeptical and paranoid about human behavior. We are trying so desperately to survive as individuals that we are running the risk of failing as sisters and brothers. Now that may be a bit high handed but I think that when we forget what spirit is all about, we run the great danger of forgetting what makes the world go round.

Now if I live to be 100,000 years old, no, better, if live to be 900 years old — I believe that was how long Methuselah lasted — if I live to be 900 years old, I don't think I shall every forget the enormous vibrancy and spirit of August 30, 1972. I don't believe that a journalist writing, or commentator broadcasting, an artist creating, or a politician reliving what happened on that evening could truly express the importance of the spirit that was felt there by all of those people in the Province of British Columbia.

Even so, let it be recorded that what happened was not just a political victory. What happened was a whole people joining in the struggle for liberation. It was a coming together of the human spirit, so to speak. The kind you don't just whip up at a moment's notice. I'll even go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to suggest that those professed and renowned opponents of the socialist movement were probably disbelieving — but way down deep, they too were secretly hoping for better things to come. I know we are going to forget this most of the time, but after all they are people too, and citizens.

The Government has made some important decisions since being in office and in fairness to it, it has had to perform under considerable difficulties. But now the pains of birth and of formative development should be subsiding. It should now look to taking decisive action — action that will further relieve the citizens of this province.

It is late, Mr. Speaker, and we need access to justice for all of the people and we need it now. We must start to look more comprehensively and with new and more sophisticated eyes at the contemporary needs and education. I mean, who says that the public school system, as it stands, should permit youngsters at age 6 only? The Minister of Finance? Because it certainly is an economical consideration.

And let's either provide employment guarantees, Mr. Speaker, or stop making all this to-do about it and come

up with intelligent alternatives — like a guaranteed income and all the rest.

Who are we kidding really, and how long must we go on peddling health so essential to the lives of children, adults and elder citizens alike? You want to have your teeth filled? If you do, and you've got \$20 — go right ahead. It will get you one tooth filled. Such, my friends, is the high cost of luxury.

We are at the critical crossroads and we may even have gone beyond.

For a start let's recognize that the essentials of human life must now be reviewed. We must take a look at what they are worth to us and take them off the bargaining table, Mr. Speaker. Let us separate the wheat from the chaff — then we can all go and have a share of the wheat. I think it would be fair to let the people who want the chaff bargain for it.

[[Page 319](#)]

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to see introduction of legislation that will allow government activity in the food and housing field through cooperatives immediately instituted. In the truly competitive economy, I feel that the public should at least be on a par with the corporate citizen. Having an equal opportunity to influence the market value of a given product is not reasonable for the people of this province, I think used as a regulating device, it could provide a good alternative for this Government — one that probably would be much more effective than such stringent regulations as price control and regulations that people don't like to obey. Instead you simply go into business — call it people business — and if you don't like the way things are you alter the price. If anybody's upset, they come and sit down and talk to you about it. That way we may be able to keep the equilibrium. We don't need to get nasty or insulting, we simply cooperate and we participate.

Now, there are going to be those people who will argue that the Government's participation in cooperatives is directly or indirectly going to be advantageous to them because of certain overhead costs. Well, the policy of this Government is to respect the rights of all people to bargain. And I'm sure that there will be no employees or otherwise connected with the Government who will not be benefiting from their capacities to get a fair deal. Therefore the Government more than likely will be spending just as much as private operators, but of course with some exceptions.

One of the exceptions may be that there may not have to be the same cost involved in promotions — because a good deal does not have to be promoted too much. Other things might be the distribution of shares for certain of these stocks because these things cost money, time, and staff. The government may not have all of these costs; it may have some of them. There may be some problem I guess, when you talk about net profit and this kind of thing. But I think we could sit down and talk about these things too — amicably, friendly, and sort of together.

I believe that arm in arm, hand in hand, that the public could work along with the corporate citizen quite well. And we should all be able to survive for many, many years to come — as long as we have the best interests of each other in mind. After all the Government is here to provide responsibly its administrative duties; not here to destroy the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make mention of something that has been on my mind for a long time. I know that it is of political significance to a lot of people but I never have been that good at being a politician. I probably have a death wish. I'm going to commit suicide but I will do my job. You know, I was one of those youngsters that was trained from the old school. So I'm not ascribing to any particular lobbyist's dreams or desires. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, and this assembly through you, that there is an area that has been long neglected in this province. In fact, it has been neglected for a long time in the country and probably on the North American continent. That is the just due, the rights of people, not only in this world but all of the worlds. We simply are out of step.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we have instituted immediately a ministry of human rights. I know it doesn't seem very urgent because we've got all kinds of economical things to do. But I think if we were to draw some parallels about the costs we are suffering because of the lack of a ministry such as this, there would be no question in the minds of any actuarial expert or anyone concerned about dollars and cents that we can afford to do anything but

get on with it.

Such an umbrella organization, to my mind, has tragically been omitted in this province. But now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should demonstrate the faith that we have in all the people who come from all over the world and make up this community by taking the first step and forming a human rights ministry. We have ministries, Mr. Speaker, for oil in the ground, not to mention trees and minerals of other descriptions. We have a ministry of travel industry. In fact, we even have a ministry for nobody called the Minister without Portfolio. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, must we continue to insult the people of this province in this way any longer? I pray not.

Under a ministry of human rights we would accommodate men as well as women. We would accommodate those who are red, white, black and brown under this ministry, Mr. Speaker. There would be no special favours, no special deals, but there would be equality and justice for all. Under the new legislation would be an advisory human rights commission made up of all colours, cultures, races, socio-economic levels — and both sexes would be included.

The ministry would promote the qualities of human dignity and citizenship in this province with pretty much the same zest and vigour and diligence that the good Hon. Minister of Travel Industry (Hon. Mr. Hall) is doing for that department. I think that's only fair.

Just let me ask the males who are present with us this afternoon a question. Why are there women today who are becoming more impatient and distrustful and indeed, in some instances, downright aggressive and antagonistic, not to mention being hostile? (Laughter). Mr. Speaker, are these women to be condemned and are we surprised at their behaviour? Or would we just like to kid ourselves and think that we are?

Well, if you didn't know it, Mr. Speaker, and this assembly through you, Mr. Speaker — I hope you're

[[Page 320](#)]

not getting uptight at me referring to you all the time. You're all right with me. (Laughter). Well in any case, my colleagues, if you didn't know it, the behaviour of these women is only a symptom of what is to come. You take a look around and see for yourself. See if you don't agree.

On the other side are the native peoples of this province. You know what they've got to say. Somewhere else are the scores of disenchanted youths of all descriptions. Elsewhere are immigrants, new Canadians we call them. Some of us have degenerated to calling foreigners and aliens and whatnot all kinds of things other than Canadians. We're learning. Then you have your welfare casualties and those people who are socially and physically deprived and alienated. You can go on and on and on.

Let me say this, that very little in this world is a laughing matter. But in these trying times I've had to personally do a lot of laughing. I certainly don't exclude myself from that category because I've experienced quite a bit in my time...the Hon. Members, through you, Mr. Speaker. So please whatever you do, don't tell me that all I have to do is look around me in this great big beautiful province of ours and look at all the smiling faces.

In finalizing, before the advent of such capitalistic contrivances as family breakdown, Mr. Speaker, there might have been considerable merit in the longstanding philosophy that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. But since our previously believable institutions are now fading — not just to mention the breakdown of the family, but the church — we have found ourselves in the position where we are going to have to take another look. We're going to have to review, Mr. Speaker, that proposition — you might call it a 16 to 1 formula — that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Now, if we were to reverse that, we would be closer to the point. I made a comment during one of my heated sessions before August 30 during the campaign — and I suggested that if we could spend \$1 million on rehabilitation and social assistance and we could justify that, surely we could spend an equal amount on the other end of the scale in prevention.

Let's take a look at the comparison. You have a 16 to 1 proposition. Are there 16 ounces in a pound? I haven't been to school for a long time. Whatever it is, 16 or whatever. O.K. That's 16 to 1. Now, if we were to match dollar for dollar on a par basis with the expenditures for rehabilitation and social assistance and anything else on that end of the scale, you would have a reversal of that on a dollar to dollar basis. It would mean that you multiply 16-fold the original philosophical idea that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. That's what you would do.

What we now have is par but in fact you have philosophically changed your thinking and now you're willing to spend 16 to 1, which is how far behind we are in prevention — 16 to 1, right now, Mr. Speaker. I think that we should change that.

I would like to...I'm more long-winded than I thought. I only intended to talk 15 or 20 minutes. So It just say this and let my last words be probably the most important of all.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have an acute situation in my riding particularly and probably throughout this province. We have a shortage of housing of all descriptions, but let's be specific — we have a shortage of housing for elderly citizens. I know many, many of the citizens who are waiting on lists to get into some of the existing accommodation that was especially designed to meet their social and physical needs. And they can't get in.

Mr. Speaker, there's discrimination even there, because the people who can afford it have taken these places over, and they can't get in. So they're still being ripped off and they're subject to the prowling wolves on the streets who are taking them for everything that they can afford, when they really can't afford it. You saw what they did to those people who were fortunate enough to qualify for the minimum income assistance. These people were immediately subjected to the ruthlessness of these people out there who don't care about anything except making money at all costs.

I think that that really supports my earlier point about cooperatives. I think that if people are going to play ball like that that's fine — this is a free society. But we're going to play ball too. And we are responsible for regulating the game.

But as I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, I would like us to really just slow down and think these elderly citizens are not just so much chaff that is finished and you throw over in the corner some place; these are the people who were here before we came. These are the ones who have taken their lumps. I think it's really disrespectful and discourteous to subject these people who have been running this battle for so long to that kind of activity on the streets. I think we owe our elders a little more respect.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, feel that we should do things comprehensively, thoroughly and with foresight and would like us to look at this as not a political matter, but a matter of humanitarian concern, and take some action to assist these elderly citizens. I think that we should do this right away. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): You know, Mr. Speaker, if that applause had lasted another five seconds I would have felt inclined to sit down, because I was ahead. (Laughter). I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that such accord, such warmth and

[[Page 321](#)]

genuine understanding, and such interest expressed to me by the House is much like people waiting to see if Granny's going to fall down the stairs.

With regard to the last speaker, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say it is remarkable to me how a Member as nice as he is could ever play for Capozzi. But in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I think it a very excellent and a very thought-provoking speech and I would indeed congratulate him.

We've experienced quite a debate over the days, Mr. Speaker, and we have had a raft of "thrusts" and

"inputs" and "rip-offs", and it really somewhat makes me wonder what happened to the "vigours" the "viables" and the "meaningfuls" of yesteryear.

The debate, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, has been living proof of the fact that a politician can put meat on the leanest bone. Because if ever a throne speech was Mother Hubbard I think it's this one. It was so bare that even the Premier and the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, had to take to the halls for their utterance of imports, the coal ports and the ferry terminals and so forth.

I'd say, Mr. Speaker, that apropos of these somewhat uniquely timed major announcements coming from the corridors, I think that the exception that was raised in the House, through the modus operandi did fail, and correctly did fail, on the grounds of parliamentary legality. And it should have failed on that premise. But it should have not failed on the premises of best ethics, nor on the premise of best record, because that's what the machine in the corner is all about, and that's why everyone in this House worked so hard over the years to have come into being, and I'm speaking of *Hansard*.

Lots of Members have received a number of letters so far in the session, and not too many have been read — thankfully, I suppose we'll all say — but I'm going to not necessarily break precedent, but read a few that I received and I hope the Hon. Members will take them kindly.

This one came in this way, Mr. Speaker:

"Dear Sir:

I like Speaker Dowding." — You're supposed to applaud — "I like his ex mero motu, too, and I wish him rots of ruck with his Ratin.

Signed,

"Pro Pelle Cutem"

Now, here's a copy of a letter that went to the Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick). It went this way:

"Dear Sir:

Thanks for your help and understanding.

Signed,

"Ex-Miner"

Here's a rather strange one. "Signed with a tear":

"The next time the Assembly sits late in a Friday night would someone please arrange for a pair for Fred Moonen."

Here's one that came without a stamp.

"Dear Sir:

When you said the Premier was a good scout, I thought he'd help me across the street, not onto it."

Signed,

"His insurance agent"

(Laughter). Well, this correspondent tells me, Mr. Speaker, that political parties are somewhat like orchestras at times — they start to develop their own theme songs. Next door, they've used "Oh God Our Help in Ages Past". It seems to me that really, in the past, they didn't do too badly, Mr. Speaker, and I think perhaps they should change that to perhaps "for now" and for "the future."

But the correspondent continues, Mr. Speaker, and he says that there should be one for the Conservatives. Taking a look at the score, it seems to be parodied on that fine old hymn for children — and you all remember that — "Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so." And with no sacrilegious intent, Mr. Speaker, it goes this way:

The people love us, this we know, For the socialists tell us so." (Laughter).

Here's another one in question-and-answer form. It's addressed: "To whomst it doth concern:

"Question: With a Social Credit leadership convention coming up, is Phil G. still in the wings?

"Answer: Yes, sir, and you'd better believe it! God bless you, and Amen!"

It's signed "Anonymous." (Laughter).

And finally:

"Dear Liberal: Give em hell, and the best to George Gregory, Gordon Gibson and Alan McFarlane."

Signed,

"Informed" (Laughter).

Well, I'd say, Mr. Speaker, that there have been some very marvelous contributions by all of those who have to cope and grope within these four walls and, although we've had some remarkable recantations of immutable positions from over there on the Social Credit side, I do feel that the substance of their non-confidence motions — and I'm not reflecting upon a vote, Mr. Speaker — very clearly and well illustrated the feelings and needs of B.C. people, which in those respects unfortunately are the same today as they were one year ago.

The terrific concern and economic disablement resulting from the staggering rate of unemployment — that's not been cured by the new Government, and the old Opposition would have spoken just as strongly as the new Opposition did, and would have introduced a motion, probably word-for-word. The terrific concern, also Mr. Speaker, about the erosion of individual rights — and we've had some very excellent statements about that earlier today. And about the awesome erosion, and perhaps indulgent

[[Page 322](#)]

power of cabinet action without the benefit of legislative sanction that's still in B.C. and is still without proper or indeed any access to legal redress. And that was really the substance of the second motion.

And I'd say, Mr. Speaker, that the same motions would have indeed been introduced by the former Opposition — perhaps even more forcefully, I don't know, but such is B.C.'s political "la ronde".

We've heard the same fine and very genuine sentiments about the same problem, but with the still clearly identifiable lack of preventative medicine, and a still clearly identifiable lack of cure. I say it's high level debate and low level action, and that seems to be the curse that most besets this chamber.

There have been an awful lot of good ideas expressed, but we've talked before about the ludicrousness of finding the best Okanagan apple for sale in Idaho at a lesser price than in Vancouver, about not community utilizing our school plants, about our senior citizens often being tax-forced out of their homes into the unpleasant unfamiliarity of expensive rest homes and on and on, Mr. Speaker. And with all Members on all sides agreeing as to the validity of the premises, and the extent of the problems, and the need for cures, but still no performance. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, if only more could be accomplished than talked about, how refreshing that would be for all of us.

