

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

**Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

(Hansard)

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 17](#)]

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

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

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House to welcome a student group today from the heart of the Saanich Peninsula. Students from Mount Newton Junior Secondary School are in the gallery — 31 of them I believe, unless we perhaps lost one or two through the noon hour — accompanied by Mr. Tom Brown and Mrs. Smith, teachers, and also accompanied by a very interested member of School District No. 63, trustee Mrs. Anne Forrester.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Mines.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Mr. Speaker, it's not very often I get a chance to announce anybody in the galleries, but I'd like to say that my son, his mother-in-law, his wife and my grandson are in the galleries along with Mr. and Mrs. Dempsey from Fort Steele.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Labour.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join me in extending a warm welcome to His Worship Mayor Ernest Harding from the Village of Nakusp who is here today in company with Mr. Ted MaKar, and Mr. Hugh Spoor.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, I would also like to welcome to the gallery Dr. Gunter of the University of Puget Sound, and 17 of his students who are here to study parliamentary procedure in British Columbia.

Introduction of bills.

**AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE
GUARANTEE BY THE PROVINCE OF LOANS
FOR FEEDING CATTLE FOR MARKET**

Mr. Schroeder moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 3 intituled *An Act to Provide for the*

Guarantee by the Province of Loans for Feeding Cattle for Market.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 3 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT RESPECTING MOBILE HOMES

Mr. Smith moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 4 intituled *An Act Respecting Mobile Homes*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 4 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPALITIES AID ACT

Mr. Fraser moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 5 intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipalities Aid Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 5 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

BRITISH COLUMBIA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

Mr. Phillips moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 6 intituled *British Columbia Development Corporation Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 6 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

THE FARM CREDITORS ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. Phillips moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 7 intituled *The Farm Creditors Assistance Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 7 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

TRAINING ON THE JOB ACT

Mrs. Jordan moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 8 intituled *Training on the Job Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 8 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL FINANCE AUTHORITY ACT

Mrs. Jordan moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 9 intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Finance Authority of British Columbia Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 9 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL HISTORIC SITE GRANT ACT

Mrs. Jordan moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 10 intituled *Christ Church Cathedral Historic Site Grant Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 10 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT TO REPEAL THE GIFT TAX ACT

Mr. Morrison moves introduction and first reading of Bill No 11 intituled *An Act to Repeal the Gift Tax Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 11 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT TO REPEAL THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Mr. Morrison moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 12 intituled *An Act to Repeal the Succession Duty Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 12 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

AN ACT TO REPEAL THE PROBATE FEES ACT

Mr. Morrison moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 13 intituled *An Act to Repeal the Probate Fees Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 13 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

(continued)

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to be back in the House again at this session of the Legislature and it is a pleasure to see you in such good form. I hope you enjoyed your trip to visit other parliaments on faraway shores and perhaps you had an opportunity to even see the Taj Mahal while you were down there, and to learn something of the parliamentary traditions of India. I also want to say a word to those people who travelled throughout Canada and as far as the United Nations investigating parliamentary processes and procedures there.

We hope that the information that they picked up will be enshrined in some of the amendments which we hope will come before us at some time during this session. I'd like to say at this time that I would hope the House would join with me in welcoming members of my family to the gallery today. My wife has suffered through a number of my speeches in the past. Today for the first time since I was elected we have the pleasure of having my daughter and son-in-law with me and they're holding her hand in the gallery so I hope you will all welcome them.

I also want to welcome the group of university students from across the border. I think it's nice that they take enough interest in the Canadian parliamentary process to be with us from the State of Washington. Certainly I have some fond recollections of the State of Washington since my mother was born in that state before immigrating to Canada as a young girl. So I have a number of relatives in and around the State of Washington and it is certainly nice to see a number of students here from that State in the Union of the United States.

Now might I deal briefly with some of the points that were raised in the Speech from the Throne. While it's a little hard to find a lot of meat in the speech there are a number of points that immediately come to our attention. One of course is the suggestion that there will be a bill introduced called the

[[Page 19](#)]

British Columbia Bill of Rights. I think this will be a good piece of legislation. At least we in the Opposition hope that it will be. I think the speaker who seconded the throne speech yesterday spoke very eloquently about human rights, and I appreciated the things that the good lady Member said.

But I would just like to say that the enshrinement of high-sounding ideals within the framework of a bill of rights will not and will never correct any of the human problems of this world. It won't stop wars. It won't eradicate jealousy or malice or racial prejudice. It won't improve the economic situation of people living at the poverty level. It won't eliminate ghettos or slums and it won't rehabilitate any alcoholic or anyone addicted to drugs. It will never blot out hypocrisy in all its forms wherever and whenever it exists. Because the things that I have mentioned are the result of our own individual inadequacies — collectively, and as a responsible citizen within our community.

It's the result of our own inadequacies as human beings. It's the result of the shortcomings of mankind and they will never be corrected by legislative enactment regardless of how eloquent or how idealistic the wording might be and I would hope that when we think of human rights — each and every one of us — we remember that the way to correct these problems is not by legislative process, although it may be high-sounding and idealistic.

The way to correct these problems is the manner in which we deal day to day with each other and the things that we say and the ideals that we stand for. So while the bill is to be welcomed into the House I just want to say that the bill itself will not do anything that we ourselves cannot do if we took it into our minds to do it even without the bill.

There's a mention of government-operated car insurance. It's a well known fact that this is a programme that

the NDP Government is dedicated to bring in. They campaigned on it throughout the province and I am sure that a bill will be forthcoming indicating their position. Until they do indicate their position by the bill that is introduced into this House, I don't have a great deal to say about government-operated car insurance and your plan, because it's a little hard to be critical of a plan that we don't know the details of.

But I would say this, that in every general insurance agency that I have talked to in recent months, they look at the introduction of this bill with trepidation and fear because most of them tell me that between 50 and 75 per cent of the total insurance underwritten in their offices is on automobiles. And they see that they will probably lose that business to a Crown corporation.

This means that most of them will be cutting back at least half of the staff that they presently employ. While some of those people may be absorbed into a department of the civil service which will be responsible for the administration of an auto insurance plan or auto pact or whatever you wish to call it in the Province of British Columbia, certainly it is not going to employ all of them.

You talk in the throne speech of a thousand new jobs. We question what you meant by that statement of a thousand new jobs. Is it new jobs exclusive of the average increase that has taken place in the civil service in the province over the past several years? We all know that that increase is twice a thousand on the average, so if that is what you are thinking about you haven't created any new jobs in the Province of British Columbia.

If we're thinking about the jobs that will be created within this new department that will handle auto pact for the province, all you've done is probably employ less than half of the people, if they're prepared to go to work for the civil service, who are presently looking at a very bleak and dismal future for themselves. It's going to create major financial upheavals in their lives and I think a number of people are aware of this. It would be different if the plan was going to provide a large degree of savings to the average person who drives a car.

But I would predict this, Mr. Speaker — that the average reduction in premium for the average driver who is not addicted to alcohol, who has a better than average driving record, will be very minimal, that the people who will really benefit by the introduction of an auto pact plan in the Province of British Columbia will be those people who presently are in the assigned risk category. The people who seem to be accident-prone. The ones who continually prang up vehicles as if they were going out of style. They're the ones who will benefit the most, and perhaps some of the younger drivers whose driving record is not too good, and they'll do it at the expense of the rest of the people who will get either no reduction or very little reduction in their rates regardless of what you may say about the nasty profit picture that is involved in the general insurance business at the present time.