That would be an interesting topic for the Press, or indeed a thesis for some student of politics — to make a chronological and detailed analysis of the process of some measure of reform from its inception to its actuality. I'm

sure for such a task patience would be the prime prerequisite. But how much more effective and pleasant it would be to put one programme into work rather than talk about 10.

We've experienced very excellent enthusiasm from the Government backbench and we have certainly enjoyed the new and varying styles of those who are searching for the correct route to cabinet. They've taken just about every course imaginable — maybe most a little more left than right. Some have ridden with the wind, or into it; some have tried the rocky road and others the philosophical path. But you know, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly going to be interesting to see who succeeds — even though it's going to be too bad that the mortality rate is going to be so high.

Let's all wish the chosen well and, for whatever a forecast is worth, it seems apparent — at least to me right now — that the tortoises are easily overtaking the hares.

In listening to so many fine talks from all sides, it also seems that, more than ever, the concept that a Speech from the Throne is supposed to document the direction of the Government has become pretty passé in this province.

For in all consciousness and fairness, Mr. Speaker, we should agree that the offerings that have flowed forth in here have hardly emanated from either support with, or contention to, this throne speech document. There have been some tremendous expressions of philosophy, philosophical direction, and philosophical interest from the House; but I don't think that really and truly flowed from or against the throne speech.

So rather than cling to a form whilst foregoing its substance — and a form, I'd say, which is held in little, if any, interest by the general public — perhaps a more contemporaneous and efficient procedure would be to start off — still in the traditional sense, fine and dandy — with a statement of policy plus a complete list of proposed legislation by the Government, followed by the remarks of only the first advocates of all other parties.

Then move tout de suite into consideration of the budget with all Members participating — twice, if they choose. The same opportunity of debate; no suggestion of cutting debate at all. In fact, I would say that the seconds should be able to continue and not lose their place under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, it's with the budget and the legislation and the estimates when the business starts getting done.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Order, order.

MR. GARDOM: What's your trouble? You're in order. Don't be worried, my friend. It's all right.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): He's just getting crotchety.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, well. He's been here a long time, Madam Member. (Laughter).

For that's when we try to rip-off our problems with viable, meaningful and vigorous inputs and thrusts into our economy and into our laws, Mr. Speaker — you see this thing is catching — then insofar as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, if I had a seconder left, Mr. Speaker — which unfortunately I have not — I would have to move that it was with regret that if there had to be one, it would have to be like this. So I can say "R.I.P." to it and move onward.

We can't say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has not come through the past five or six months unscathed. It sure seems that their 40 per cent is slowly starting to erode, because people do not like bus purchases without tender; people do not like cabinet freezings which, apart from probably being ultra vires, will result in the long run, if they have not already, in some form of economic expropriation; people will not accept the rather histrionic forcing of a Howe Sound coal port down their throats. Make no mistake of that.

[[Page 323](#)]

You know, Mr. Speaker, we don't need loaded rhetoric or a thousand studies to see that Britannia Beach is not the priority place. I would just commend the Hon. Premier to show any student, in any school, from grades 1 to 12, anywhere in this province:

(1) where our ports are now,

(2) where the bulk of our underdeveloped resources are,

(3) where the bulk of our population now is,

(4) where, in any reasonable run, a port will be most needed and best suited. And I'd say 100 per cent of those students would say to the Premier: "Go north with your port, young man. Go north with your port.:

People are not enamoured also, Mr. Speaker, with the heavy-handed, non-consultative treatment foisted onto Kamloops and onto Kelowna. People were not sold on the Premier's pitch for subsidized shipbuilding to cure the ills of unemployment — and which even he, with his infinite grace, charm, capacity and all of those other things, was really only able to deliver with the conviction of Lawrence Welk singing Pagliacci. (Laughter).

You know, all the Hon. Premier needed, Mr. Speaker, to add to that performance to make it completely similar to what we heard before, was Bill Budd and a black Homburg.

The people, Mr. Speaker, are grieving about the Government's allocation of priorities: to wit, your chopping of private automobile insurance in priority to killing the heroin industry. That's a priority decision you've made, and I think you've made a wrong one. Perhaps putting all of those people out of work. Perhaps — we don't know. But they're afraid. They sure are afraid. You've received letters about it. They're going to say, "Am I going to still have a job tomorrow when this B.C. automobile insurance..." Are they? Are they?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. GARDOM: Are they?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Put your question on the order paper.

MR. GARDOM: "Put the question on the order paper," says the Hon. Premier. I'm afraid putting a question on the order paper isn't going to make them too happy when they've got to face their mortgage payments at the end of the month.

I'll tell you that the clerks and the saleswomen and the bookkeepers and the agents and the adjusters feel — and I think they feel very correctly — that you could have accomplished your task by an intelligent use of regulation which is already on the statute books, and not by take-over. And not by take-over.

Your decision is pretty tough to understand.

The people are worried, Mr. Speaker. They're worried about how this Government has so far used power: no bids, cabinet directives, economic executions of industry, all without the right of legal redress to any who may be hurt. No right in the Province of B.C., still, to sue an errant Government. Our citizens are still without the right to sue the Crown. Our citizens are still without the right to the benefit of an ombudsman to wade through the snarls and tangles of bureaucratic red tape. And still no indication that there will be full accountability. "Is it coming," says the Hon....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. GARDOM: Ah! Will you back it, my friend?

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): You'll have to wait for the debate.

MR. GARDOM: Still no indication that there will be full accountability of the business of the people, and still no indication that this Government fully accepts the theory that public money must be totally subject to public account.

In specific, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking of the Crown corporations: Hydro, B.C. Railway and the Liquor Control Board. I'd say that the Ministers concerned must furnish complete particulars or programmes, policies, expenditures and incomes of those concerned. They must be subject to full inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee of this Legislature and there must be a provincial Auditor General in British Columbia. Because we do not wish "democracy in the dark" to continue any longer in B.C.

Where are the full assurances and the fulsome assurances from the Government that these things will come into being? We've heard none so far. There are none in this document, in this so-called Speech from the Throne.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the bigger government is, the more powerful it becomes — that's a natural process. Consequently, the higher is its duty and the greater its responsibility to provide safeguards and checks and balances against any possibility of abuse of power. But if these things are going to be coming in B.C. from that side over there, fine and dandy. But they certainly are not here yet and they should have been announced in this throne speech.

We have heard the Opposition talk continuously in the throne debate. We've heard the former Opposition — as they then were — talk continuously about full accountability. Are they going to go ahead, Mr. Speaker, and take the same course as last year when they voted a \$500 million bill — \$100 million a line —

[[Page 324](#)]

without a question? Is that going to be their practice in the province or are they the reformers that they say they are? Let's hope they are; but there have been no indications of that coming yet.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, in passing — and I say this lightly — is it recommended that the Premier should walk around these halls talking to his Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) because that can give rise to very, very awkward rumours.

I want to tell the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Macdonald) — unfortunately he's not here; he's the person in charge of restraints — and I'd like to tell the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), who is here, and who is in charge of the boys with the nets and the white coats — that what they may be seeing when the Premier is going down the hall talking to the Minister of Finance, is not a new experience in this province. It's just an old form of political schizophrenia, which is far from unfamiliar to all of our citizens. All he's doing, Mr. Speaker, is he taketh with the left hand and he giveth from the right. About the only thing that I see is altered in this construction is the hands that are doing the giving and doing the taking.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the most universally unsettling feeling that is still permeating the province is the uncertainty the people have concerning the economic direction of the government. Is it left of waffle, right of waffle, infra-waffle, ultra-waffle or just plain dead-on waffle? Now according to *Webster's Dictionary*, "waffle" means to flutter, flap or blather, or in the nutrient sense it means pancake batter in an indented form, and I think the word "indented" is perhaps entitled to some significance, because it seems from the 38 members of the Government side we've had almost 38 different "indentations" or expressions of that economic direction and there's still no great indication of what the way will be.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Look up the meaning of the word indent.

MR. GARDOM: Don't feel lonely, Mr. Member. I know you've had a tortuous path in politics but things are rosier for you now. You're not forgotten.

AN HON. MEMBER: He'll get to you.

MR. GARDOM: Semper Strachan. (Laughter). But the Government leader, and that is not you, Mr. Minister of Highways, has not told the people of B.C. he's prepared to save the province from the designs of the more radical wing of his party. The reason may well be that they have a larger control of its destiny than he'd care to admit.

You'd think, Mr. Speaker, it may be a little too early for intra-party postures to become so evident. But they

have become evident and it seems that the radical wing, or the rads have their standard bearer. It's slowly becoming evident who'll be spearheading the moderates or the mods. Which leaves the Premier — someone used to say it's a Liberal position — which leaves the Premier walking somewhat hesitatingly in never-never, in between, trying to find a schismatic balance between historically opposed forces on the one hand and on the other hand, present a package to the public of British Columbia that does not frighten it out of its wits.

It wasn't hard for the NDP the first time around — because you happily inherited a negative vote situation, and to a great extent created it. But today the NDP 40 per cent is moving way closer to 30 per cent than it is to 50. And trying to sell that NDP package to that soon to be 70 per cent of the public who are opposed to your philosophies could well be the poor old Premier's Armageddon.

So I suppose his game has got to be to play for time. In playing for time that's why the uncertain curtain has been run across this province, with the result that capital is afraid, labour is leery, expansion is at a crawl if not dead in neutral, and little wonder that unemployment is on the incline. All of that spells t-r-o-u-b-l-e, which has emanated from your most leftist side, because B.C. people do not want to become TKO'd by takeovers. If they had wished that, you wouldn't have received a 40 per cent vote, you'd have received an 80 per cent vote. But that's not what the majority of B.C. people want in government.

I'll tell you what they do want. They want a government that will, at all times, democratize the political process; that will direct and regulate in the public interest, but retain incentive and stimulate interest and farm out the tasks of services to the private sector. So go ahead and set the guidelines and the standards and provide the employment incentives. Get the best deal possible for the public with a view to decreasing but not increasing the in-House complement and keep government out of the job of doing it itself. That's the gospel that should be preached in B.C. today and if it was, that uncertain curtain would lift in a hurry and so indeed it should.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources; Minister of Recreation and Conservation): M-o-t-h-e-r.

MR. GARDOM: I've always liked her my friend, I've always liked her. I got a letter from her too, as a matter of fact. (Laughter). She said, "You're doing a great job. How come you aren't speaker?" But I don't know. (Laughter).

You may recall that during the fall I spoke of the leader of the Social Credit Party and of his tenure of service and his loyalty to the province, and I indeed congratulated him on his ten year gladiatorship. But he must be slowly accepting his well deserved desire

[[Page 325](#)]

to retire. I'm sure that it is obvious to everyone in here, and to the general public as well. I'd say for a statesman-like departure which is unequivocally and unquestionably his due, and in the interests of this province and the Legislature that the decision should be made and it should be made now. Certainly not on the basis of partisan politics, which appears to be the principal influencing factor for the absence of his decision so far. That, to use the phrase, "Oh, unfortunately he's not here," of the Member for South Peace (Mr. Phillips) and the rejoinder of the former first socialist Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

The Member for South Peace, when he sat over there in one of the chairs at the back got rather incensed one day and turning on — I have forgotten, I think it was us probably — the Liberal Party — and he said, "Oh, Mr. Speaker, what they're doing, they're playing political politics." And Torn Berger, as it then was said, "and that's the worst kind." (Laughter). And I'm afraid that's what we're seeing over here by the Hon. Member for South Okanagan (Hon. Mr. Bennett).

Because the Opposition over here, they want to find a new leader. *Que sera sera*, true, but they want to know who it will be. And they want to let him or her take their chances along with the Liberals and the Conservatives and the NDP in Okanagan South, and permit the winner to become a part of this parliament.

I'd ask all Members, and particularly the new ones, to have a look at the *Constitution Act* RSBC 1960 Chapter

71 and Amendments thereto, and particularly sections 55 and 62, and were the Speaker in the chair, I am sure he'd say that this is found at page 816 of the first volume. This is the procedure. It's laid down there: that if there is to be a resignation, there first of all has to be a notice to the Speaker, and then the Speaker sends a warrant to the Deputy Provincial Secretary, who issues the Writ of Election. The distance between the notice to the Speaker and issuance of the Writ of Election is 6 months and the distance from the writ to the election is 2, so the total altogether is an 8 month period.

Let's just look at that 8 month period for a while. Even if the Hon. Member should cable now from shipboard that he will not return, a new representative would not be in a position to serve his electorate until October of this year.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): The Government decides that.

MR. GARDOM: No, it's in the statute my friend. Little wonder you had trouble with the law. In October of this year, at least from what we hear from what the Premier tells the little birds, we are then going to be in session. So we would be once again in the awkward position perhaps of not having an individual present. So I would say that within the next week or so it's just about the last chance for this assembly to sit as a 55 Member assembly in October unless notice is given right now by the Member for Okanagan South (Hon. Mr. Bennett).

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. GARDOM: He says, don't hold my breath. Alright, I'll tell you what will happen if the notice is not given. This is exactly what will happen, you know it too, and I think it's very unfortunate for you folks over there.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Don't worry about us,

MR. GARDOM: Well somebody has got to worry about you, Ma'am. (Laughter).

The other point is this, surely it's not within the spirit, Mr. Speaker, of the *Constitution Act* nor the history of representative government here that a Member, particularly one that has been favoured with such high office, to time his retirement to such a partisan consideration as waiting for the results of the convention. Because when this convention goes in November, the Social Credit will end up with a new leader. That is a certainty. That will be a certainty whether the Hon. Member for Okanagan South runs or not. So let's just face that as fact. Surely It's extremely unlikely that he would carry on after that. There would be no rationale to that, save and except some other Member over here would volunteer to step down and let a new leader take a shot at his seat. No, I don't see any volunteers.

So on the basis of no resignation in either case until this November, the province could face one vacancy in a 55 person assembly, not only through the fall, but into the winter of 1974 and right smack into the fall of 1974 — 8 months from the Notice of Vacancy and that's the time required.

Since it indeed appears conclusive, Mr. Speaker, that a new representative will be coming here, he or she should get here as quickly as possible. Hence I hope all Members from all sides would urge the Hon. Member to make his farewell and receive all of those accolades to which he's entitled, and let's get along with the election of a new representative for Okanagan South.

Now, on the Government side, amongst its lady Members, a Ministry of women seems to be running 50-50. So it's going to be very interesting to hear the casting opinion of the Lady Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly). But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the redress they seek should be obtainable within the existing framework and without the establishment of a separate infra-structure. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, surely the greatest call for new

Ministry by far is not for a Ministry of women, but a Minister of the Environment. Anti-pollution laws in B.C. are

still far from being sufficiently encompassing and are still far from being effective.

I've always advocated that in this area the mandate of all of us should be short and simple and very definitive — polluters beware. We need an environmental bill of rights and we should establish a ministry of the environment. Under its aegis, amongst other things, there should be the administration of a province-wide *Clean Air Act*. New industries should meet environmental standards or their doors should remain closed. Old industries should be encouraged by depletion allowances and interest-free loans to come up to scratch.

This conversion from polluter to non-polluter should also provide more work and provide more jobs. Perpetual offenders should be encouraged to phase out because the public interest should be the main interest. Insignificant fines have certainly not proven to be the answer or proven to be successful. Penalties should be stiffened and injunctive processes should be made available against the defilers.

I've introduced, Mr. Speaker, certain amendments to the Pollution Control Act, which I'm not at liberty to talk about now. But I would indeed welcome the comments and suggestions of the Members concerning that matter which, I trust, is now in their books.

But the silence of the Government, Mr. Speaker, for the establishment of this new ministry has been pretty deafening. It's also been a pretty deafening silence concerning its specific resource policy. Also very, very silent indeed has been the desk of the Minister of Forests and whatever. Whatever that bodes, Mr. Speaker, whether it bodes good or bad will have to be seen. But at the present time, if nothing else, that also certainly bodes uncertainty. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the very worst thing that he could do would be to come up with some kind of a micro-economic or micro-procedural change to the forest industry without consideration of its whole spectrum.

This is the most unique economic situation that we have in the province. The world-wide dependencies and internal and external complexities of that lifeline industry make it indeed very, very vulnerable to precipitous change. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that this over-all resource and its management and the taxation policies affecting it are far, far too important to be left to the politicians alone. I'm particularly apprehensive of the simplistic posture of the Waffle Manifesto, which indicates that the relevant instrument for bringing the Canadian economy under Canadian ownership and control "include extensive public control over investment and nationalization of the commanding heights of the economy, such as the key resource industries, finance and credit, and industries strategic to planning our economy." Do not please, Mr. Speaker, do not please — and I'm addressing the Government — come in with just that for the forestry industry, or our province will end up right smack in the soup.

So I advocate, Mr. Speaker, the reception of greater expertise and say that it is indeed high time that B.C. once again had the benefit of a dispassionate fact-finding body such as the Sloan Royal Commission. The call we have here today, Mr. Speaker, is not for some kind of mono-politic tampering but to look at the whole thing and to consider it from all bases. If British Columbia ever, ever received something of value out of a royal commission, it did out of the Sloan commission on forestry. The first one was around 1944-45 and Commissioner Sloan recommended that there should be another public inquiry in 10 years. So the second one was in 1955 and 1956. The Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) well remembers.

But now it's 1973 — 17 years later. During those 17 years the industry has encountered enormous change, both in its operation and its technology, its content, its taxation and the extent of its sociological effect upon British Columbia. The questions that faced those earlier commissions, Mr. Speaker, are not the questions that we're faced with today.

Ecological balance has become a great priority. Logging techniques are far more sophisticated. Existing ownership is far more centralized. Government then had greater detachment than it has now. The industry is today faced with an entirely different set of trading blocks... a very, very important point and from which the possibilities of a great freeze in the not-inconceivable future is something that has to be taken into account. The customers are of different character and there's an every-changing degree of reliance upon them. Labour is more demanding. Capital source is more skeptical and taxes are on the increase. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, marked changes from 1955 to 1973.

Also in the Sloan commission, the B.C. forest service appeared as sort of depression-oriented. They felt

they'd never be able to have the necessary budget or expertise or staff for adequate research or planning for the industry. The tree farm businesses were delivered on the basis that large industry was the entity most capable of conducting proper forestry practices, a premise that this Government largely questions.

So for answers, Mr. Speaker, and opinions as to whether this one aspect I'm speaking of now is best suited to be all industry or all government or a conjunction of the two — for those kinds of answers and opinions we should also hear from the experts in the field.

Another point dealing with this. There seems to be no doubt that the bigger indeed are getting bigger and

[[Page 327](#)]

the smaller are disappearing. But are we sure that's in our best interest? There's no question that B.C.'s an export province and there's no question that we must have the large organizations, But a balance of the large and the small proved very much in the past to be the better economy and a better base for an even society. Is that going to be our forecast for the future? Shouldn't we find that out?

The smaller operator, Mr. Speaker, questions that the open log market is pretty darn difficult to find. The tariff position works to his disadvantage. The heavy equipment he needs to operate today is so expensive he's almost priced out of existence. In other areas, such as cameras and cars and radios, the flow from Japan and Europe have brought about realistic solutions to this kind of problem. But there hasn't been much similar kind of counterbalance with the logging equipment.

In order to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that the small logger receive some land, the Sloan concept was that the public working circles be set up for them on a quota system with the forestry service doing the forestry in this type of tenure. But then the law of the market came into play, and pretty soon it was found that the larger companies were purchasing the smaller operators' quota. So, once more, the big became bigger and the small became smaller.

Chief Justice Sloan recommended this: that each tree farm licence have a certain number of contracts available for the smaller operators. This was to be incorporated in the tree farm licence contract and this was done. But maybe it wasn't clearly enough spelled out, that such contracts should be from stump to dump. Or indeed, maybe in today's logging methods that is totally uneconomic. But this provision of allowing for the little man has also largely been circumvented by allowing transactions for felling and yarding and booming and so forth, and also by the letting of pretty darn tough open-end contracts where small contractors could be cut off for almost any reason with very little notice.

There's another factor which very much enters the picture since the Sloan commission. That's the very complex utilization of wood. The TFL has increased tremendously in volume because of its use in pulp and veneer, all of which were not too merchantable say around 1955. Now we find there's a different and more highly integrated use but once again pretty well under the original ground rules.

An additional factor which seems to forecast the end of the little man is that under the present system, when stumpage finally goes down after a market fall, many of the small operators are caught in the bind. The market fell yet they had a fixed stumpage. So maybe a better formula for determining governmental revenue would be a percentage of the market's price of logs as opposed to an earlier guestimate as to stumpage value. Maybe that's something else that should be looked at.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): It's a sliding scale now.

MR. GARDOM: But in the forestry economy of today, Mr. Speaker, the little operator has become, for all practical purposes, an economic anachronism. You know, maybe his erosion is inevitable but I hope it isn't and I think it should be found out. That's why I say that everything points to the need for another royal commission into this important plus industry — And, I would say, with very broad lines of reference for an updated review to include a consideration of existing policies and priorities, as well as areas of encouragement and improvement and guidelines for the future. We should be looking, Mr. Speaker, without any question of a doubt at the whole spectrum.

Taxation of the forestry industry is another point that will require a great deal of in-depth study.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fred Moonen's speech.

MR. GARDOM: No, it's not Fred Moonen's speech, my friend. It's mine.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the royal commission should also look into whether reforestation should be intensified and researched via the Government. Should we not develop better trees and better methods of harvesting them, in view of the enormous degree of public involvement? Should not the Government offer more incentive for research, for development and for better methods, and for more sophisticated lines of equipment which would more effectively convert decadent and smaller timber into useful and merchantable products?

Should not Government also very clearly indicate what its precise posture and attitudes will be so industry-wide long range and lead planning can take place?

We have seen terrific progress I think in the past few years, in the fact of forest management appreciating that it involves not only forest companies but people from the environmental, recreational and conservation field, Harmonious agreement, I think, is slowly being reached between these concerns, and it has got to continue to remain a harmonious arrangement.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be greater incentive and greater research done concerning an emphasis for increasing flexibility on the part of the lumber industry to accommodate as many end uses of lumber as possible. We've got to shore up and invigorate the secondary facilities for the remanufacture of lumber products and stimulate an incentive programme for that purpose.

And, I say through licensing or taxing, perhaps

[[Page 328](#)]

some incentive should be provided to those who are prepared to maintain domestic ownership of the wherewithal which is brought about by the existence of the B.C. tree.

Today we see — certainly not to the same extent as during the era of the Sloan Commission — an enormous transition in the lumber industry, particularly in the interior, from the days when ownership used to be in the hands of pioneer British Columbians. In 1973, with precious few exceptions, we have major foreign-based companies controlling the cutting of timber for pulp and lumber. It is a pity in my view that so many B.C. owners sold as they did. But perhaps they wouldn't have if they had been instilled with greater faith in the future and prosperity of their endeavour.

Perhaps the reluctant sellers would have remained had they received better assurance from the programmes and policies of this province, tax and otherwise. They wouldn't have been forced into being gobbled up or forced to close their doors by virtue of uncertain tenure and uncertainty of markets, labour instability and uncertainty of long-range policies which could grant them a fair opportunity for continued progress.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this royal commission could indeed well look at this point, in order to give stimulus to those who own at home, produce at home and want to process and manufacture at home, surely a few controls or incentives should be government-stimulated for their encouragement for unless and until we have some kind of effective free trade area, which I think is long overdue, in B.C. we shouldn't be relegated to the job of just cutting and shipping to some foreign-based organization to process.

There is absolutely no simplistic approach to this industry which I have said and which we all know is the economic lifeline of the province, but tinkering with it is not going to produce realistic situations and realistic solutions.

Change may well be in order. But I say that change should not come about without very serious in-depth

consideration and in-depth study from all areas, and with everyone connected having the opportunity for a public say. So, in order that we can have this new look, Mr. Speaker, and in order that we may receive the expertise of the industry in all of its environs and of those satellite operations in the communities and the people of B.C. who are reliant upon its success, I say the matters that I have raised here and, no doubt, many, many more should be put to a royal commission.

This has been recommended by me before. The industry has also become in accord — for example, the truck loggers who support the proposition. And I say that the sooner the Government initiates the proposal the better, because now is not the time for ad hoc.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one word about schools and just a couple of words to the Hon. lady Member who is in her seat. I would like to talk about the area of independent schools. I understand that the Independent Schools Association will be very soon meeting Cabinet and that in itself is a great step forward for them. I commend the Cabinet for the position it has taken.

The arguments for the support and recognition of independent schools in the province are well known and they are very well documented. Here are six pretty good reasons. We can look to the United Nations for decent definition: "Everyone has the right to education: education shall be free; it shall be compulsory; parents have the prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." Value can also be gained, Mr. Speaker, from the opportunity for diversification.

Look also at the test of fairness. Look also at the economic consequences of continuing non-support. Look to other areas for precedent. We don't have to do that but...worldwide, all Canada save B.C. Look for legal competence. The British North America Act allows for the establishment and providing of more than one educational system, and hence contemplates it.

In 1971, Mr. Speaker, I proposed a motion to the House. It read this way: "that this House recommend that the Minister of Education examine the feasibility of paying for educational services at independent schools in this province and/or providing those schools with educational aid and similar benefits now enjoyed by out public schools and/or otherwise recognizing the contribution made to the academic educations of some 23,000 students now attending the independent schools in B.C."...but no success. This just died on the vine as did many motions in those days. But I would like to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that education should be the joint responsibility of the family and the school.

We must keep in mind that the conveyance of factual knowledge is not the only criterion for learning. There is a question here also of minority rights, of equity and of the basic tenet of any acceptable philosophy, fairness. But apart from the philosophical arguments there is an enormous economic argument. Independent schools are performing an indispensable service.

They equip and educate about 23,000 people per year. They provide jobs, they provide income and if they were all closed and all turned public, the added burden on public funds would overnight become enormous. In operating moneys alone it would probably come in at around \$15 million, totally exclusive of buildings or capital cost. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that any government should be indifferent to the potential economic collapse of these institutions. If that did happen overnight it could,

[[Page 329](#)]

apart from everything else, throw the public school system into chaos.

But they are starting to fold. They are starting to fold in this province because the load is too heavy. I say this, five points: provide qualifying independent schools with access to all educational aids, libraries and aptitude tests; permit teaching time by certified teachers to count towards their standing with the Department of Education" accept transferability of pupils; ensure that public buses stop at the corner, not leave independent school children standing in the rain. The fifth point is that I would commend the province to finance a handsome portion, 60 per cent or at least 50/50 partnership, in the operating cost of independent schools which meet provincial standards, with one

proviso — that the Government would not contribute to studies outside the accepted provincial curriculum.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, providing the independent schools effectively educate and meet provincial standards and subject themselves to some kind of school board control, they should receive help and there should be no ifs, ands or buts about that. And I'd say with continuing consultation this kind of policy would not detract from but enhance the quality of education in our province. Surely education is a right and pluralism is an advantage.

You know, it doesn't matter a whit — and I used this example before and I think it sums it up best of all, Mr. Speaker — it doesn't matter who runs the hospital as long as it is properly run. That is the key principle in the field of health — the cure. Similarly in education, it is to educate and that's the job. And providing, and this is the caveat, providing the independent schools effectively educate and meet provincial standards and be subject to consultation and inspection, they furnish a public function. They should be entitled to due recognition. That's only fair and I indeed hope that this new Government intends to be fair.

This debate is waning into its final stages, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to sit down in a moment — in order to alert the next speaker. But before I do so I wish to make a very important public announcement. And particularly so as not to catch the Government or any of my legislative colleagues off guard or by surprise, and I don't want to create any kind of unexpected shocks...and that's this: When the Government falls this afternoon I hope that I shall have played a small part in the history of the province by voting against this motion. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Alberni,

MR. R.E. SKELLY (Alberni): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, fellow Members. This is the first time I've risen in the House to take part in this debate and I'd like to say that I feel fairly edgy at this point.

First of all, it's a bit of a disadvantage to be included on the Speaker's list on the last day. For one reason, you're sandwiched in between two of the "big guns" of the Opposition....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SKELLY: Also, I wrote my speech about a week ago and it's beginning to look like there's seagull tracks all over it (Laughter).

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very proud to be a Member of this assembly and extremely proud to be associated with the first socialist Government of the Province of B.C.

The people of Alberni are also pleased to be back in the socialist fold. Many of the things that should have been said on their behalf over the past six years went unsaid, and they're looking forward to me and to this administration for better representation than they had in the past. I'll do my best to see that they get it.

During the past few months some exciting new governments have been elected in this Commonwealth. The new Labour Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand have made some startling announcements that have completely reversed the previous policy directions of those governments. While B.C. is not in the same international league as Australia and New Zealand, some of the changes advocated by our Government are no less fundamental, and people everywhere are watching as the "just and open era" takes shape in this province.

We have heard a great deal in the last few days in the way of complaints and criticisms of the throne speech. Some Opposition Members have called it a "hollow document", devoid of any statement of philosophy or intent. But, Mr. Speaker, that's the role of the Opposition as they see it.

I'm sure if His Honour had read chapter and verse from the Holy Bible the Opposition would have proposed several amendments. (Laughter). I hate to admit The address is short but it does reveal in part, for those who listened, the direction of this administration and some of its underlying philosophies. It indicates that the government will consult more with neighbouring states and provinces than it did in the past. It states our concern for the profligacy and waste caused by acquisitive North American values.

The most important point of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is that it underlines our party's interest in the people and our government's determination to provide quality services for those people.

If anything characterized the previous administration, it was a lack of active concern for the needs of people. The mess which the new cabinet is trying to

[[Page 330](#)]

tidy up now is evidence of that.

The condition of our health and correction facilities, our pension plans, social services — all of these are criminally inadequate. I'm pleased to note that the NDP has already taken positive steps to improve those services.