You talk about amendments and improvements to the pension plans in the province. It will be interesting to see what kind of amendments you have in mind. Is it your position to improve the benefits and provide larger pensions for all the employed people within the civil service and within the pension plans that come under the control of the provincial government?

Or is it your position to merely transfer the accumulated funds from one type of an investment to another? Will it be your position to use the accumulated reserves in those pension plans to create new Crown corporations? Will it be your position perhaps to set up a shoe factory, or a strawboard factory, or a brick factory or a number of co-op processing plants with the accumulated funds that are

[[Page 20](#)]

presently available to you to invest?

I think that if this happens it will be a sad, sad day for the civil servants of this province. Because I will tell you this — the experience of a number of these Crown corporations administered by other NDP governments in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba have been financial disaster. If this is where you are going to put the accumulated pension funds that are available to you, your stewardship of that money, which is there to provide pensions for people when they reach retirement age, is very, very shallow. Because those funds should be invested in guaranteed ventures, not in risk ventures that you as an NDP government might decide to set up, just because this is

one of the policies of the NDP government.

It does not take much thinking to set up and suggest that you will make certain amendments to the Liquor Act. Certainly this has been a matter of discussion, both by the Hon. Premier and the Attorney General of this province, that they intend to introduce some legislation which will result in changes in the B.C. Liquor Act.

Really, there will probably be a number of this type of bill introduced into the House this year — amendments to existing Acts. But before they start opening up the Liquor Act in the Province of British Columbia, I think the Premier and the Attorney General should look very closely at a wire they received recently from an individual in New Westminster. I know the Premier and the Attorney General are aware of it, and we are aware of the wire because we happen to have a copy of it. I am going to read parts of it. This man is concerned about the effect of alcoholism in the Province of British Columbia. He is concerned about people who should be rehabilitated. He is concerned about people who have a problem trying to put together a livelihood for themselves and their families. He has this to say:

It certainly doesn't take very much to pass amendments, but to introduce new covering legislation is a job and a duty. You appear to be playing the part of a Monday-morning quarterback. Any amendments that open up the area of liberalized drinking any more than it presently is, in my view, is no way to solve the enormous growing problem of alcoholism. I would recommend an increase in liquor prices at the retail level providing this money is earmarked for the preventive education and rehabilitation of alcoholism. I fear that it appears you have a debt to pay to the voters. Your attitude is to give them what they want, not what they need. "Keep them drunk and happy" appears to be the Government's attitude.

Is that your attitude, Mr. Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking.

MR. SMITH: Is that the attitude of the Government?

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Staggering!

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SMITH: ...that you are going to open up these Acts to the extent that they will not provide anything in the way of benefits to these people who do have a problem? Certainly, if that is your intention, then you will find that the official Opposition will not be supporting it.

There has been a great deal said about the....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: Repeat it, would you mind? I didn't hear you.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: You know, Mr. Member, in the years that our party was in Government, we solved more problems...(Laughter)...than you will be able to create in the time that you are in office. (Laughter). Because I will tell you this — the positive steps that were taken by the Social Credit administration — and laugh all you like, Mr. Premier. Laugh it up and ham it up — because this has been the attitude of the NDP when they were in Opposition. But I will tell you this — that you are now in a position of responsibility and act responsibly to the people of British Columbia. Just act responsibly to the people of this province, you and the rest of your cabinet back there, who think they know all the answers, who have done nothing. Just act responsibly.

AN HON. MEMBER: They made only one decision, only one decision — that's to gain some points.

MR. SMITH: You know, the Premier would like to suggest that only through his efforts have we been able to establish friendly relations with the State of Washington Is that right?. Let me recall to your attention...

AN HON. MEMBER: Publicity stunt.

MR. SMITH: ...the fact that in 1967 a standing committee of this House, the forestry committee, made a trip, to the State of Washington to investigate the programme of the Weyerhaeuser corporation with regard to reforestation. We were interested because we knew that the Province of British Columbia could do better, I think. There was a general consensus of opinion of the forestry committee that we could do better in this province than we were doing and we wanted to pick up new ideas and new information

[[Page 21](#)]

from a state that we had heard was doing a great deal in the matter of reforesting some of the areas that had been logged off.

It might be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to know the Opposition Members on the forestry committee in 1967. It is interesting to note that we see the names of Mr. Berger, Mr. Calder, Mr. Harding, Mr. Stupich and Mr. McGeer. It is also interesting to note that the chairman of that committee at that time was Mr. Cyril Shelford and he invited not only the Government Members of the forestry committee, but all the Opposition Members to accompany us on this trip to Washington. All it meant was that you had to take off one weekend because they picked us up here and flew us down into the State of Washington and returned us on Sunday evening — picked us up on a Saturday morning.

Now, how many of the official Opposition at that time — or of any of the Opposition — went on that trip? Not Mr. Berger. Not Mr. Calder. Not Mr. Harding. Not Mr. McGeer.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, Hon. Member. You can refer to former Members of the House by name, but you know our rule that we only refer to Members of the present House by their constituency.

MR. SMITH: Former Members of the Opposition?

MR. SPEAKER: I still say present Members of the House are referred to by their constituency or by their ministerial post, if they are a Minister. Would you abide by that rule, please?

MR. SMITH: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: It is interesting to note that the only Member of the then Opposition that attended or went to the State of Washington on that trip is the present Minister of Agriculture. Where were the rest of you people at that time, those of you who still sit in this House? If forestry was a big problem then and you were concerned about the reforestation of our areas in British Columbia, why wouldn't you take the time to go to Washington State and see what they have done?

MR. PHILLIPS: They called it a "junket".

MR. SMITH: I would like to comment just briefly, Mr. Speaker, on a matter that came to our attention — and I am sure it came to the attention of everyone — in the first part of December last year. And that is the write-ups in all the papers, probably right across Canada, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police force in this country — 1972 was the year that the RCMP celebrated their centennial. I think if we have anything to be proud of as Canadians, it is the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the part that they have played in the development of Canada as a humane law-enforcement agency over a period of the last hundred years.

Certainly these have been dedicated individuals who in early years risked their lives to open up and pioneer areas of the west and bring law and order to these communities. I think it's also great that they still retain the scarlet coat that is the identification mark of an RCMP officer throughout the whole world.

These are dedicated people and today, in my opinion, too many people take cheap shots at the police force. They have become a whipping boy for all the moral wrongs of this nation. It's not fair, Mr. Speaker, because they

have been dedicated individuals and sometimes under very trying circumstances they have performed a very creditable job for all of us. We are indebted to them for that.

I'd like now to refer briefly to the fall session — the mini session, if you want to call it that — we participated in earlier, a few months ago. It was late in the year 1972. It was called by the new Government to homologate some of the promises that the NDP had seen fit to make during the election campaign. It seemed to me little more than window dressing and an opportunity for the new Premier and the newly sworn-in cabinet Members, to create a favourable impression in the minds of the public without running into very much enemy flak.

At that time everyone said, "Well, they've only been in office a few weeks, give them time. You can't expect miracles. The other party was in power for 20 years. Give us some time."

And I think in the main the Opposition at the fall session cooperated with that point of view.

But I want it to be known now as clearly and concisely as I can say it, that the honeymoon is over. It's over as far as our position in this House is concerned. It's over in the minds of the general public and, if it isn't over with the members of the Fourth Estate, it's only because they may be a little slow in grasping some of the current trends in thinking.