It will take time and a good deal of study before remedial measures are implemented and I realize that our own people out there are extremely impatient. But it should be clear to all of us by now that this Government is determined to keep its promises.

One promise we made before the last election is to create a government automobile insurance plan. As the throne speech indicates, legislation to establish the plan will be presented during this session.

The merits of government automobile insurance have been debated for more than two decades — since it was first successfully introduced in Saskatchewan. No doubt the ground will be covered again most thoroughly when the bill comes up for consideration in the House.

I'd like to say this, Mr. Speaker: in spite of the misinformation propagated by the insurance companies and the Insurance Bureau of Canada; in spite of the expensive and misleading "option" campaign which recently flopped in this province, the people of British Columbia want government monopoly of auto insurance. They want it as soon as is humanly possible and they don't want a watered-down version such as that offered by the Liberal Party during the last campaign. That plan was a thinly-disguised attempt to subsidize insurance companies in order to get in on their campaign loot.

All of the letters I have received since the election have supported government auto insurance. Several have asked us to go much further, into other lines of insurance such as home protection and small craft insurance. I suggest that once the automobile plan is in operation, the Minister should give those requests serious consideration.

Throughout the last campaign — and especially on the question of automobile insurance — the Opposition kept referring to the old saw of "free enterprise versus socialism". And why not? Like mother's home remedy, it worked in the past.

I understand that some of the Members on the opposite benches are starting a new "old line" party — new party but same old line (Laughter) — that has offered to restore free enterprise to British Columbia. But is it still possible that those people over there believe that free enterprise ever governed the economic life of B.C.? Mr. Speaker, free enterprise never existed. It's a myth that has clouded the thinking of old line parties for years.

From the time of its inception, this province has been company-dominated. Our first governor was an employee of the Hudson's Bay Company and later administration, although not directly on corporate payrolls, divided up this province into huge corporate concessions.

For example, there's now two major fishing companies operating in this province — both foreign controlled. A small clique of timber companies have divided among themselves the largest part of our Crown forests. The same can be said of mining, manufacturing, transportation and food processing industries.

The most visible characteristic of the economic development in this province has always been monopoly or oligopoly control. It is truly the "company" province.

I noticed in the Press recently that the Combines Investigation section of the federal government has begun

proceedings against several building product firms. I don't intend to go into that issue because it's before the courts. However, I'd like to speak briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the problem of industrial concentration because it's of particular interest to the people of Alberni who are dependent almost entirely on concentrated industries such as fisheries and forestry.

There are three major forest management concerns in my constituency: Tahsis Company, mainly with mills in the northern part of the constituency at Gold River and Tahsis; MacMillan-Bloedel, in the central part of the island with mills at Port Alberni; and B.C. Forest Products, with large holdings on the coast and in the Nitnat area in the south of my constituency.

In all areas, forest company cheques are the largest payroll. In three of the municipalities, forest-related industries pay the largest portion of municipal taxes. In the Nootka Sound-Kyuquot Sound-Barkley Sound areas, restricted access logging roads are the only means of ground travel for people and freight. If the company changes its cutting areas, those roads would be abandoned or neglected. If a company decides to close its operation or to cut down on production near or in a municipality, that municipality could end up as a ghost town — Ocean Falls is a good example.

The point I am trying to make is that large forest management companies have a tremendous influence in the economic, social and political life of every community in my riding. I believe this is a dangerous situation because corporate priorities are not the priorities of the people in those communities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the needs of the people — their priorities — are the first concern of this Government.

The first priority of a corporation is to make a profit. The first concern of corporate management is to return a profit to that corporation. There's nothing wrong with this concern from a management point of view. It's often a question of survival in a high-pressure line of work.

Often corporations demand such an intense loyalty from management that family and personal

[[Page 331](#)]

life, marriages are sacrificed to the profit motive. The result is a small executive elite which tends toward a peculiarly distorted point of view. It's a point of view that can only conceive of costs and benefits in terms that can be quantified into dollars. If a man wishes to survive in the management game, he must cultivate that point of view to the exclusion of all others.

I once had lunch with a manager from a forest company and the conversation after lunch turned to his company's decision to subdivide and sell lands that were previously under forest management. The reason for subdivision was that the lands were no longer useful for harvesting of trees. It was mainly rock and it couldn't be replanted.

When I suggested that the company leave the land in its present state for recreational or aesthetic reasons, he said that no benefit would accrue to the company unless the land was developed, and consequently it will be developed. I can understand why a person with that viewpoint became a successful corporation manager and I can appreciate that survival in his career motivated his decision. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that men with this point of view should be allowed to exercise control over the everyday political, social and economic lives of people in large areas of this province. Because most people are not devoted to the earning of corporate profits but are interested in the enjoyment of their friends, their families and the environment of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the previous government abdicated much of its planning function to corporations. Not simply the responsibility for planning resource management, but also the function of planning services to people. In many communities such as Gold River and Tahsis and the Nootka-Kyuquot Sound region, where community life is dominated by the company, the people are extremely unhappy.

To their credit, the corporations do attempt to solve some of the people's problems. But because of management's particular point of view, their limited understanding of problems that aren't production or profit related, solutions are not always possible. What is required, Mr. Speaker, is a Government take-over. I'm not asking that the Government nationalize the large forest firms, simply that we take over some of the functions that have previously been turned over to those firms by default of the previous government.

Some of the functions I'm thinking of at the moment are fish, wildlife and land management; provision of housing, transportation, recreational and other services. I know that the companies would willingly part with these functions. I'm not so sure that they'd be willing to pay for them if the Government took them over, but I'm convinced that they should pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Government will begin to pursue a functional type of socialism within a short time; that it will signal its intention by assuming the function of providing full-time road access on a joint-use basis to communities in the northern part of my constituency.

I would also like to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) give close attention to company-dominated towns, perhaps with a view to taking over vacant land in those towns that are presently controlled by forest companies. I'm not asking that this should be done without compensation, I believe that the companies originally paid \$100 an acre and perhaps we should buy it back for that price.

I would also like to see the whole question of industrial concentration in the forest industry submitted to a commission of inquiry. As the previous speaker said, a commission of inquiry in the forest industry is long overdue, and I agree with that. I believe there's strong evidence to indicate that private monopolies and oligopolies are causing us tremendous economic harm. Ralph Nader's study group on antitrust enforcement in the U.S. has produced some startling information to back up this assertion.

For example, and I'm quoting from the antitrust study group: "27 out of 28 econometric studies have found a significant correlation between monopoly market power and high prices ... An internal federal trade commission report notes that if highly concentrated industries were deconcentrated to the point where the four largest firms controlled 40 per cent or less of an industry's sales, prices would fall by 25 per cent or more." And third, "the overall cost of monopoly and share monopoly in terms of lost production is somewhere between \$48 billion and \$60 billion annually."

Those facts, Mr. Speaker, apply mainly to the United States, but I'm certain that if the effects of industrial concentration were investigated in this country, we would find that it is equally harmful here. Nader's book also documents the effects of monopolies on unemployment, inflation, political and social life, industrial efficiency and innovation. The picture presented by that study is not a happy one and indicates a pressing need for a study to be done in our own province.

The taxpayers and consumers of this province are tired of feeding the bank accounts of bloated monopolies that have controlled the economy of this province for years. They welcome the Government's announcement that a commission will be established to control prices in the oil industry. They welcome the investigation into price-fixing among building products firms. They would like to see action taken to control prices in other highly-concentrated sectors of the economy.

Before I leave fisheries and forestry entirely, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Members to the important question of maintaining

[[Page 332](#)]

fish and wild life habitat. This is one of the functions I mentioned previously that had been turned over by the previous government to the forest management companies. The result has been the wholesale destruction of spawning streams, estuaries and wildlife winter ranges.

There was a picture in the Vancouver *Sun* recently which shows the Cameron Valley, located in my

constituency, completely stripped of trees up to a level of about 2,000 feet. This valley is a national disgrace. Not only is it bad management of wildlife habitat but it's also bad forest practice. If the company had logged the valley floor and the side hills in alternate patches, they could have built roads on the side hills long ago. Now they have to build those roads at today's spiraling costs. The cost of harvesting poorer timber at the higher levels has become prohibitive. In the meantime, as a result of creaming all the best timber from the valley bottoms, they have destroyed the habitat and brought elk on this island to the verge of extinction.

The story is the same in watersheds such as the Gold River, the Heber River and the Englishman River. This Government must draw the line on destructive logging practices and they must do it quickly. I know that the Minister is concerned about this issue and he has seen firsthand the effects of poor logging practices when we visited the Indian River and Staghorn Creek in the Tofino area. I hope that new regulations governing fish and wildlife habitat will be forthcoming before cutting permits are issued for this winter's logging.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) took a little time out from his speech to discuss a topic about which he had strong feelings. For a few minutes today I'd like to do the same.

I'm sorry the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) isn't here. While I was a student at the university, I worked for two years at Oakalla Prison Farm and I'd like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that Oakalla was a real education for me. There is far more to learn in prisons about human relationships and our society's attitudes than you can ever possibly learn in a university. It was an experience that had a profound influence on me and one that I won't soon forget.

Large penal institutions have a brutalizing effect, not just on the inmates who live there but also on the people who work in them. The reason is that it's institutional rather than human needs that your job is designed to fulfill. For example, if a man asks to have a shave or a shower, you have to tell him to wait until the time appointed, no matter how uncomfortable he feels. We must remember that time is an institutional dimension, as well as the four walls. If a man asks for a job to do so that he might feel useful or so that he might relieve the tension that he feels after being cooped up alone in his cell all day thinking about his problems, you have to tell him that there's no work to do. It's all been taken care of in an institution. Or that prisoners on remand can't work — they're not allowed to. If a man is having difficulty with his family relationships or with his trial and he wants a special visit or a phone call to the outside, you have to tell him to put his name on a long list. By the time his name comes up, it may be too late to solve the problem.

The result is an increase in tension and anxiety, an emotional strain which often leads to senseless violence, attempted suicides and suicides. I can give you several examples. One of an inmate from the lower mainland, a fairly young man about my age, who couldn't sleep one night. He was pacing his cell, concerned about the problems — his trial, his appeal — so as I walked past his cell one night, he took the sharpened tip of his spoon and drove it into his arm. By mutilating his body he was able to get out of the cell, go to the hospital for a change of scenery, I suppose, and to get a prescription for sleeping medication to get rid of his problem.

On another night, when I took the midnight count prior to taking over supervision of the west wing, I found another man slouched over his bed and the whole floor of his cell was covered with blood. He had slashed every vein on his body that he could reach with a razor blade before losing consciousness. It took five hours of surgery and several transfusions to revive that man. But he did suffer some brain damage and he will never recover.

I could recount hundreds more incidents from my experience, incidents of self-mutilation, attempted suicides and successful suicides. But I'd like to mention two assaults on staff that occurred while I worked there. In one case, a guard was beaten unconscious by inmates armed with metal chairs. In the second case, another guard was beaten and permanently disabled with steel bedposts.

Both of the staff members involved were fairly gentle, family men and the attacks on them were not personally motivated. They were simply mindless, violent, responses resulting from institutional tensions and frustration. I don't know what kind of thought went into the design and operation of such an inflexible, ineffective, dehumanizing institution like Oakalla. I can't understand the kind of mediaeval thinking of the Government that

maintained it over the past 20 years. I can't understand what kind of thinking kept that institution going. They can't say like the people who lived in the shadows of Dachau and Auschwitz that they didn't know what was going on in there. They knew it and they remained silent.

They knew that until about five years ago, the whole institution was crawling with cockroaches. They knew that the very bricks of the building were permeated with the stench of 60 years of close human habitation. They knew it was a school of

[[Page 333](#)]

crime, a breeding ground of drug addiction and homosexuality and they did nothing about it.

They could be excused if a prison like Oakalla solved problems, if it protected society or if by punishment offenders it was a deterrent to crime — or even if it corrected offenders. But prisons, and that one especially, did none of these things. A man who goes to Oakalla leaves there permanently scarred.

In many cases, simply because of long separation, he has lost touch with his family and friends, those who might give him support in becoming a good citizen when he hits the street. When he does get out of prison he is lonely, insecure. He's not under supervision but always under suspicion.

His only contacts are those from prison and when I worked there something like 85 out of 100 inmates committed crimes again and returned.

The previous government might be excused if institutional prisons were less expensive and they were always concerned, Mr. Speaker, about balancing the book. If there was some kind of a trade-off between social costs and economic benefits they might be excused. But it has always been demonstrated clearly that institutional prisons are far more expensive than other means of correction.

If we adopted a programme in this province of increased supervision and support for offenders in the community, we could allow many inmates to provide for themselves and their families and possibly to pay some compensation for their victims. This type of programme would keep family and friends together, strengthen the offender's position in the straight community, rather than disrupting it, and although the professional staff required would be more highly paid than custodial staff, they can handle the higher case loads, and the cost per person under supervision would be lower.

Under the present correctional system we break up families, put the bread winners in prison and leave the rest of the family to struggle along on welfare and the crime victim instead of receiving compensation or partial compensation is saddled with prison and welfare bills in addition to his original losses.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that some offenders should never be sent to jail and I am also convinced that some require such a high level of supervision that perhaps they should never be let out. But there should be varying levels of custody in between prison and unconditional release.

These could be in the form of day paroles, work releases, weekend sentences or half-way houses and conditional releases. These forms of supervision and support can only be prescribed by people who are trained and experienced in the analysis and modification of human behavior. For this reason I think the judges who are trained to determine on law and on facts and on the conduct of legal processes should never be allowed to pass sentence on people.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the Hon. Attorney-General has reversed the trend of the past 20 years. He has established a commission to inquire into the operation of the corrections branch and I hope that this committee will recommend the demolition of Oakalla and similar institutions, and that we will move into more productive methods to prevent and to correct criminal behavior.

If the Attorney-General needs someone to hammer down the first wall of that barbaric institution, I'd be

perfectly willing to handle the hammer and the wrecking bar if the Opposition will let me hold onto it for a while. I understand that another Member of the cabinet has some experience in this regard and I'd be pleased to work alongside him.

I'm also pleased to hear the new Government — and this is on another topic — has devoted some of its effort towards making cities more livable by improving rapid transit facilities, by negotiating better financial and land banking arrangements for urban housing and by rationalizing the boundaries of municipalities. Also by demanding better treatment for sewage and other municipal services. I am aware that Canada is the fastest urbanizing country in the world and that these measures to improve the quality of urban life are long overdue.

The previous government in its unplanned, ad hoc way either ignored urban problems and hoped that they would disappear or more often than not they aggravated those problems by gerrymandering municipal boundaries, by catering to speculators and by ignoring sound planning techniques. As an MLA for a rural constituency, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this new focus on problems of urban decay, mainly because of my concern for the people who suffer the effects of an unhealthy city environment. However, a beneficial side effect of this concentration on city problems and their solutions is the relief of pressures on suburban and rural areas.

As the Government improves the quality of life in the cities and makes them more desirable places to live, and as they reorganize land use priorities in the rural areas, we can expect to see the tapering off in the progress of urban sprawl and sporadic residential development outside of cities. Many people on the east coast of Vancouver Island and in the Alberni Valley have witnessed the sprawl of urban development into the rural area and most of this sprawl is of the worst type imaginable. Subdivisions hurriedly carved out of farm and forest lands, poorly serviced with gravel roads and inadequate provision for water supplies and sewage disposal.

As these subdivisions multiply, local services and environmental systems are taxed beyond their limits. Schools are over crowded; power distribution is hampered by excessive demands resulting in low voltage and frequent interruption and streams and

[[Page 334](#)]

wet lands are polluted by sewage disposal fields.

At the same time assessments and taxes are increasing to the point where rural residents are unwilling and in many cases unable to pay. The only people who profit from this state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, are a small group of land speculators whose greed for short-term profit saddles the Government with the necessity to provide for services and the people with the necessity to pay for them.

Not the least among these speculators were several Social Credit MLA's and the sons of Social Credit cabinet Ministers and although they claim they are as strong as ever, I'm sure that this is not the case and for the people of Alberni anyway, I say that we are well rid of them.

But we in the rural constituencies recognize the need to improve urban environments and applaud the work that has been done thus far, in the very few months that this Government has been in office. We urge you most strongly not to forget the out-back — those small rural coastal communities that struggled along for years with meagre assistance from this past Government and no worthwhile assistance at all from our new-found friends in Ottawa.

I would like to remind the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that there are several communities on the west coast of Vancouver Island that have no public power at all. Places like Ahousat. They requested a power generation years ago, under the former government but each time they were given the run-around. Hydro sent them to Indian Affairs. Indian Affairs sent them back to Hydro and the Social Credit MLA forgot about their problems because year after year they put their trust in the New Democratic Party.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, like others who have supported us for many years, the efforts of the Ahousat citizens were rewarded and a government was elected that is concerned about people in small communities. These people

now expect a fair deal from the Government, Mr. Speaker, and I'm certain that our Premier won't let them down.

I visited Ahousat several times last year and I was taken around the village from house to house by members of the band council and the band council has done a tremendous amount of work to build up that community. Improvements in housing — they have brought houses in that are fully wired and for the most modern electrical conveniences and yet they don't have public power and in one house a woman had a jolly-jumper hanging from the ceiling where an electric light connection should have been.

When I return to the west coast at the end of this session, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I'll be able to tell the people of Ahousat that a power generator is on the way.

Another convenience that most of us have taken for granted is the telephone and although I have begun to doubt its usefulness since I became a MLA there are a great many people in B.C. that don't have telephone service. From Tofino north to Estevan Point there's an ancient magnet type of system. You know the type I mean, in vogue before the advent of the 20 great years. There are four lines up the coast, a maximum of 19 subscribers on each line. It's a real feat of intelligence to try to memorize the bell code. It's also a feat to try to preserve your sanity as you're sitting in a council meeting and the telephone is sounding off in code for hours on end.

But really, Mr. Speaker, the problems of electricity and communication are relatively minor ones on the coast, although we'd like to see some solution out there. What we really need is a stable industrial base that will ensure the survival of those communities by providing work for young people. It's a real tragedy when a young person from Nanaimo, Campbell River or Port Alberni drifts off to Vancouver because he can't get a job in his own town, and possibly, in many cases, ends up involved with drugs or alcohol. But in small villages on the West Coast, the tragedy of a single family is compounded because it's shared by everyone. Mr. Speaker, I urge the new Government to give careful consideration to those who live in our rural coastal communities. Those people are stubbornly independent and, once given assistance to re-establish their industries, they're perfectly willing to stand on their own feet.

One final point I'd like to make, and a question which I believe to be of the first priority, is that of aboriginal title to the lands and resources of this province. I'm fully aware that the Premier has appointed a Minister Without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Calder) to study the whole range of problems facing the Indian people in British Columbia. I wouldn't like to prescribe limits for that study. However, I think it's of primary importance for this Government to make a basic statement of its position with regard to the Indian claims. It's an issue that previous administrations have attempted to ignore and sweep under the carpet, but the problem is still very much with us. In the long history of British expansion and colonization in America, it was the policy of the Imperial Crown to acknowledge aboriginal title, and to extinguish it with compensation by treaty. Most of the time compensation was grossly inadequate.

In British Columbia, however, with very few exceptions, there were no treaties — no compensation whatsoever. I hope that during this session the Government will make a statement addressed to the Indian people of this province and to the Government of Canada to the effect that we are willing to recognize aboriginal title to the lands and resources of this province, and that we are prepared to participate with those two jurisdictions to negotiate a fair and final and final compensation for the loss of native title. Thank you.

[[Page 335](#)]

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do want to say that I waited a long time to take my place in this debate — to speak on behalf of the people that I represent in the Columbia River constituency. The constituency I come from, Mr. Speaker, is one which is forestry oriented, but tourism plays a very important role as well. Not too long ago, just a few days ago, one of the Chambers of Commerce in my constituency wrote the Minister of Travel Industry (Hon. Mr. Hall) in relationship to the tourist industry. There are communities in my riding that would not exist — there would be no reason for their existence — if it were not for tourism. I speak specifically about communities such as Radium Hot Springs and Fairmont Hot Springs. Also, the community in which I live, Invermere, is tourist oriented.

We have a tremendous influx of tourists from the Province of Alberta. In fact, there are at least 300 summer homes on Lake Windermere owned by Albertans. But the concern expressed in the letter from the Chamber of Commerce to the Minister of Travel Industry was that related to the closing of the travel industry offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles. They indicated their concern of this closure. They also indicated very clearly the percentage of tourists that come from California into the Windermere valley. It's substantial. It's substantial.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce): Get your facts straight.

Interjections by some Hon. Members,

MR. CHABOT: It certainly has been, it certainly has. (Laughter). Travel industry hasn't been closed?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHABOT: Well, at least I'm telling you that the travel industry, and you're so secretive over there.... I'll talk about that in just a few moments. This is a letter that was written to you. If you haven't closed them, you're on the verge of closing them and they're quite concerned. They're quite concerned.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Next subject.

MR. CHABOT: You know, I never cease to be amazed by the Socialist mind. It waffle-waffles in all directions, Mr. Speaker. In all directions. I just heard the Member for Alberni (Mr. Skelly), just a few moments ago, plead to the Government for power line extensions in his constituency — that there was a need for power in these remote communities. At the same time the Premier is saying, "Turn the lights out. Don't consume so much electricity." How inconsistent are those socialists? How inconsistent are they really? Most inconsistent.

You know, the Member, the Second Member (Mr. Lauk) — and thank God there's a good First Member for Vancouver Centre, or he'd never have been elected to this assembly — he had this to say when he spoke just a few days ago, relative to research. "The official Opposition offered in debate nothing but unresearched, groundless accusations based on gut reaction and not reasoned argument." He also said, "What's wrong with your research assistant? What's wrong with your research assistant?"

You know, I was rather surprised the following day...for a statement like that from a big city criminal lawyer to be made in this House, accusing other Members not to have researched their material, Mr. Speaker. I read in the newspaper the next day the following statement about this same man who is accusing the Opposition of not doing sufficient research on the material which they deliver in this House.

This is what the newspaper article said. It's very short, I'll read it to you. "It will no doubt come as a surprise to Southam press, but an NDP backbencher Wednesday gave one of their papers, the *Province* in Vancouver, to a competing newspaper group. Gary Lauk, NDP Vancouver Centre, told the Legislature he was glad to see the quality of the *Province* is improving, and he speculated that perhaps Lance Corporal Malone was on holiday somewhere." Then in brackets it says, "Brigadier Richard Malone is the president and general manager of F.P. Publications of Winnipeg, which controls the *Sun*. The *Province* is controlled by Southam Press, a separate company."

Now that was a well-researched statement you made, Mr. Member. Very well researched! But why I bring up this point.... I don't think it's the question of the lack of research that you've made. I assure you you've probably lost a lot of court cases too. Because, if that's the type of research you do, you deserve to lose your court cases.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): Say that outside the House.

MR. CHABOT: I'll tell you, you have one Member sitting beside you that's frightened to repeat the irresponsible statements he made in this assembly. But the thing that I don't like is the disparaging remark made against an individual who is in no position to defend himself in this House, by calling him "Lance Corporal" when he's a brigadier. (Laughter). The man can't defend himself. Attack me if you like, but don't attack people that cannot

defend themselves on the floor of this House.

[[Page 336](#)]

You know that Member, Mr. Speaker, will say almost anything, almost anything to get into the cabinet — almost anything. But I've watched his performance over the last two weeks. I've watched him very closely, his actions — not necessarily his performance in this House, but his actions outside of this House. I want to tell you that he would make a better butler than he would a cabinet Minister — a better butler than a cabinet Minister.

Not too long ago I read an article in the newspaper of a statement made by the Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) — in one of his newspapers. I want to say that his attitude is a fresh, honest perspective of the political role. The man's straightforward and he expresses the frustrations and the way he thinks that legislation should be introduced and the type of consideration that should be given to other organizations in the province. I think it's an enlightening statement which he has made. It is worthy of repeating at this time.

This is what he had to say:

"The MLA from Omineca is looking forward to the re-opening of the B.C. Legislature with mixed feelings. Visiting in Fort St. James last Wednesday, Mr. Kelly admitted there has been a general feeling of disorientation in Victoria since the provincial election of last summer while new NDP Members and cabinet Ministers have attempted to familiarize themselves with protocol and the workings of government.

'I am certain things will begin to take shape once we get back into session,' Kelly said. 'At first I felt very ineffective because I had so many people to meet in my riding and so many problems to bring to the attention of the Government. I admit there were times when I really didn't know where to begin but I am now becoming more familiar with some of the pressing needs of the Omineca area, and I have spent considerable time travelling throughout the riding, meeting with individuals, with village council — it all takes time.'

'It cannot be done overnight,' he says, 'it cannot be done overnight.' Mr. Kelly deplored the private auto insurance companies that appear to be waging a strong advertising campaign against government car insurance in the province. 'These people had their chance for years and they just wouldn't give the people a break. When the people finally voted for an NDP government last summer, knowing that one of our plans was to institute government auto insurance, then they all began the great cry about monopolies.'"

Here is a very significant part of the statement —

""There's no reason why they shouldn't be allowed to sell car insurance if they wish.'"

No reason why they shouldn't be allowed to sell car insurance if they wish. I want to assure you, Mr. Member from Omineca, we'll keep an eye on you when the vote comes for monopoly car insurance in this province. We will keep an eye on you — how you vote, whether you are sincere, whether you vote by conviction or as a sheep in this assembly, we'll keep an eye on you.

But he went on to say: "But frankly I can't see any of them wanting to compete with what the NDP Government plans to offer." Nobody else knows what they are going to offer. In fact, the Government doesn't know themselves. But apparently he does.

He goes on and he says one of the main problems for you backbenchers in Victoria in recent months has been one of poor communication from an open government.

"None of us has been informed yet as to what proposals the Government plans to make and this has made it difficult for us to work on our own presentations. However, once the cabinet gets into the swing of things I feel certain that the secretive aspect will disappear and everything will be, completely open for all Members of the Legislative Assembly."

He has indicated very clearly that you have a closed, secretive organization over there, and he is looking for changes. He is looking for changes from that Government. He is looking for fulfillment of that promise you, made to the people, of open government. He is waiting patiently for open government. He hasn't seen any evidence of it as

yet. I don't know how long he'll wait.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS: (South Peace River): Forever.

MR. CHABOT: You know, I never cease to be amazed by some of the postures taken in this assembly by some of the Members, and some of the public statements they make as well.

Now I don't want to challenge the women and their fight they have going on at the moment but there are a lot of inconsistencies with their approach to a particular situation. Because I heard the Member from Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) get up here and advocate the establishment of a Ministry of Women. And then I listened to the Member from Comox (Ms. Sanford) get up and ridicule the idea of a Ministry of Women. Then a few days ago I heard the First Member from Vancouver-Little Mountain (Ms. Young) get up and defend the establishment of a Ministry of Women portfolio.

I say that if there exists discrimination against women in this province — that it should be resolved forthwith. But I say very clearly that there is no need for the establishment of a Women's Ministry, or a Ministry of Women, call it what you may, in the Province of British Columbia. It would be a boondoggle. It is unnecessary in, this province. It is not necessary, whatsoever.

[[Page 337](#)]

But I think you have to realize instead of fighting each other in this assembly on what you believe your priorities are, you must realize that at the last takeover convention of the NDP in Vancouver, you were clearly told by the Premier of this province, in no uncertain terms he told you, that he is opposed to a Ministry of Women in the Province of British Columbia.

Now what I suggest you do, rather than fight amongst yourselves on the floor of this assembly, is attempt to influence the majority of the cabinet Ministers over here. If you really, sincerely believe that there is a need for this particular type of portfolio in this province, convince a majority of the cabinet Ministers over here and if you can't do that, attempt to convince the Premier, because I think he wields a fair amount of power in that cabinet.

So, I suggest that if you're frustrated about this particular issue, why don't you attack the Premier — he's the man who has said that there won't be a Ministry of Women in this province. You won't influence him by talking the way you're doing on the floor of the House. Go to the cabinet — convince the cabinet. But first of all, convince the Premier. I want to assure you that you are going to have a hard selling job to convince him of the need of a Ministry of Women.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of statements relating to the *Human Rights Act* on the subject which I was just talking about a few moments ago. But the Member from Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) has made a great variety of statements about the *Human Rights Act* of this province. There was a substantial article in the *Vancouver Sun* on January 6 in which she made statements about the Human Rights Act of British Columbia. She said this: "The *Human Rights Act* has holes so large you can drive a tanker through." You can drive a tanker through the *Human Rights Act* — that was her statement. Then in that same article it says: "MLA Rosemary Brown has promised to have a new Act ready for the spring session." For the spring session.

Now I have had no indication that she is going to be presenting her new Act, but apparently she is going to be present one.

Then we listen to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) speak about the *Human Rights Act* when he spoke last Monday. He had this to say about the *Human Rights Act*:

"The *Human Rights Act* of this province is one statute which requires the complete thoroughgoing overhaul. It is typical of the previous government that they paid lip service to an ideal and did very little else. I will do little more than outline a few of the things I consider ineffective in the Act and leave the matter there, since I expect the commission of enquiry will do a complete study of this vital topic, and suggest amendments which will make British Columbia a leader in this field rather than one of the provinces bringing up the rear."

That speech was delivered on February 5, last Monday, by the Minister of Labour. First we hear from the Member from Vancouver-Burrard that you can drive a tanker through the *Human Rights Act*. Then she in turn says in that same article that she is going to be bringing in a new human rights Act this session. Then we listen to the Minister of Labour, who says that he is going to include in the terms of reference to the commission of enquiry the question of amendments to the *Human Rights Act*.

That's not all. Just two days before the Minister spoke last Monday, on Saturday the Member from Vancouver-Burrard, while she was speaking at the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Convention, had this to say about the *Human Rights Act*. Referring to the B.C. *Human Rights Act* Ms. Brown said: "It isn't all that bad compared to other provinces." — This is a direct quote — "The trouble has been that the people administering it didn't believe in it."