Now let's take a look at what the real record shows, in retrospect. One of the bills introduced at the fall session, which you were most proud of and I think that we all felt pride in, was the bill introduced to increase the old age pension to \$200 per month. A bill that would provide all the old age pensioners with an income of \$200 a month.

Now as the details of your plan unfolded, you even coined a new name for the plan — you called it "Mincome." The day the bill was given royal assent was a proud day for the Premier, I'm sure. He spoke as if he was proud of that day. It was a proud day for his Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improve-

[[Page 22](#)]

ment — and in fact for all the Members of this Legislature.

But my question to you, Mr. Premier, through Mr. Speaker, is this: Why did you tarnish what was basically a good idea? Why did you tarnish it by using an advertising campaign that deliberately created an impression in the minds of every senior citizen that they would receive \$200 per month income? You advertised in newspapers and you turned out a pamphlet explaining the plan.

You recall the pamphlet. It was circulated throughout the Province of British Columbia — a little leaflet like this and another one like this. The pamphlets even have what I would describe as a blushing pink cover. I think that was designed after some of your campaign material from previous elections to create an impression in the minds of the public.

But I say to you it is blushing pink, and so it should have been. Because the impressions, Mr. Speaker, deliberately created in the minds of our senior citizens, and what is really provided by the Guaranteed Minimum Income Assistance Plan, are not one and the same.

Initially every old age pensioner in the province thought that he would automatically receive \$200 a month. After all, this is what some of the literature said... "\$200 a month. To make things easier, there is no means test nor any special application forms. The amount of your new additional cheque will depend on the income you receive from the federal government"...and then, at the end, "and other sources."

But did you really expect, in preparing that advertising material, that the average old age pension was going to read completely, line for line, word for word what you said in that advertising material? I think you owed the people who were on old age pension a little more than that. Because many of them, if they presently do not receive the guaranteed income supplement, got nothing in the way of an increase in their old age pension. They got a big fat goose egg. Many of you, when you were in Opposition stood in your place in this House and castigated the general

business public for misleading advertising. In my opinion, if there was ever misleading advertising published, it was the type of advertising that came out in those leaflets and in the papers concerning the introduction of the \$200 a month old age pension.

Surely many of you must have received the same type of phone call that I did right after the introduction of the plan — and the cheques were supposed to be in the mail. The conversations went something like this: "When will I receive my cheque? Will the difference come from the province in a separate cheque? The advertising said that it will be automatic, that we didn't have to apply. Do we have to apply? My neighbour got her cheque, but I didn't get one. Why not?"

All of us in the official Opposition received those types of phone calls, and I'm sure that Members on the Government side of the House must have received phone calls of a similar nature.

You know, it took a lot of explaining to elderly people that contacted me to tell them that "well, perhaps you won't receive an increase in old age pension. Do you presently receive the guaranteed income supplement? And if you don't receive that"... then I had to go into great detail as to why they wouldn't receive \$200 a month old age pension. And to me that was a fault of the type of advertising that you deliberately used to promote that plan. It was cheap and shoddy advertising that gave an indication and left an impression in the minds of old age pensioners that they would, in fact, receive an increase in their pension benefits. And you know that many of them did not receive it, and many of them will never receive it.

I'm sure that some of you must have realized the problem that you were creating in the minds of old age pensioners. Because after the plan was in effect and after the flak began to fly and after, I'm sure, many of you received the phone calls in the same manner that I did, the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement sent a letter to every MLA in the Province of British Columbia. It was under the signature of the executive assistant, Mr. Raymond Wargill — this must be a new position. I hadn't heard of it before.

In any event, the letter reads,:

"The Minister requested that I provide you and all other MLA's with copies of the attached field directives outlining procedures and regulations with respect to the recently proclaimed *Guaranteed Minimum Income Assistance Act* and the *Handicapped Persons Income Assistance Act*. I have also enclosed a copy of the Mincome brochure available for public distribution from the Department.

"It is hoped that this information will assist you in answering your constituents' questions with regard to these new programmes."

We did receive questions, all of us, concerning the programme.

I don't wish to dwell on the matter except to say, Mr. Speaker, that how much better it would have been had whoever was responsible for that advertising programme been completely fair and forthright in the advertising, so that there was no mis-impression in the minds of senior citizens; that they would have known that some of them would receive the \$200 a month — or the difference between what they presently receive and \$200 a month — and some of them would not.

May I turn now to a matter under the administration of the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer).

You know, it seems that the Minister of Municipal

[[Page 23](#)]

Affairs is so busy spending his time and energy amalgamating municipalities unilaterally, without consulting the residents of those municipalities and without allowing them or their councils to take the matter to the residents in the form of a plebiscite or a referendum, that he has little time to turn his attentions in the directions that would be beneficial and productive to all levels of local government in this province.

This direction, in my opinion, is to financially assist — to underwrite — the establishment of a provincial institute and faculty for the purposes of training personnel in municipal administration. Look around this province. Look at the growth that has taken place and growth that we hope will continue. Relate this in terms of the number of people employed in the field of local government — as clerks and treasurers, as engineers, as municipal managers, as assessors — in fact, in all municipal administrative categories.

I think when you relate to that you will note that the growth of British Columbia has certainly been way above the national average and that many of the people employed in these professions and jobs today are not far from retirement age, that there'll be a large number, say within 5 years, retiring. We don't even have the trained personnel to replace those individuals let alone provide for the increased numbers that will be needed in the field of municipal administration in the next few years.

Let's take a look at the record as prepared by the Department of Industrial Development in 1972, in a report they called "Growth in B.C." During the Forties our growth rate was 3.5 per cent per year, Canada's 1.9. We get up to the Fifties and Sixties — our growth rate in the Sixties — 3 per cent a year compared to 1.8 per cent on the average in Canada.

It's interesting to note also, that migration to this province is not a myth, it is a fact. That from 1950 to 1970 we had 586,000 people come from other parts of Canada to the Province of British Columbia. Pardon me, we had an increase in population of 586,000 people. We also had an increase in population of 414,000 as a result of birth, and natural increases in the province. So roughly a million people in total or, yes, a million people in total during that period.

Now, where did they go? Well, statistics show that a lot of them went to the central interior and the northern parts of British Columbia. Particularly from the period 1965 to 1970 the trend accelerated with 74.6 per cent going into these respective areas. The projection on a graph by migration to the province is on an upward curve. So that from 1975 to 1979, it will increase by 55,000 and from 1980 to 1984, by 60,000. It is estimated that the population by 1980 will be 2,895,000 in the province. If these projections hold true, and just an aside to the Department of Municipal Affairs — if these projections hold true, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that if the consumption of electricity goes up, as indicated by B.C. Hydro, at 9.5 per cent a year. In the field of capital alone for that particular corporation at 9.5 per cent a year, in a field of capital alone for that particular corporation in the Province of British Columbia.

But what I wanted to point out more than anything else is that the migration of people to British Columbia and the mix of population is heavily concentrated towards areas other than the urban centres. That areas like the Kamloops area will increase from 94,000 to 150,000 in 1980. In the Peace River, from 44,000 to 115,000. In northwest B.C., from 54,000 to 130,000. In central B.C., from 116,000 to 300,000.

Now these are facts, and they're the type of fact that will require a large number of additional trained personnel. That is why I would like to suggest that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) create a training programme for people interested in municipal administration. I have in mind a programme something similar to what is available in the Province of Alberta at the Banff School of Fine Arts.

Now, I realize that is not possible overnight, but that institution should be duplicated somewhere in the Province of British Columbia, and preferably not too far from the metropolitan areas. It is an institution dedicated to advanced training in a very concentrated seminar form — generally the courses take no more than two or three weeks, a month at the maximum. Highly intensified programmes are designed to acquaint people with changing trends, changing ideas, and new techniques in many, many fields.

It would be appropriate if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) directed his attention to just one segment of that, and that is the training of new personnel to fill the offices that will be needed to be filled in this province in the next few years. Certainly that type of training programme could be introduced, It should be financed by the Province — of British Columbia. It would be very productive not only for the Department of Municipal Affairs, but also for many other endeavours, and many other branches of service — both within and without the civil service, Because these are the type of programmes that can benefit a large number of people very quickly, and adapt

them better than they would be adapted if they had no training, into the field of municipal administration or many other allied fields.

There's another point that I would like to refer to, before leaving the Department of Municipal Affairs, it has been reported that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) is to be the official cabinet contact for future consultation between governments and the Northern Development Council.

[[Page 24](#)]

And Mr. Minister, I have to take what the newspapers reported at the meeting between yourself, Members of the cabinet, some MLA's for the Peace River ridings of North Peace and South Peace — even though they're vitally interested in northern development, to sit in on the consultation....

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): They know something about it too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMITH: However, if it is still NDP policy to create a northern affairs department, an idea which incidentally was originated by members of the Social Credit Party sometime ago, would you first then, in fairness to the people who live north of the 52nd parallel, spell out in concise, definitive terms, your policies and the policies of your government. Particularly with regard to the future of the north and northern development, The fact of the matter is this, that those of us in the Opposition would be most interested as this session progresses in hearing your policies period, on development in the Province of British Columbia. Because if we form our opinions from some of the quotes that have appeared in newspapers particularly in the last few months, then the creation of a northern development department is not compatible with the policies of your government. For instance, I would like to refer specifically to a number of quotations taken from newspapers in recent weeks.

From the *Vancouver Province* September 17, 1972. The Hon. Premier is reported as saying, "The day of growth and incentive has gone in British Columbia. And as long as we are in power, it will not return. I am not a boomer, there will be no growth for growth's sake."

The *Victoria Colonist* October 22, 1972. "If there are jobs lost by not developing a mine, let them be lost. The resources can stay in the ground for 50 years."

The *Vancouver Province* January 13, 1973. "Consumers should curb their use of electricity so as to reduce the growth of demand."

Just as recently the Hon. Premier, who applauds that statement, suggested that it would be a good idea if the consumers of the Province of British Columbia boycotted the purchase of beef.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): He wouldn't do that.

MR. SMITH: He did. But he retracted the statement after he'd had a little friendly consultation with the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), you don't retract that statement?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SMITH: Just shake your head or nod your head. Do you retract that statement? Which way did you shake your head, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker? Obviously he doesn't retract the statement. I think the people that are in the farming industry in the Province of British Columbia should realize, and it should be on the record that apparently by the attitude of the Premier, he supports the idea of boycotting the purchase of beef within this province.

There's only been one time in the last 20 years that a person engaged in raising cattle for market in the Province of British Columbia has got anything near a fair return on his investment. And that's today, at the prices that beef is selling for on the hoof into the market place. And you would suggest, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the price of beef is so high that it should be boycotted? It should be boycotted by people who consistently received 6 and

8 and 10 per cent increases in salary every year through negotiations and labour contracts? The only person within the Province of British Columbia who has not received an increase on his investment, who has not received an increase in salary for the last 20 years, is the person who is in the farming sector of this economy. Now, today when one part of that sector looks like they may receive a fair return on the cattle that they put in the market, the Premier says, "boycott the purchase of beef." Is this the policy of the NDP Party? Your party has talked of nothing but slowdowns, of cutbacks, of higher taxes, of Crown corporations to take over existing businesses. If anyone in the Government side would question those statements, let me refer them to some of the points that have been raised in their conventions concerning takeovers.

Let's see what the shopping list included at the last provincial convention of the NDP. Well, it included the take-over of MacMillan-Bloedel; the take-over of the production and distribution of natural gas; the take-over and the distribution of petroleum products, including retail gas stations; the take-over and nationalization of all prime area resource industries — and that is being applauded by a Member in the Government side of the House; the take-over of the car manufacturing business in British Columbia; the take-over of airlines operated by a public corporation; the take-over of all main industries involved with manufacturing, transportation, communications and finance; the take-over and operation of casualty, fire and life insurance companies — and that was referred to yesterday; the take-over and operation of autobody repair shops; the take-over, operation and control of all cable television stations in the Province of British Columbia.

Tell me, Mr. Premier, when you finish with this shopping list — when you finish with the take-over of all these particular segments of business outlined by

[[Page 25](#)]

resolution and suggested by the members of your party in your convention — what is going to be left? Are you saying now that you are going to take over all of those types of businesses? That you are going to create within the province an even larger bureaucratic set-up than we presently have? That in order to be gainfully employed you will have to work for the Province of British Columbia or there will be no job for you? Is that what you are saying? That only the friends of the NDP will receive jobs — is that what you are saying? Because if you are, that is jackboot treatment...

AN HON. MEMBER: You've got the list.

MR. SMITH: ...of the people of the Province of British Columbia. I will tell you one thing. The people who pioneered this great province — the farmers who went out and developed the province and the fishermen — didn't develop it to have it taken over in that manner. They didn't develop it to see a government come in and take away all their individual rights.

We have a crop disaster in the Peace River country at the present time. 1972 was a disaster — almost a complete write-off. Seventy-five per cent at least of all the crop is still in the field under three feet of snow and it is very, very doubtful if they will ever harvest a bushel of it. The Minister of Agriculture, in consultation with the farm organizations, has suggested that the Government would do something about it. Well, we know that over 1,200 claims have been filed by individual farmers concerning their crop losses. We know that the average loss, as closely as can be estimated, is over \$15 million. We know that the average claim that is eligible under the programme is on 224 acres of crop.

Now, if the financial contribution by the Province of British Columbia is \$2.50 an acre on eligible crops and the contribution by the federal government is \$1.25 an acre, for a total of \$3.75 per acre on eligible crops — and I underline the word "eligible" because there is a discussion and a dispute there as to what will be eligible and what will not be — on the basis of your definition of eligible crops, the average claim will be on 224 acres, which amounts to a grand sum of \$840 payment to farmers in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, \$840 won't even pay for the fertilizer that was used in 1972 by the farmers who planted crops that year. It will not in any way make any payment to those who are vegetable farmers and who produce those types of crops. It is shamefully inadequate. It is a pittance, a token payment, and it is the first time in the history of that

part of the Province of British Columbia when they have had to come to the Government for financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, there is no seed grain available in the northern part of British Columbia in the Peace River area. These farmers are going to have to have help and they are going to need far more than a measly, miserly \$840 to bail them out of the predicament that they are in right now. \$840 is equivalent to two months' unemployment insurance benefits paid to someone who is working in a job where they contribute to unemployment insurance, where their employer contributes to unemployment insurance, and they are eligible, if unemployed, to collect \$100 a week.

You know, that was bad enough — that the crop up there was almost a complete write-off, that it was a disaster. But perhaps the unkindest cut of all is the fact that you saw fit, as a government, to slap a land freeze on all farmland by order-in-council. That you gave no indication to the farmers of this province what you were going to do, other than the fact that you were going to freeze their lands. You gave no indication to them whether it was your position to buy out older farmers who had been looking at their land as a potential pension plan for themselves. Remember this — that the majority of farmers presently occupied in that particular field of endeavour in the Province of British Columbia are presently over 50 years of age. They are not far from retirement age, Mr. Speaker. They need some assurance from this Government, not by order-in-council. They need some assurance of a definitive nature as to what the position of the Government is going to be now that they have frozen the farmland.