So early in January you say the Act is a terrible Act, that you could drive a tanker through it, that you would be presenting a new Act at this session. And then we hear from the Minister of Labour. He says he is going to have it revised or thrown into the lap of the commission of enquiry. Then again we see a complete circle made by the Member from Vancouver-Burrard relative to her position on the Human Rights Act — a complete reversal of her original position. But the significant thing in what she had to say here is what disturbs me.

That is the most deliberate, unfair attack against the civil service — saying that the trouble has been that the people administering it didn't believe in it — is a direct attack against the director of the *Human Rights Act*, Jack Sherlock — a direct attack against Jack Sherlock, a man who has given 40 years of his life to the service of people in this province. That's a very unjustifiable attack against his integrity — a man that I consider one of the most outstanding men in the Department of Labour in this province. I don't think these attacks should be continued — attacking the civil service and attacking Mr. Sherlock.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a strange obsession on the part of the Government to acquire land, to establish a land bank. It's a philosophical obsession they have. They'll purchase land at almost any price. They purchased some land in the City of Victoria, 4.3 acres of land. We heard the Minister indicate yesterday that he either has presently allocated \$13 million for land assembly or will, in future, earmark \$13 million for the accumulation of land. But he's buying land at almost any price. 4.3 acres of land purchased in Victoria for low-cost housing or housing

[[Page 338](#)]

of some description, at a purchase price of \$82,000 an acre.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. CHABOT: \$82,000 an acre. It's unreal, unreal, Mr. Speaker, unbelievable, that they have this unbelievable urge to acquire land and to amass land at almost any cost — almost any cost. I want to assure you that they were ripped-off when they purchased their land in Victoria from the City of Victoria. I don't blame the City of Victoria, if this Government is so hung up on accumulation of land from another level of government. I don't blame the municipal governments for, holding you up in the sale of land.

They originally made an offer to the City of Victoria to purchase this 4.3 acres of land located in Victoria West, on McCaskill Street. Originally they offered the City of Victoria \$275,000 based on a 55-unit construction on this 4.3 acres — to build 55 units on this land. After they approached the City of Victoria, the City of Victoria said, "Well, we'll examine your proposal and see whether we agree with it."

So the City of Victoria came back with a counterproposal, and said: "Well, we think that this land can tolerate 70 units — not 55; 70 units. But you've already indicated that you're prepared to pay \$5,000 per unit, so we'll up the price from \$275,000 to \$350,000 and you'll still be able to maintain your original intent of \$5,000 per unit."

What a bunch of nonsense! You know the only problem here is the fact that the City of Victoria should have said that, "instead of allowing you to building 70 units on this 4.3 acres of land, we'll allow you 140 units", and they

would have received from the provincial government \$700,000 for the land. I fault them for that and that alone.

I'm telling you that this Government has such a strange obsession about land banks they'll pay almost any price and reach any form of terms with municipal governments. It's almost unreal.

So you've purchased this land on the basis of constructing 70 units on 4.3 acres, which I consider high-density. But the question comes to mind, in view of the fact that you're competing with other levels of local government in land ownership: are you going to acquire the land that is held by all municipal governments? Is that your intent — to buy all their land? Are you prepared to pay \$82,000 an acre for all suitable residential land? Because in the Greater Vancouver Regional District there are 9,000 acres of land controlled by the various cities that make up that regional district. If you pay \$82,000 an acre for that land, you'll have wasted \$738 million of taxpayers' money.

No, there is this strange obsession. There is this real anxiety on the part of Government to accumulate land — any kind of land as long as they have a land bank.

The federal government participates up to a certain level — I'm not sure exactly but I think it's maximum \$5 million. I stand to be corrected on that — 75 per cent through C.M.H.C., in which they participate in the purchase of this land. All I want to say of the national government is that they should establish guidelines on the allocation of their portion of the land bank so that we don't have this type of expenditure on the part of a provincial government in buying extremely expensive land....

MRS. JORDAN: It's irresponsible.

MR. CHABOT: I'm not going to call it irresponsible.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): Try. Say it.

MR. CHABOT: The federal government should establish some very stringent guidelines against actions which I have described about this provincial government. This Government just wants to accumulate land.

You know, what they will do, really, in paying those kind of prices, is establish ghettos on real expensive land. They could have purchased suitable residential land in Victoria and in the adjoining Municipality of Saanich for between \$6,000 and \$20,000 an acre. They could have found very suitable land.

I didn't see the Mayor of...are you still the mayor? I didn't see the Mayor of Saanich (Mr. Curtis) nod his head, but I know for a fact that the maximum price you have to pay for suitable residential land is \$20,000 an acre — prime residential land — \$20,000 an acre. Yet they pay \$86,000 an acre...

AN HON. MEMBER: Four times as much.

MR. CHABOT: ...in their obsession to accumulate land. No, they could have ensured that the density wouldn't have been as high as it will be on this 4.3 acres.

No, I'll never understand their land policies and their psychological hang-up on the question of land.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): You don't understand a lot of things.

MR. CHABOT: There are a lot of people that understand today the attitude of that Government over there relative to its employees. You talk about compassion. You talk about being concerned about people, Mr. Minister of Health. You have no

compassion whatsoever. No compassion. That's what your Government lacks — compassion for the working people

of this province. When you set out on a phony, deliberate, feeble excuse to lay off hundreds of people in the Department of Highways, you say you have compassion. When unemployment has reached the highest level ever in the history of this province, you deliberately set out to lay people off because the money has not been provided for in the estimates. It's just unreal.

You know, I'm also very upset at the feeble political defence of the Government's position, the layoff of these workers, by the secretary of the B.C. Government Employees Union. I've never yet heard of a union leader who will go out of his way to take the side of the employer as Mr. Fryer has in this particular dispute. Here we have hundreds of workers attached to the civil service that have been laid off, and Mr. Fryer runs to the defence of the Government, runs to the defence of the employer, It's really unreal that this would ever take place. He should be knocking on the door of that cabinet over there telling them to hire these people, to reinstate these people at a time of high unemployment. Talk about a callous attitude. Laying these people off in the middle of winter. No compassion. No heart and no feeling for people. That's the attitude of that Government.

You know, one of the officials of the B.C. Government Employees Union was so frustrated by the attitude of his secretary, Mr. Fryer, that he had this to say. A member of the union of the Fraser Valley's executive, Mr. Ray Keating, said, "Mr. Fryer has know about the situation for some time but chose to do nothing about it." He said he is so dissatisfied — that's Mr. Keating — with the union's leadership, he will resign from the Fraser Valley executive.

I don't blame him for resigning. I would too, when you find an executive of the union taking the position of the employer, as he has done here, It's most irresponsible on the part of a union leader. Most irresponsible. It's not his job to defend the government. It's his job to defend the workers, to defend the people he represents.

The firing of these people is the callous indifference and lack of human compassion on the part of that Government over there — no consideration. Certainly they can spend money on other things. They have passed special warrants and they have used the very feeble excuse — and the Premier can smile and giggle all he wants. If he doesn't think this is a serious matter, he can leave the House any time.

I think it's most serious that in a time of high unemployment, hundreds of people have been laid off by that Government and all I get from the Premier is giggling and turning around in his seat and smiling. It's most irresponsible on the part of that Government and I just won't tolerate that kind of nonsense.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHABOT: Oh, stop defending your Premier. He can defend himself.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CHABOT: But not too long ago there were special orders-in-council passed. The B.C. cabinet has approved the expenditure of \$19.7 million to cover unexpected costs in a variety of areas for the 1972-73 fiscal year. The largest among in the cabinet orders-incouncil made public Wednesday was \$10.5 million for extra payments of social assistance. Other expenditures included \$6.1 million for additional payments under the hospital insurance scheme, \$1.1 million for operation of the courts and the administration of justice, and \$1 million for maintenance and rental of government buildings.

A commission set up by Labour Minister Bill King will receive \$150,000 for operating expenses during its investigation of labour laws in B.C. — \$150,000 for examination of the labour laws of this province. Not 5 cents for the workers you've fired in the middle of winter — not 5 cents.

Were there allowances in the estimates for the renovation of your office, Mr. Premier? How many times have you renovated your office since you've been in your office? Once? Twice? Three times? Certainly it's acceptable to renovate your office, to bring in bricks and fancy ornaments in your office. But you have no money for those poor people that were fired in the middle of the winter. No compassion, absolutely no compassion. Talk about a Government that cares for people — no consideration for people whatsoever.

I mentioned very briefly the new estimate of \$150,000 that was allocated to the Minister of Labour for the commission of inquiry on labour reform, an examination of labour laws of British Columbia. I'm certainly not opposed to a complete re-examination of the labour laws because if the examination will bring about better bargaining between management and labour.

I was going to make the announcement that Mr. Johnston, the president of the B.C. Federation of Labour, was going to be the union representative on this commission of inquiry. However, I made my notes prior to the Webster show of a couple of days ago and he kind of scooped me there. He also scooped the Minister, I want to assure you. He also announced that Mary Southin would be the chairman of this particular committee and we've since found out that it will be Mr. Gray representing management.

[[Page 340](#)]

We've been waiting for the Minister to make the announcement on this commission of inquiry for some considerable time. He indicated very clearly that by January I he would have set up this structure to examine the labour laws of this province. No answer was forthcoming from the Minister. Then when he spoke in the House last Monday, he said: "Within 24 hours I'm going to make an announcement as to who is going to be on that commission." What do we get from the Minister to this day? What do we get but silence — that's all we get from the Minister on this commission of inquiry.

But his friends are talking today and what are they saying about his inquiry? They've told him in no uncertain terms what they think of his inquiry. Here's an article that appeared just last night in the *Vancouver Sun*. It says:

"Organized labour's unhappiness with the New Democratic Party Government came out in the open Thursday night. George Johnston, president of the B.C. Federation of Labour, which worked harder than ever before to help elect the NDP, confirmed that he had been asked to sit on the Government's proposed three-man commission of inquiry into labour laws.

But he said he will not be available to serve on the commission which labour Minister William King has had difficulty assembling. 'To anyone suggesting I am on a commission which the Minister has not yet named, I can only say that I am not.'

Then they went on to tear apart the other individuals that are on this commission that hasn't been announced by the Minister. It was stated by a spokesman of the Vancouver and District Labour Council on the question of the chairman of this commission that the chairman has to be neutral. That's their attitude already before the commission's been established about the chairman — that the chairman cannot possibly be neutral because she has been a card-carrying member of the Conservative Party for a long time. They've already destroyed her position on this commission. If I were Miss Southin, I would resign forthwith from that commission.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: No, I wouldn't resign from the party because they need a lot of help.

They've also discredited the position of Mr. Gray of Cominco in Trail as the representative of management.

They go on to say that this labour movement — and this is a spokesman for the Vancouver and District Labour Council — he says: "This labour movement played a major role in defeating the Socreds." They played a major role — they tell us, right now. "And we have no choice but to insist that unjust legislation used to put people in jail be scrapped," Thompson told the delegates."

Do you know that to placate the labour movement the Minister of Labour revamped his deadline because he had been told publicly and otherwise that 18 to 24 months was too long before he would bring in changes to the labour laws of this province? But he went on to say that, "I will not accept band-aid legislation, ad hoc pieces of legislation. I want a complete review and a complete change in the labour laws of British Columbia." Because of pressure put on him by the B.C. Federation of Labour, he has revamped his position on the deadline as to when he would make changes in the labour laws of British Columbia.

He's moved from 18 to 24 months and now he's revamped it to 6 to 8 months — a very drastic change indeed.

Certainly it's been changed because of the pressure put on him. Now they are attempting to scuttle his commission, that's what they're doing. I want to say that if you're not going to use band-aids on legislative changes, you're going to need a lot of band-aids to re-institute that commission of inquiry, I want to assure you of that.

I had hoped that the commission of inquiry would bring about changes in the labour laws that would be conducive to making collective bargaining a more realistic thing in this province. I had hoped and I was not opposed to that. But I tell you, his friends and your friends have scuttled his commission and he's going to have great difficulty re-instituting or resurrecting that commission now — very great difficulty. He's going to need those band-aids he's often talked about.

Another question which I'm sure the Minister of Travel Industry and Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) will enlighten us about when he speaks, is the question of the vote presently being taken by the B.C. government employees relative to the affiliation with the B.C. Federation of Labour. There is presently a vote being conducted amongst the organized civil servants of which there are between 15,000 and 16,000.

I would hope that there is a negative vote in this canvass. I suspect there will be a negative vote but the thing that bothers me is that the Minister has talked about instituting the Rand formula. If you want to belong to the labour union, you must contribute — that's what the Rand formula is all about.

But the affiliation question is one that should be not entertained at this particular time if the Government is going to introduce legislation dealing with the Rand formula being instituted on the B.C. Government Employees' Union or the civil service of this province.

I do not think that 8,000 civil servants should decide on behalf of 32,000 whether affiliation should

[[Page 341](#)]

take place with the B.C. Federation of Labour. I think that the Minister for once should show some courage and tell the B.C. Government Employees Union that he will not tolerate at this time at least, an affiliation vote to be undertaken by the B.C. Government Employees Union for an affiliation with the B.C. Federation of Labour.

I've always believed that civil servants should not be involved in contribution unless it's a personal thing, as a group to any political party. And I want to assure you that an affiliation with the B.C. Federation of Labour is a direct political financial contribution to the NDP. That's what it is. Because they are so intermingled today — the B.C. Federation of Labour and the NDP that you don't know who is on the executive of the NDP and who is on the executive of the B.C. Federation of Labour. They are one and the same, Mr. Speaker, one and the same. And it's a politically oriented organization and not labour oriented. They are more interested in politics than they are in labour welfare — that particular organization. And the Premier knows that full well. That's why he's trying to brush them aside from time to time with his little volleys of Press releases against Mr. Haynes and so forth. Attempting to show that there is a very distinct line between the NDP and the B.C. Federation of Labour. They are one and the same. They are one and the same, that's what they are. I hope that the Minister when he speaks, will speak on this most important question of the affiliation vote of the civil service with the political organization — B.C. Federation of Labour.

We have today a most critical and crucial union dispute you might call it a battle — taking place in the west Kootenays at Cominco. It's one in which the Canadian Workers Union are attempting to gain the control of the membership of the United Steelworkers of America. And this is legal. There is nothing wrong with that, because the laws of this province state very clearly that members can belong to the union of their choice. Apparently there are some of the members at Cominco that want to belong to the Canadian Workers Union. During the eleventh and twelfth month of a contract they have an opportunity of attempting to organize these workers, which they have done. The seventh and eighth month — I'm sorry. I apologize.

Now, they need 50 per cent signed up in their union....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: Wow! You are going to be so technical. 50 plus one. 50 per cent plus one the Minister says — plus one in order to bring about a vote. I hope that the Minister will not allow any legal technicalities to stand in the way of the right of those workers to take a vote. The vote has been counted and tabulated by the Labour Relations Board some considerable time ago. Weeks ago. Don't allow any legal technicalities to stand in the way of the workers determining which union will represent them.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): Did you interfere with the work when you were Labour Minister?