It seems to me that if you want to retain farmland for green-belt purposes and for farming, then you have an obligation to tell the individual farmers in the Province of British Columbia how you plan to deal with them. What are you going to do — are you going to buy them out at fair market value so that you can retain that land? And the side effect that apparently you did not even consider — the side effect that is already showing up — is the fact that the day after you put that freeze into operation, all subdivided property, particularly within the lower mainland and the Vancouver Island parts of this province — the subdivided property which is presently available, the unoccupied lots — the re-sale price was inflated by about an average of \$1,000 per lot. Because you immediately created a freeze where people began to realize that if they wanted to buy, they had better buy now — otherwise there would be no opportunity to do it in the future.

So you contributed to inflation by one order-in-council. A method, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that we heard the official Opposition of prior years say time and again they would never use — only in an emergency situation. No more legislation by orders-in-council. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if it is the intent of the Government of this province to wipe the farmers out in the Province of British

[[Page 26](#)]

Columbia, they could not have approached the matter in a better way. Because the apparent direction the Government is travelling right now will force the farmers out of business.

AN HON. MEMBER: They're travelling, all right.

MR SMITH: They will zone the land without regard to the individual farmer's rights. You will tax it and increase assessments out of relation to what it can actually return as farmland. Thus, when the land comes up for tax sale, the recipient of the benefits will be the Crown of the Province of British Columbia. You will regulate it so that farmers can no longer operate viably and economically on the farm units that they have taken a lifetime to build up. In other words, you will grab it back in the name of the Crown. This has even been suggested.

The unfortunate part of it is this — that less than 10 per cent of the total land mass in the Province of British Columbia is in the hands of private owners. Do you want to leave nothing, nothing at all, to private ownership in the Province of British Columbia?

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right. That's their policy.

MR. SMITH: If that is your policy, state it clearly and concisely that you intend to wipe out private ownership in the Province of British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can't do it all at once.

MR. SMITH: I know, it's going to be a step-by-step proposition. But if this is the direction that the Government is taking, then they owe it to the farmers to tell them that.

Don't you think it would have been a great deal fairer in approaching this problem if you had first talked to the people who represent the farming economy of this province — to the Federation of Agriculture, to the B.C. Farmers' Institute, to the Farmers' Union in the Province of British Columbia? Because the B.C. Federation of Agriculture did approach the Government of this province. They said the provincial Government must lift the farmland freeze order of December 21, 1972, and replace it with legislation decreeing that future sales of farmland will take place unencumbered by government regulation, unless the land is to be converted to non-farm use.

In instances where farm land would otherwise be sold for non-farm use, the provincial government would have the first right of refusal to be the purchaser at fair market value at the time of sale. What's wrong with that? What's wrong with telling the people who are in the farming industry in this province, who have stuck to their job through many questionable years of financial return in the hope that the appreciation in value of their farm land would eventually put them in a position that they could sell and retire comfortably for the rest of their lives — aren't they entitled to the same benefits as everyone else in the economy of the Province of British Columbia?

This is all that they're asking for. They're asking for a right to remain farmers as long as they wish to farm. They're asking for the Government to take into consideration that, in their senior years when they wish to retire, they'll pay them fair market value for the land, take them out of farming and lease it back to someone else of a younger age who wants to develop and operate that farm as farm land — or retain it as park land, if that happens to be the situation at that particular time.

Certainly there's nothing wrong with that. It's a worthwhile objective and one that could have been very easily worked out by the Government of this province had they made up their minds to do something besides pass an order-in-council.

A short time ago a controversy arose between the Hon. Premier and the federal environmental Minister, the Hon. Jack Davis, concerning a port development in British Columbia. Of course that controversy has not yet been completed, because there's still much talk about the port of Prince Rupert and a proposed port at Squamish. But the information that I gathered from the papers seemed to go something like this: "What price would we pay if there was ecological damage — or was it possible to develop both sites with a minimum of interference to marine life in the harbour area? Which port would provide the best route to transport mineral, coal and forest products to market, particularly with reference to those products coming from the north and north-central part of the Province of British Columbia? What should be the total transportation concept for the north and western section of British Columbia?"

From the start, the proposed coal development by coalition mining on the Sukunka River became a focal point. Should the coal from that particular development be hauled to Prince Rupert by B.C. Railway to Prince George and then by the CN to Rupert, or should it be hauled by B.C. Railway all the way to the Port of Squamish?

From the start, the verbal battle raged and the two main contestants became so busy throwing up smoke screens for one reason or another, — and for reasons best known to themselves — that I think the most important consideration of all was bypassed. The most important question is not which port the coal should be delivered to because, if you analyse the markets presently being investigated by coalition mining, it becomes obvious that the final destination for the greatest percentage of their intended produc-

[[Page 27](#)]

tion is Europe.

If you take into consideration the millions of dollars of capital the taxpayers of this province have invested in a provincially owned and operated railway; if you realize that the distance from the source of the coal to tidewater is almost identical in mileage whether it goes to Prince Rupert or Squamish as a final destination within this province;

if you consider that the secondary market for Sukunka coal is Japan; then it must be obvious that the practical solution will be to deliver that coal destined for Europe by B.C. Railway to Squamish — although the Premier today has said that there will be no development at Squamish. The economics involved indicate to me that the balance of the production destined for Japanese markets will, in all likelihood, be delivered to the Prince Rupert port.

Now if it is your intention to stand firm on the suggestion that there will be no port development at Squamish, at least give consideration to a like development somewhere in the Howe Sound area, because this is where the coal should go.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SMITH: I understand it's Britannia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over my dead body you will. (Laughter).

MR. SMITH: There seems to be some discussion as to whether that is even a good idea.

But in my opinion, really, when you're talking about this whole matter of delivery of coal from the Peace River country, the \$64 question does not involve port facilities at all. The \$64 question is this: will coalition mining, or for that matter any other mining company interested in a potential new development in the Province of British Columbia, proceed with their plans in view of the NDP policy to extract ever larger royalties from the mining industry and to tax them heavier than they have ever been taxed before?

If this is the intent, as has been suggested by the Hon. Premier and Members of the cabinet, then instead of creating jobs in the Province of British Columbia, instead of new mines opening up, instead of those that are presently borderline operations being able to continue and employ people gainfully, we'll have a position where the unemployment rate — that we know today is alarming — will be far greater in a month's time or two months' time than even presently.

The last report we had showed the unemployment rate in British Columbia to be over 8 per cent. It's very likely to approach 10 percent before very many days are out and another report is delivered to us. It's interesting to note that two years ago, at a time when unemployment was not nearly as critical as it is now, the B.C. Federation of Labour chose the opening day of the session to invade the parliament buildings to bring forcefully to the attention of the Government the plight of those people that are unemployed.

What is the B.C. Federation of Labour saying today — and more important, what is the Government of the Province of British Columbia saying today — about the unemployment in this province?

If we look at reports — and I refer specifically to the report recently published by the Economic Council — we will find that they suggest, instead of increasing taxes in the economy at the present time, we should be decreasing them. The council makes three important points: first, that contrary to popular belief, tax increases are actually a cause of inflation — and this is taken from the *Vancouver Sun*, January 22, 1973; second, that even with the present rates of taxation, because of the progressive nature of our tax system and rising incomes, a share of all levels of government in Canada's gross national product will rise to nearly 40 per cent by 1980; finally, that in my opinion — and this is the opinion of the writer — the government sector should reduce both direct and indirect taxes or, if this is not possible, at least maintain them at the present level.

If you refer to the 1971 economic study on mining, produced by Price, Waterhouse, a study that contains hard facts objectively presented by competent accountants, you will get a summary of what is happening in just one of the basic resource industries of our province — and that is the mining industry.

The report indicates that between the period of 1962 and 1971 we attracted almost \$2 billion in investment capital into this province in the mining industry; that the net inflow in 1962 was \$40 million; in 1971 it had increased to \$465 million.

Of the \$2 billion of capital that was introduced, it is interesting to note that \$435 million came from equity capital raised within the province on shares that were sold by the stock exchanges, that \$863 million came from loan capital, and that \$697 million came from capital internally generated by plowing profits back into the businesses.

Now of that somebody may say, "Aha! Loan capital. It all came from the United States. The Americans are buying out our own country again." But let me tell you the facts. Fifty per cent of the loan capital came from B.C. and the rest of Canada. Forty per cent did come from the United States and 10 per cent from other countries, particularly Japan. But it is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that the net investment in 1973 will go down from \$465 million in 1971 to an estimated \$50 million in 1973. What will B.C. do to replace this lost investment? I think this is a question that the government of this province should be occupying themselves with right now. Because if there was ever a time when you need to

[[Page 28](#)]

give the public confidence, it is now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it to a committee.

MR. SMITH: Put it to a committee? This is a good way of not making a decision, of allowing things to go along and perhaps have a worse unemployment situation than we have today. That was never the Sacred way, and you know it, Mr. Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: What of the Glenshiel Hotel?

MR. SMITH: It is interesting to note that in 1971, through the purchases of material, supplies, machinery, services, and transportation, the mining industry invested \$551 million in the Province of British Columbia. In the same year, 1971, they paid out \$163 million in wages, with an average wage of \$11,000 per employee. Then in 1970 they paid \$79 million in provincial, municipal and federal tax. Then in 1971 they paid \$76 million to provincial, municipal and federal tax authorities. It is also interesting to note that of the 22 major mining companies operating in the province in 1971, 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, and that is a point worth reiterating — 50 per cent failed to make a profit and if you take the across the board situation, the return on net assets employed in 1971 was minus 1.1 per cent. Here we have the Government of the day suggesting that the mining industry is to be subjected to increased taxes, to higher royalties, to impairment of their titles to mining lands. No wonder there is a great feeling of insecurity within the industry. No wonder the people are retrenching instead of broadening their operations in the Province of British Columbia.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it's very apparent that if we go on the record of the NDP Government, there are many things that disturb people of this province — that they have not enhanced the investment climate in this province — that you are scaring investment away — that instead of creating a better employment situation within the province the situation is degenerating and the employment opportunities will become less each day that you are in office. So far it has been your decision to amalgamate property without consent of the property owners. You set up a land freeze by order-in-council without consultation. It would seem that you are determined to eliminate private ownership; that you have used patronage in placing orders for B.C. Hydro buses without calling tenders — something you said that you would never do. That even in property deals some of the private Members have a free wheeling attitude towards property deals, particularly in the Vancouver, area. You. want it named? We all know who made a rip-off profit in the Vancouver area on the sale....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SMITH: Not a rip-off? The very man who sat on this side of the House and accused everyone that he could think of rip-offs, was a man that at this time last year — at about the time that we are presently in this session — was negotiating a handsome profit for himself on the sale of property in the Vancouver area. And if that's not a rip-off, Mr. Speaker, then I don't know what is.

You have done your best to destroy the confidence of the public. You've done your best to scare investment

capital away. You've done nothing to promote confidence, to promote growth and prosperity in the province. In the words of the mover of the throne speech for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson) — Friday afternoon. He said that you came into office in an economically sound province and he was correct. Why then have you done everything that you could to suppress the very things that have made this province successful over a period of 20 years? Why then is your attitude the way it is toward creating opportunities for people to earn a gainful living in the Province of British Columbia? Why do you suppress the very things that will create prosperity in the province and increase the jobs that are available to people when they badly need jobs? The only thing I can see is that your whole attitude is to suppress these things so that these people will not have the opportunity that they would have had in prior years.

It would seem to me that the whole attitude of the NDP Government, as we have seen it expressed by releases from the offices of the Ministers, is negative towards growth in the Province of British Columbia. It is not concerned with producing jobs. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in moving the following amendment to the message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor; that the motion in reply to the opening speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be amended by adding the words: "But this House regrets that the speech of His Honour fails to provide any adequate proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the province affecting many thousands of our citizens and their families. And it fails to deal with the impact of widespread unemployment upon the social and economic life of the province." Moved by myself and seconded by the Hon. Member for North Okanagan. (Mrs. Jordan).

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member await the examination of the motion. Yes, would the Hon. Member who seconded proceed? The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to second this motion, I would like

[[Page 29](#)]

first to also extend my welcome, and it looks as if a farewell to the students from Puget Sound. We are very pleased to have you in British Columbia. Our family, as you know, Mr. Speaker, had the privilege and pleasure of living in the United States and gaining some of our training there for five years, and we feel a very warm feeling towards the American people.

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be very proper to recall that a similar motion was made in this House in 1971. It was made by the then Leader of the Opposition, who is the Premier of this province today. After the Speaker then ruled the motion out of order, and we thank you for accepting this motion, the Speaker then advised the then Leader of the Opposition and the now Premier of this province that he would have an opportunity to bring up the subject at the earliest possible date, and told him when it would be. Did that man who is now Premier of this province follow through with his concern? He did not, Mr. Speaker. He did not follow through in 1971, the earliest time for introducing his amendment he chose in January, on the 26th day, four days later. That was his concern for the unemployed in British Columbia. Those were then considered political tactics and we have moved this motion because we feel that he is using political tactics today. It was not a dedicated motion of non-confidence. It was merely a plaything. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the employment was under 6.5 percent and it was rank hypocrisy on the part of the now Premier of this province.

The unemployment picture today....

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, that is going beyond the parliamentary usage to accuse any other member of rank hypocrisy and I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw that statement, please.

MRS. JORDAN: I'll withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, at your wish and suggest that it could almost be interpreted as rank hypocrisy.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, you can't say it indirectly if you can't say it directly and May is very clear on that point. It is ruled out of order.

MRS. JORDAN: The semantics don't matter. It is that Premier that uses the semantics. We're concerned with facts. The facts are that unemployment in December of 1971 was 6.7 per cent and in December 1973, and the latest figure up to today is 8.3 per cent.

We consider that it is a matter of urgent consideration, There is every indication to suggest that these figures will rise to an all time high in the Province of British Columbia in the next month. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne which we are moving to amend, there was not one word of concern, not one word of reference to this crisis that is mounting in British Columbia.

We listened to some very eloquent and very fine speeches in this House on Friday but there was no word of this crisis. It's as if they have been stifled and the Premier has his head in the sand and thinks it's going away.

If another Government was in office in British Columbia and the unemployment figures were at 8.3, the militant union leaders who instigated riots and sit-ins when the figure was considerably less would be encouraging their workers to riot outside this Legislature. We can only assume that they had other things to do last Thursday, perhaps even having tea with the new Government.

But we assure you, Mr. Speaker, if they have been bought off by inside information or promises from this NDP government of stronger positions for themselves, then I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the working people of this province have not been bought off, and this Social Credit Opposition has not been bought off.