MR. CHABOT: The Minister knows full well — and it has been stated by the unions over there that any delay will be beneficial to the United Steel Workers. It's been said by the United Steel representatives up there that they are hoping for delay. They are hoping for delay because it will be beneficial to them. I want to assure you that I'm not taking sides as to Canadian Workers Union or United Steel Workers. But I think that the workers have a right to determine the union of their choice without delay.

HON. MR. KING: They know the Act better than you do.

MR. CHABOT: If the delay continues, Mr. Minister of Labour, one has to suspect that some other matter has not come to the surface. Some other matter in this dispute has not come to the surface if there's any further delay in the taking of a vote — if they have 50 per cent plus one, as you say, of the representatives.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Hon. Member please address the chair.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Two years at Harmac before you gave them a vote. Two years.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: Today, the Labour Relations Board for instance is under attack from all sides — is under attack from your friends the B.C. Federation of Labour, the Vancouver and District Labour Council. I don't consider the B.C. Federation of Labour a union and they are not. They are a political organization and you know it. That's what they are. But the Labour Relations Board is under attack at this moment from the Vancouver and District Labour Council and the B.C. Federation of Labour. They are under attack. They want to abolish it. And I want to assure you that the Labour Relations Board of British Columbia will disappear. The will and the wish of the B.C. Federation of Labour will be fulfilled. They will disappear because that body has a tremendous influence over that particular Government.

But I want to plead with them before they do away with the Labour Relations Board. That they give some consideration to the expansion of that

[[Page 342](#)]

Labour Relations Board: that they give representation to the Canadian unions on the board. You presently have two international reps on the board. Don't you think the time has come for a Canadian union representative on that board? They represent almost one-third of the organized labour force in this province and they have a right to have a representative on that board.

I want to assure you that the Canadian union movement is here to stay. I think that they should be represented and I hope you will not be influenced by the B.C. Federation of Labour when I appeal to you to allow the Canadian unions to be represented on the board. I know full well that the B.C. Federation of Labour is most violently opposed to the Canadian unions being on that board. But I hope that sanity will prevail and that you will allow this one-third of the organized labour force to have a say on the decisions of the Labour Relations Board.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a national publication that came out not too long ago — in the month of February which talks about our Premier — called the *Maclean's Magazine*. It has wide distribution from coast to coast. I was most embarrassed by this particular issue of *Maclean's Magazine*. I was embarrassed by my Premier. I don't think the Premier has the right to embarrass the people of this province to the degree in which he embarrassed

us in *Maclean's Magazine*.

This is what it said in the *Maclean's Magazine*. *Maclean's* canvassed the various Premiers of this country, asking them 16 very simple questions. And they all answered in a very elaborate way, with the exception of the Premier of British Columbia. The last of the 16 questions was: "Which of your fellow provincial Premiers do you think has the easiest job and which of them as the toughest assignment?" Nothing is wrong with that particular question.

They all answered it pretty straightforwardly — with the exception that most of them did not attempt to say who had the easiest job. But they all said that Bourassa from Quebec has the most difficult job, which I strongly believe. But two of those Premiers went on to say that the Premier of British Columbia has the easiest job. One of them I'll mention. One of your friends from the prairies, Mr. Blakeney from Saskatchewan had this to say: "Being Premier of British Columbia might be the easiest task. Dealing with the problems of growth while taxing, is relatively easier than dealing with recession. B.C. is well endowed with resources and has a high rate of growth". That's his attitude about who has the easiest job.

AN HON. MEMBER: If that's so easy, Bennett wouldn't have had it so long.

MR. CHABOT: That's right. But they all answered these questions and very few of the questions were missed.

What do we get from our Premier? He goes on, through his assistant, the article says. "Premier Barrett of British Columbia passed on these answers to selected parts of *Maclean's* questionnaire. He answered question number three, question number four, question number five, question number 10 and question number 11." Then he went on to make another statement and he went on to say, "There was also a personal message from the Premier delivered orally to a writer." "You might tell *Maclean's Magazine* that this kind of questionnaire might be O.K. for the rest of Canada, but in British Columbia we are too sophisticated and too busy for that kind of childish nonsense."

That's our Premier talking. "We are too sophisticated in British Columbia," that's what he says. And then in the latter part of October, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi), at a meeting in October...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: I have the floor at the moment.

...at a meeting in October, a pre-election victory rally after the last session of the provincial Legislature, prior to the federal election. It says here in this article — and I'm not going to read it all, I'm just going to read the pertinent points — it says, "Levi, who arrived casually dressed and smoking a big, fat cigar..."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHABOT: ...took the lectern, looked over the assembled, some of whom campaigned for him in the by-election that won him the Vancouver South provincial seat some years earlier, and offered, as an opening line, 'Shall we all pray?'" (Laughter).

"Well, believe it or not, you're looking at a real live cabinet Minister standing before you, contrary to what some of you might think." Contrary to what some of you might think.

He said....

AN HON. MEMBER: You're just making fun of religion.

MR. CHABOT: I'm just quoting a statement.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: There's the Premier attempting to twist as he did the last time I spoke in this assembly. He's attempting to twist again, Mr. Speaker. I'm just quoting a newspaper article, a direct quotation from the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improve-

[[Page 343](#)]

ment.

But he went on: "Well, believe it or not, you're looking at a real live cabinet Minister standing before you, contrary to what some of you might think,' he said, removing his jacket before getting into a long, informal review of the just-ended session of the Legislature."

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Premier: does he consider that statement sophistication? Is that what he calls sophistication?

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): It's an improvement over Gaglardi. (Laughter).

MR. CHABOT: We've heard from the "little chickadee" from Saanich now. The "lonely chickadee" has got to infuse his two-bits worth, you know. The "little chickadee" from Saanich has been heard from.

Now do you think that's sophistication, Mr. Speaker? Do you think that accusing the Minister of the Environment of the national government — calling him a "tippy-toe gandy dancer" — that's sophistication? Is that sophistication? I think it's an attack against the sectionmen of this country. (Laughter). People have toiled.

It's a real derogatory remark and which I hope, Mr. Premier, you'd drop from your vocabulary. I wish you'd drop it, because I know a lot of sectionmen and it's the kind of remark that I would never use — referring to sectionmen.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHABOT: I don't care what you call me here in this assembly, but I don't think you should use this type of derogatory remarks and make reference to other people who have worked so hard and diligently to help make this country what it is today.

In the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, it talks about the B.C. bill of rights. Just a few days ago in this assembly they voted against a section of the Canadian Bill of Rights — and they talk about the institution of a B.C. bill of rights. What a shallow comment.

We heard during that debate from the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) who said it was a "vague comment," that it was a "vague amendment," that we thought "vague," I want to assure you that Mr. Diefenbaker, who wrote the Bill of Rights, the Canadian Bill of Rights, would disown that member of the Conservative Party for that statement talking about a "vague amendment" dealing with a section of the Canadian Bill of Rights.

It's quite obvious to me that where he comes from, he's a turncoat of the Liberal Party, that's what he is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Member, I would just draw your attention to section 40, part III, that you should not reflect upon a vote that's already been taken in the House.

MR. CHABOT: Thank you very much. I respect your request, Mr. Speaker.

There's been a tremendous delay. We hear about the great anxiety in the last election about the establishment of \$25 a year car insurance. But it's delay after delay. What is the delay in giving the people this cheap car insurance you keep talking about? The people are out there waiting for this \$25 a year car insurance.

AN HON. MEMBER: There's glue in the computer.

MR. CHABOT: All we hear from the Minister is that, "If you have an auto insurance policy at this time I suggest you renew it, because we won't have..."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: "...you renew it for one year," that's what you said, You've indicated to the people that you won't have car insurance prior to February of next year. Nothing but delay, delay, delay.

Even the legislation of that Government's been delayed.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): What legislation.

MR. CHABOT: They'll use a series of phony reasons why there's been no legislation introduced in this House. Where is the legislation? Where is the legislative programme of this Government? Are they having difficulty somewhere with getting their bills on the floor of this House? They're having difficulties everywhere, as my colleague says.

In the Speech from the Throne it talks about the creation of 1,000 new jobs in the civil service.

MR. PHILLIPS: They just fired 500.

MR. CHABOT: The annual report of the Civil Service Commission said that in 1972 there were 1,471 jobs created in the civil service. What about the 471 jobs you're not creating? And you have the audacity to put in the Speech from the Throne that you're going to create 1,000 jobs just prior to the submission of annual report that indicates very clearly that you're going to slash the growth of the civil service by 471.

I wouldn't put that in the throne speech if I was the Government. I'd hide my head in shame...

AN HON. MEMBER: They are.

[[Page 344](#)]

MR. CHABOT: ...at making that type of reference.

I talked about the unemployment the other day and I was accused by the Premier of jumping from column to column. I stated my source of information — it was from the British Columbia Department of Labour and I indicated at that particular time that there was only one column: the actual unemployed percentage figure. But after my talk, so that I couldn't quote from that thing having only the one column of figures, they've issued a new form that now has both so that they can accuse me of playing from one column to the other.

One column of unemployment rates in British Columbia says "Actual;" now it's "Seasonally adjusted" as well — a situation which never existed before. It was always the actual number of unemployed people in the province.

I want to tell you that I'm not going to use percentages of people unemployed when I talk about the unemployment situation which is extremely tragic in this province; higher than it has ever been before, not only on a percentage basis but on a numbers basis we well.

When you became Government on September 16, there was 61,000 people unemployed in British Columbia. Today there are 95,000 people unemployed in the Province of British Columbia. You can't juggle that between actual and seasonally adjusted figures. There are bodies; 95,000 bodies unemployed in British Columbia today.

MR. PHILLIPS: And then they fire 500 more.

MR. CHABOT: A 57 per cent increase since last September — a 57 per cent increase. Unreal! And yet you turn around with an unemployment figure higher than it has ever been in the history of this province not only on a percentage basis but on a numbers basis. Yet you callously and with a lack of compassion set out to fire hundreds of

workers that were employed with the Department of Highways, in the dead of winter.

I think that it's most unfortunate, really, that the new Government in its first Speech from the Throne was not more specific relative to the direction of the economy of this province, I have to conclude, Mr. Speaker...

AN HON. MEMBER: It's pretty tough to take, isn't it, backbench?

MR. CHABOT: ...that that Speech from the Throne is a hollow, shallow, vague and weak document not worthy of support by the representatives of the people of this province.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I recognize the next Member, I would just draw the attention of the Hon. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) to the standing order No. 40, part II, that no Member shall use offensive words against any Member of this House. I am sure he would wish to withdraw the use of the term "turncoat" as applied to a Member of this House.

MR. CHABOT: Is that derogatory?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it is.

MR. CHABOT: I'm sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't you know?

MR. CHABOT: If the Speaker feels that I've slandered the... I called him a "chickadee." Shall I withdraw that too? If "turncoat" is a derogatory word I will withdraw, one time member of the Liberal Party.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I recognize the Hon. Provincial Secretary.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I rise to wind up this debate and I think I should first of all pay tribute to the speakers this afternoon. We had a number of eloquent speeches. I want to say to the Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Barnes) and the Member for Alberni (Mr. Skelly) that I was impressed — impressed with the eloquence and, as far as the Member for Alberni is concerned, as a maiden speech, that is one of the best I have heard in a number of years here.

In the case of my old friend, the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom), who spoke this afternoon, his debating style is still a treat. It is a wonder to behold and I think that the knockabout style that he always starts off with is good. Then he sort of flattens out a bit.

This afternoon he really admitted to himself and to the House that he couldn't really believe what happened last August 30, and like King Canute and the waves, this province should get ready for auto insurance, Mr. Member. Get ready for government auto insurance.

The debating style picks up at the end as he designs his own answers to his own questions and then berates for us the responsibility of answering.

He posed one interesting series of figures of percentages of votes. How does 84 per cent against you stand in terms of the general election last time? How does 1,044 votes less stand? Then he'd be as big as the Tory Party he's sitting next to. That's right.

And I want to say to you: Remember what you

said about the Minister of Finance and the Premier? Next Monday I'm going to be watching; sitting in my seat to see.

who leads off for the Liberals in the budget debate.

Now then, we come to the windup spokesman for the Social Credit Party. It's a return, unfortunately, to the old politics and I like to have some fun too. But I will say that words like "find courage, find courage," words like "turncoat," have no place in this Legislative Assembly. No place whatsoever.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HALL: To try and bring home some lesson, and to say to that small remnant of a once powerful machine that the kind of man who destroyed the ship of state like the Titanic went down has now got a facsimile ruining that lifeboat over there.

MRS. JORDAN: ...he uses the word "machine" in a political connotation...(Laughter).

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that matter was canvassed by a previous Speaker and it was found that "machine" is in order.

HON. MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, if somebody hadn't written the Member for Columbia River a letter — if they hadn't sent him a clipping — he really wouldn't have had much of a speech. The letter that he referred to from the Windermere District Chamber of Commerce which he read to us was dated February 1. I received it on February 5. A reply has gone to them already. That's openness of government. The previous administration never replied to their letters, and this is what I told the good member of your constituency, Mrs. Taft. I said:

"I appreciate the concern expressed in your letter regarding the recent announcement regarding the travel and the trade industry offices. The Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce offices will be closing. But this in no way will affect the operation of the Travel Industry Department. The Department of Travel Industry under the new administration expects to involve these out-of-province offices to a much greater degree in our promotion of tourism. The personnel in these two offices will remain the same and our office in San Francisco will be at a new location and the Los Angeles one will continue."

That I have written to numbers of requests for information from chambers of commerce, boards of trade.

He talks about openness in government. I remember this Member standing up in front of the 5,000 people in New Westminster and voting against *Hansard*. Nobody will ever forget that day.

Then I remember, as I sit here listening to him talk, about all the debates about the Labour Department. I had some part to play in those. And I listened today and I heard him say, I heard him request, I heard him demand, I heard him ask, for interference on the part of my colleague, the Minister of Labour, with the affairs of the Labour Relations Board. That's what you did and the *Hansard* will show it.

He also asked me to interfere with the internal workings of the B.C. Government Employees Union. That will be a frosty Friday, my friend. A frosty Friday.

MR. PHILLIPS: Pretty frosty now, isn't it?

HON. MR. HALL: And all we had were personal attacks on everyone within sight. Mr. Speaker, no matter what the throne speech had said, it wouldn't have changed the speeches of the Opposition one jot. The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) had his speech all written out; counseling civil disobedience and predicting violence. If an NDP Member had made that, Mr. Premier — you remember this — the then Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain, Mrs. McCarthy, would have stood up in this House in a white dress and she would have called on all the revenge of everybody on an NDP Member who said that.

The Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) recycled an old speech from the Member, Hunter Vogel, some years ago — said it beautifully. But I want to say this about the flood plains of Surrey and the Hazelmere Valley — "the vegetable salad bowl," he calls it. I was the first Member to bring the diking district to meet the Minister of Agriculture and the Lands and Forests Minister in 1967. Even before he had spoken, the diking commission, the flooded farmers, had been in the office of the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources. And they now are

confident that something will be done after waiting for six years, believing promises by the previous administration.