We want jobs for these people, and we want them now. Not next week when the budget comes down, not next year, not when the Premier decides that he's going to recognize this crisis. But we and the working people of this province want jobs now. And I assure you, the working people of this province want the healthy, able worker off the welfare bandwagon, off the Unemployment Insurance Commission boondoggle and out of the worker's pocket. Welfare and the Unemployment Insurance Commission are fine programmes for those who need it and when it's properly administered. But the working people of this province and Social Credit object to them becoming what the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) is making them in British Columbia — people on a guaranteed holiday.

On August 31 of this year, the new NDP Government was literally armed to the teeth with active Social Credit programmes which had been built up over the years — programmes creating jobs, ongoing work projects that created lasting jobs in industry and within the government that put people to work, doing work which was of lasting value not only to the people themselves but to the province and, therefore, a good investment for the taxpayer's dollar.

You were armed to the teeth with money in the treasury, by your own admission, with which you could create new jobs, and you were armed with active programmes and drafted legislation to stimulate the private sector of the economy of this province to help create jobs, and you were armed with people to put those, who one can only kindly describe as being "shy of work," onto a job.

You had 40 years of your own socialist job-creating ideas. But in four months you proved completely passive in any job-creating programmes. Mr. Speaker, 40 years of NDP jobs barren in four

[[Page 30](#)]

months. The Premier of this province and all his party members have stated that they have a no-growth policy for British Columbia and you have proved that your Government is a no-job Government.

At the first session which you billed as an emergency session, you repealed vital legislation that protected the public interest against this sort of problem and you repealed vital legislation that controlled the inflation in the government sector and gave you a wider use of dollars, a wider amount of dollars through which you could create jobs for more people, and a wider range of jobs. In so doing, you unleashed spiraling inflation in British Columbia as well as a lack of job creation potential.

In these four months the power the NDP have, by their own admission and through the document that we are amending in order to bring the attention to jobs — which could literally be described as a sneeze from the throne — turned an open, exciting, free, economically attractive, confident and respected province into an uncertain, fear-ridden, economically questionable shadow of its former self with a major job crisis.

It can only be described — as I mentioned in the last session — as Barrett's Blunderland, and I add this time, with a jokester Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, the use of personal insults against any other Member is forbidden in this House and I wish we could retain that rule in this new House. Would the Hon. Member please remember that? I will try to make both sides of the House adhere to that rule.

MRS. JORDAN: The Premier with an exaggerated sense of humour, Mr. Speaker, entertaining in the corridors, issuing more in the corridors than there is to amend in this Speech from the Throne, frightening small investors, frightening farmers, generally frightening the people of this province who put their confidence in his hands, and in whose hands lies the future direction of their lives.

Since you took power, your positive legislation and order-in-council legislation put more money in the hands of a few and literally picked the pockets of the many. The low income people, the pensioners, the unorganized — such as the farmers. You picked the pockets of the untrained and you picked the pockets of the young people of this province before they even had an opportunity to work and put some money in them.

It is because the NDP "no-work" philosophy has denied the youth of British Columbia the opportunity to get good, interesting, and a wide variety of jobs in an expanding economy. Your policy or your lack of policy has really fired more people than it has hired and your land freeze has created a job freeze in agriculture and in secondary manufacturing of agricultural products.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, what farmer is going to dig down into his small cash reserve or his credit and hire workers when his assets have been frozen, when his pension has been frozen, when his land has been frozen, and when his very ability to make a living has been frozen. Mr. Speaker, that Minister who holds one of the most important portfolios in this province spelled out the philosophy of this Government when he said: "We look upon running a Government like running a popcorn stand," when he said: "We look upon running a Government like running a popcorn stand," Government like popcorn stands and you think the unemployed of this province are nothing but popcorn. We will not stand for this, Mr. Minister.

I ask you again, Mr. Speaker, what young person will go into agriculture when the actions of the NDP government at this moment offer him or her, at best, a less than welfare income and virtually make him a serf of the land? It shouldn't be surprising because if you read through *Hansard* the Hon. Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain (Ms. Young) did describe the NDP philosophy in the last session when she said, "We are going to teach people to work for the love of working. We think people ought to learn that to give through work is better than to receive," and on and on. It is interesting that she happens to lie very close to one of the groups in British Columbia that through pressure have gained a good deal higher — in fact, about 100 times higher — than the farmers of this province who work the land.

The Premier and the NDP Government have constantly shown themselves to be financially immature. Two of your orders-in-council have confiscated property rights, your boundary extension policy has crushed the rights of the individual people in our communities and your loose attitude toward the sanctity of contracts between government and investor has cut at the core of the free, individual society and literally stifled the opportunity for job-creation in the private sector.

This ham-handed approach, through you, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier — this ham-handed and steel-heeled approach to individual rights and the sanctity of contract is alarming. It has spread a cloud of concern over the investment markets and all other areas where jobs are created in this province. It exemplifies the emotional hang-up that we stated before that the Premier has — that all profit is evil, that all profit is dirty, that all profit is something that should be done away with. In fact, we've even had one of his Ministers, the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and

Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) who came to this province because the systems that he is now damning provided him with the opportunity to gain an education and to earn a good living.

Its democratic approach in fact provided him with the opportunity to sit in this House, and he has

[[Page 31](#)]

turned around and said we will destroy this system, we will obliterate any traces of free enterprise and capitalism.

The Premier lets these statements stand unanswered. The Premier not only unaware of the problem of jobs for people in this province seems to be unaware that while capital is fleeing from British Columbia, other capital is sitting frozen by this murky and uncertain business future that the NDP has created. And these aren't big lumps of capital, Mr. Premier, these are small businesses, small farmers, small people in service industries, families — 12, 15, 20 jobs, some go up to 50 and 100. In the North Okanagan alone 47 developments, from apartment buildings to small industries and the expansion of present small industries, all good clean industries, all good employment creating industries, are either cancelled permanently or are in the deep freeze.

Mr. Premier, if you won't listen to us, and you won't listen to the people of British Columbia, just go over to Vancouver and look at the burnpers on some of the cars. They say: "When you take your capital and your possessions to Alberta, don't forget to turn out the lights." Everybody seems to be aware of this crisis and this problem but you, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker. I personally know of at least 100 larger projects around the Province of British Columbia this is just myself, I am just one member out of 55 that have been permanently cancelled. The capital has gone, or they're very much in the deep freeze because of the uncertainty that this Government has created. And all of these undertakings would have created jobs at this time when we need them desperately.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Will you table the list of 100?

MRS. JORDAN: No, but I'll ask you something, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker. When you said last Fall, "We are not interested in little jobs," did you imply we're not interested in little people? We're not interested in 15 or 20 jobs, and little businesses, little service industries, we're interested in big projects that create hundreds of jobs. And that's all right, Mr. Speaker, if that's the philosophy of the Premier and his cabinet Members. I'm sure it's not the philosophy of all the private Members that sit there. But if that is your philosophy and you do not want small businesses in British Columbia, small businesses that are solely owned by British Columbians — that's what the people bought in the last election. But we ask you where are the big jobs?

Where in the Speech from the Throne — this supposed document of philosophy and thrust for British Columbia — is there one word about where you are really going to create jobs? Where are the statements which would calm down the fears of the private sector, and encourage them to get on with their work creating plans and interests, and to start these service industries, start new production, expand production, build houses — houses for people to live in, building of houses that create local jobs for local people? Where are your efforts to restore confidence in the future economy of British Columbia? Where are your efforts to assure markets for the products of the farmers whose land livelihood and assets and pension you have frozen? Where are the statements of philosophy which would stimulate new ideas from a very exciting and talented people?