The Member for Boundary-Similkameen (Mr. Richter) talked of the heavy hand of state socialism, a phrase borrowed from his boss. His absent boss.

HON. MR. BARRETT: By telegram.

HON. MR. HALL: And I guess that's all we will hear from both of them for the rest of the session. (Laughter). The Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) made a constructive proposal — very constructive. The only trouble was it's been made over and over and over again when we were sitting over there. I first heard it in 1965 by an alderman in the City of Vancouver. He happens now to be the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) — about a land bank.

He has had his warning this afternoon. Don't talk

[[Page 346](#)]

about a land bank because you will hear about the heavy hand of socialism. And your acting leader has given you a whipping this afternoon about that obsession of getting land.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble is rather obvious. If a politician has a strong case, he quotes the facts and he quotes the law. If a politician has a weak case, he builds and then destroys a man of straw. A politician who has no case, bangs the desk and stamps the floor. I think we saw quite a bit of that this afternoon.

The rest was entirely predictable except for one thing. I haven't heard the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) shout "rubbish" once since we have been Government and that must mean something.

The main thrust of the Opposition's case, if it has a case at all, is that they accuse us of standing still on the one hand and yet dashing madly on the road to provincial destruction on the other.

You look at the record. In 4 1/2 months, 13 bills: the Mincome guarantee; the *Mediation Commission Act*; the minimum wage from \$2 to \$2.50; a review of our own rules and practices; the *Gift Tax Act* amendments; we restored local autonomy to school boards; we ended the farcical situation of advertising on liquor and tobacco. That was October, within a month of assuming office.

On top of that, we have taken steps to set up a health security programme investigation; collective bargaining commission; we've purchased and designated as parks, several parks totaling over 2,000 acres. In 4 1/2 months — 2,000 acres of parkland — finally achieving a park system in the sensitive Gulf Islands that should have begun 20 years ago.

We've got the input we now need for the production of the auto insurance legislation. Transit people have been hired; the studies are on line. Studies are going ahead for a cooperative lottery investigation with the four western provinces. We have taken quick decisive action on the erosion of our farmlands and you scorn all of that. And we started to sort out the mess in highways that saw an over-expenditure of over \$30 million when we walked in here on September 15. We rejoined Canada.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we've listed and we've presented, and we've had analyzed by our good friends in the other estate all our programmes and all our promises. They've been listed over and over again. And you say you don't know what's going on. During the first 55 days in office, we made 42 promises. You all read that article. Surely we don't have to have many research people around to do much work when we've got a list that starts off like that. And then those who've got the real research spirit, if they want, for a buck they can buy our programme. With a dollar, they can buy our programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: A dollar and a half.

HON. MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, in my life I've never seen such a myopic opposition. It's all there, all laid

out, all official statements. There's none so blind as those that can't see.

If I may, I'd like to spend a few moments dealing with my responsibilities as the Minister of Travel Industry. As a new Minister with a new Deputy, I thought it advisable to start on a reorganization plan, which is going ahead. We are going to make sure that the work of the various branches and the sections of the department will be better, will make more use of experienced staff.

This will include an examination of the present organization of the sports festival. Again I have asked for experts and professionals in the field for help, and we will be making public our findings from time to time. The department maintains offices in London, England; Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Since the closure of our old B.C. House in San Francisco, our travel office there now occupies an off-street location on Bush Street. The decision to continue the operation of these offices has been well received by the travel industry of the province. I have some results of the sports festival. They will come out by form of Press release and I won't take up your time only to tell you that nearly 25,000 persons participated in 120 events and we got nine national swimming records in B.C. over this last week.

On research, there was a total absence of any in that department when I walked in. The department, with the valued assistance of my colleague in the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), has been able to complete and compile figures on occupancy rates in the various regions in the province. We so arrived at the approximate number of employees engaged in the various sectors of travel industry. When the final figure has been obtained, the value of this important industry to the economic well being of the Province will be further confirmed, But it's hoped to embark on a programme of basic research to assist in the future planning and the direction of the industry as a whole. We are, even as we speak, engaged in discussions with the B.C. Research Council following that council's production of a short term of reference paper.

I suppose one of these days, I may add parenthetically, we as the House may have to debate about the whole question of tourism. I admit freely and openly that I have not done that even as far as step one is concerned until we find out where we are, and perhaps where we've been. Sufficient to the day thereof let me say, but don't believe everything you read in the newspapers about some of our friends to the south. Governor McCall in Oregon has probably got one of the finest advertising programmes that you've ever seen in your life by saying, "Don't come."

[[Page 347](#)]

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. HALL: No, he now says, "Don't come," my good friend from West Vancouver. However, on examining his budget, I see he's spending well over \$1 million on promoting Oregon.

In terms of special promotions — and I don't think this will come as much of a surprise to many — we've changed the format of the annual Californian promotion. Future presentations to local clubs and small groups will be made by our local travel representatives. As a substitute, presentations to the larger consumer groups will concentrate on the cooperative promotions held in certain areas and will consist of audio-visual stuff and all that kind of thing. But I think you should know in short order that that junketing is finished.

The printing — we've printed a brand new B.C. tourist directory. It has been changed to a larger format, larger type, reducing the thickness, set up on computer, and three-quarters of a million have been printed.

The road map has been updated. If I may add selfishly, the word Surrey now appears on the road map. The reverse side has been completely revised to show how you can get in and out of some of the major centres. This problem I think has given some difficulty from time to time. A million and a quarter copies will be ready by the end of March.

Convention and contributing grants. Bookings as of January I show a record year for 1973 already on the line. Staff members are going to Montreal, Toronto and New York to make presentations to travel agents and convention organizers. For the first time in several years, the department has promoted tourism in Quebec. That's

important.

The construction of a number of hotels in British Columbia, particularly the greater Vancouver area, shows the faith that private industry has in the future of tourism in British Columbia. And I think that spells out something.

Some changes have been made and are being contemplated in the contributing grants plan. We've had a good go around with the people in the department on civil aviation. I confess I didn't even know we had a group that was promoting civil aviation until I became the Minister and that's going on line and with a very excellent person in charge. My girl friends will applaud when I tell you that it's a senior civil servant who is also woman — Elaine Johnston.

The mail enquiries for 1973 are up and already we've got records involved in all those kind of receipts. The kind of thing you'd expect that's going on in a good province with a lot to offer. A lot to offer. That's right.

I turn if I may to the Community Recreation Branch, a branch which has been discouraged and has been staffed by previous governments. In spite of that, the Community Recreation Branch has developed some 325 recreation commissions throughout the province. These commissions are not restricted to the large urban areas. They exist in Zeballos, Lower Post and elsewhere. Consisting of local citizens, the commissions attempt to serve the recreational needs of their communities. Statistically it shows that again another good year was achieved on the basis of hardly any budget, on the basis of hardly any travel facilities for the staff people to go about. A fresh new look, I hope, will be observed in that department, and I'll be discussing with the Provincial Secretary soon the future home of that department.

I would like to turn if I may — because it's the first time I've had an opportunity to make a major, free wheeling sort of speech since elected — to go to some personal notes. First of all, I want to say that it's the first session in eight — and I refer to two very good friends of mine, the Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Hon. Mr. Strachan) and again the Second Member for Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) — it's the first session in eight that no major domestic crises in my life have taken place this session. For the first time in a major speech, my wife is in the gallery.

MR G.B. GARDOM: Thought you were talking about your girl friend. (Laughter).

HON. MR. HALL: In mentioning our wives and husbands and so on, I think I should pay tribute, if I may, on all your behalf to husbands and wives of Members. I can't think of much greater sacrifice that people make.

I come from a family that's been involved with it for a long, long time. Twenty-nine years ago, in 1944, when I joined the Labour Party in England, I must confess to you all, I did not expect to be standing here today as a cabinet Minister in another country. I made mention of that in a major speech in 1967. Those early beginnings and there are a number of us that arrived here that way — the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) and one from the other side of the wall, another one from the other side of the wall, and so on. I remember as a boy reading Merrie England by Blatchford, and the Ragged Trousered Philanthropist by Tressall, G.B. Shaw — The Webbs, Fame is The Spur and those things and I confess a warm feeling — this never really left me since August 30, and I hope you'll allow me to feel that.

I remember in 1945 when the Labour Government was in power in that remarkable election in England, to my house came Lord Shawcross — he wasn't a Lord then, he was a very bronzed, smiling, ivory toothed Commander in the Navy — with his brother, another Shawcross, and with the son of Shackleton the explorer, all naval officers, all fighting on our side

[[Page 348](#)]

in 1945.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were all socialists.

HON. MR. HALL: That's right, every one of them. I renewed some old contracts in London when I was there just recently. But I want to pay tribute to others here in B.C. I well remember that I mentioned it three times today, I don't know why. I guess we've been working together a bit on that committee, but I remember the major speech of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources in 1967.

I'm going to pay tribute to Arthur Turner and to Dolly Steeves and to the Winches. By an incredible coincidence, Arthur Turner is sitting here today. And I want to pay tribute to the helpers that have helped me in British Columbia since 1957 when I arrived, people like Fred Vulliamy who died in office as a Member of the House.

And Grant McNeil and Ran Harding and a good friend of mine who was mentioned over there, Justice Berger. I want to offer my personal congratulations to him on the Nishga case, starting off as he did so many years ago.

So I'm proud, Mr. Speaker, to stand here today in closing this debate for the Government. I'm thankful for the opportunity of serving with my colleagues. I'm pleased with my party and I want to feel humble, and I do feel humble to the members of my constituency and the voters of the province. There have been lots of proud events in 4 1/2 months but none have been greater than the one I refer to in this cutting.

It reads, "Barrett backs cost-sharing plans, B.C. bucks the trend. Premier Dave Barrett said Friday night his Government will not support any financial arrangements with, the federal government that might endanger the standards of health care across Canada. 'One thing that will keep this country together is security of health care and hospital care,' he said in an interview," ...et cetera, et cetera.

I want to say that I never felt prouder of my leader and my Premier than when I read that, when on this occasion he stood for Canada in a way that we've been lacking for so long.

A lot of our debate has been spent just recently on growth — this twisted argument, if you like, about growth, where people take from your remarks really what they want to take. The New Democratic Party policy is this: we are against growth for growth's sake. The Opposition, however, believes that economic and industrial development must come at any cost. The only yardstick is annual productivity. That's why when they were Government they neglected to provide chronic care or financial support for the aged — because it didn't enhance B.C.'s contribution to the GNP.

We heard speeches over and over again — I remember the Attorney General of the previous administration standing here, with his thumbs in his waistcoat pocket, giving me those facts. That's why they were never concerned about the provision of low-cost housing — because it didn't enhance the revenue of the province in any way that was desirable to the old Minister of Finance. That's why they regarded the provision of funds for education and mental health as a matter of secondary importance — because it didn't yield an immediate, tangible contribution to the province's economy.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier, the old Government measured Confederation solely against an economic yardstick and then wondered out loud whether they should stay in. That's what they did. There's a feeling in British Columbia today that the old policies aren't good enough and the old politics aren't good enough. And from now on we've got to be concerned about planning in terms of land use and urban development whenever we build a highway, whenever we build a freeway. We're concerned about the impact of our developments on other modes of transport and we should be concerned about the total social cost accounting that is necessary in a new Government.

We've seen pollution threaten us right over from the east, from the Great Lakes in Ontario. We're threatened here. We've seen great cities built, only to stand on the verge of destruction from congestion, from crime, from pollution and decay. It needn't happen here. But we must abandon as a House and as politicians the philosophy of profligate development and profligate expenditure that animated the old Government. That's what the Speech from the Throne said. Simply and clearly, that's what it said.

This House must look to the future and not the past. The House must look beyond the boundaries of British

Columbia. The outline of the future is not obvious. The path is not easy. We can still be pioneers but we must be pioneers in a new urban, industrial era. We must pioneer in politics that reflect the changes in our province and the world and the changes in the lives of the people of British Columbia.

The new Government is going to do that. We've got lots of help and lots of good will in setting forth on the task. When I look at the Members assembled, and I could read off their ridings, I see the quality, the dedication and the experience to do that. We're not here, Mr. Speaker, to fritter away this opportunity. I don't want, and my colleagues don't want, simply to tinker about with the system. We want real change, real responsiveness and a new responsibility on the part of the Government of British Columbia.

Our actions will be based on principles. They'll be based on ideals, based on a programme. And that programme will be adhered to even if it may cause all sorts of surprise in the Opposition. Our people can

[[Page 349](#)]

say that at last here is a Government that means what it says and says what it means. I hope that it will come to pass that we can look back when we leave here, as all of us eventually will, and say that the province is the better for our being here.

Mr. Speaker, I close now, calling the question so that tomorrow we can see the first part of this journey unfold. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the call for the question for the motion thanking His Honour for his gracious Speech.

Motion approved on the following division.

YEAS — 35

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Nunweiler	Nicolson
Brown	Radford	Sanford
D'Arcy	Cummings	Dent
Levi	Lorimer	Williams, R.A.
Cocke	King	Skelly
Gabelmann	Lauk	Lea
Young	Lockstead	Gorst
Rolston	Anderson, G.H.	Barnes
Steves	Kelly	Webster
Lewis	Liden	

NAYS — 16

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

HON. MR. BARRETT: I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a committee to consider supply to be granted to Her Majesty and that this order have precedence over all other business except introduction of bills until disposed of.

Motion approved.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General, that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a committee to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion approved.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honour to present, pursuant to section 7 of the *Legislative Procedure and Practice Inquiry Act*, being chapter 6 of the Statutes of British Columbia, 1972, second session, my first report.

The Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. CHABOT: I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Langley, that the report....

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, you don't move or second with respect to reports required by statute. The are simply filed with the House....

MR. CHABOT: Well, may I ask your indulgence that the report be read?

MR. SPEAKER: Well I certainly believe that in the circumstances the report does not have to be read in this House. It is simply filed at the table and that is the rule with all reports. Unless you can show me a contrary authority, I will take the usual proceeding that the report is filed at the table and that is the end of the matter.

If the House wishes to do anything with any statutory report, they do so by motion — on a substantive motion filed by notice.

Hon. Mr. Hall files the report of a royal commission concerning the preparation and tendering of bids pertaining to the construction of an addition to the Campbell River and District General Hospital.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Cocke files the annual report of the Mental Health Branch for 1972.

Hon. Mr. Cocke files answers to questions.

Hon. Mi. Williams files answers to questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, through you, if the Premier could give us some indication, in view of the precedents motion that has just been passed, as to when the report which has just been tabled from yourself might be taken into consideration by the House,

HON. MR. BARRETT: I wasn't aware that it was going to be tabled tonight. Now that the report is....

MR. McGEER: By statute....

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, I wasn't aware that it was tonight. O.K. I just asked the Attorney General to

prepare the proper motion tomorrow so that it can go into committee as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

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

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