Mr. Speaker, before going on, I'd like to talk a little bit more about this dreadful situation with regard to the freezing of land and the freezing of job opportunities on the land.

The methods that this Government has used to destroy the job creating potential of agriculture and private ownership of land are clear. I would like to read you one person's opinion:

"Rezone the land — residential sub-divisions become farms, farms become parks, industrial land becomes low rental housing zones. In all cases the land loses value and the owner must unload it at a loss. These are the methods that the NDP Government use. Raise the assessments artificially and force the owners to sell when they cannot afford to pay their taxes. With lots of land on the market at once, all prices must be reduced. Be sure to blame the rising assessments on 'land speculators',

especially foreigners. That way the public will believe for awhile that it is somebody else's land."

Talk grandiosely about the need for planning, Mr. Premier. Regulation and control through your innocent Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer), who admitted that he didn't know the difference between zoning and planning. I hope you've caught up with it now, Mr. Minister. It's amazing how many people will fall for the idea that by some mysterious process, people who are individually incapable of the right decisions can collectively overcome their mental and moral handicaps. Most people will think that they are somehow involved in the decision making and will not realize in time that it is an elite of backroom government. These are the methods used by this government to create jobs, through land. But they all spell out one thing, Mr. Speaker — the obliteration of jobs through the land, the obliteration of private ownership and fair return for one's efforts and one's holdings. Because they spell out expropriation without compensation.

Another thing that they don't wish to discuss is the fact — although we may well see it in the bill of rights, but certainly they have not spelled it out now — of life, liberty and property. And the fact that property is the guarantor of the first two — they don't acknowledge common law. Life, for health and

[[Page 32](#)]

care, to cater to the family, to provide for the family, and to provide jobs. Liberty and equality, through their ability to be independent and work for themselves, and receive a fair remuneration. And property, which is their pension, and their asset. This government doesn't recognize a very simple little homily that a man's home is his castle.

What do we see from other Members of this NDP Government as to what their philosophy is? I would suggest that the Premier didn't put this philosophy in the Speech from the Throne, which we are amending, because he is afraid to. They suggest that they will abolish all private land holdings in British Columbia and I ask you, Mr. Premier, who is next? You've picked on the disorganized, unorganized, down to earth farmer; you know that he's a mere 11 per cent of the population.

You've picked a motherhood issue and the story is not getting through to the people in the cities and the metropolitan area. Everyone is for green belts and the preservation of green lands and jobs created through this, because it is motherhood. But I certainly don't notice in the area of motherhood that 1 per cent of the women of British Columbia are offering to produce all the babies. And neither should 11 per cent of the population who are in agriculture be asked to make the sacrifice that this Government has asked of them. Or be asked to undergo fear — fear in British Columbia! For the first time in our history, families are afraid and they are afraid of their government.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Would you care to put that comment on the *Hansard* Madam Member, pardon me, Ms. Member? And if that private Member, and other Members of that Government think this is what that Member said, which is a good down to earth farm comment, then get out of your Vancouver offices, and get out of this Legislature, and go out and talk to the people.

I'd like to read to you, Mr. Speaker, what the B.C. Federation of Agriculture said in speaking for all the farmers of this province — and if the Minister thinks that they don't represent the farmers of this province, then he'd better get out too: "The general public's desire to prevent the industrial and residential development of our farmland has made clear to all of us..." Pardon me, I've got the wrong statement. I was so disturbed by the callous, inhumane, attitude of Ms. Member in relation to the rights of the farming community. Anyone who is concerned would be upset.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member from where? Which one?

MRS. JORDAN: The Hon. lady Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain. (Ms. P.F. Young) Secretary of a well known organization. Anyway, I won't quote, I'll tell you, because I've been to all the meetings. That Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) should be able to tell you. There isn't one farmer, one farm family, in British Columbia who does not want to see agricultural lands preserved — who does not want to see green belts, green

areas, natural areas. But what they object to is that they are being asked to do it all.

As early as January 10, 1973 the B.C. Federation of Agriculture went to the cabinet. I will quote what they said. "The federation welcomes the announcement by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that he is going to preserve green belts and agricultural land and that we would be called in to review the draft legislation with him. Farmers expect this consideration, keeping in mind that they own the land that the Minister is talking about. Farmers expect to have a meaningful role in negotiating with the Government for a settlement on this issue on a basis that adequate compensation for agriculture will further the general public's interest."

This is how they feel. That was on December 18, the very day a devastating order-in-council came out. Their reaction and concern was that the Ministers in that cabinet meeting didn't listen and many of them, as has been said publicly, walked out of that meeting. They didn't even excuse themselves....

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Order-in-council Government.

MRS. JORDAN: Not only an order-in-council Government, but a Government that will not listen.

Following the disturbing order-in-council of December 18, these people made representation to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), again without any fanfare — no riots. They were concerned. And he asked them again to meet his commitment to discuss the moves that the Government was going to make with them before he made it. They tried to explain to this Government that not only was there a great job-loss area here, but the complexities of what the Government was trying to do were unbelievable.

From his own statements and the statements of those of the Premier, it became evident that they did not understand what they were doing, the complexities involved, nor the incredible financial commitment that these individual farmers have made — not only in their land and their machinery and their homes and the years that they haven't received a sufficient income, but in water systems... millions and millions of dollars. The area I represent has a water system for which they are responsible, in cooperation with the provincial and federal govern-

[[Page 33](#)]

ments. Their responsibility is \$3.5 million amongst our farming community.

If you think, Madam Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain (Ms. P.F. Young), that they are not worried, you'd better sit up and take another think. How would you like to be one of about 50 people responsible for \$3 million for a water system to irrigate your land — and a sub-welfare income — and then have your land frozen, your pension frozen, your assets frozen?

You're closely aligned with the union, a very powerful union in this province, and I assure you that union would not accept those terms. No negotiation? — freezing of your pension assets? — freezing of your capital assets? — freezing of your income-earning ability? The orders-in-council passed by this Government make Bill 33 look like child's play, or popcorn, as that Minister would say.

But even then, after they went to the Minister to explain their problems, to ask him to listen, he assured them that he would listen — that there would be discussion.

And what happened? On January 18 an order-in-council came out from this Government that could do nothing but literally shock any lawyer, any thinking citizen, and certainly any farmer. It is unbelievable. It completely disregarded anything that these people had said to the Minister and to the cabinet committee. It literally tied them into an intolerable situation. And it has some other very serious implications. I might add that they used a section of an Act which, two sessions ago when they were in the Opposition, they said had no teeth in it.

When we used section 6 of the Environmental Act, we had public hearings before it was used, and the public was invited to make the decision. This order was done without public hearings. Where are the public hearings today, Mr. Speaker? Where is the involvement of the public? Where is the farmer's voice in this?

And the Press at this time should consider itself with great embarrassment because it hasn't even registered, with the exception of one member of the Press or media, exactly what is going on in this province. And they have made no effort to put the other side of the story.

Along with this order-in-council the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) sent out a letter to all municipalities. He said, "I am enclosing a copy of order-in-council No. 157-73, approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council under the *Environment and Land Use Act*."

And he says — and I would underline this — "I think that you will find the meaning clear." And the meaning is very clear, Mr. Speaker, because it literally destroys all local government in British Columbia — water districts, sewer districts, municipal councils and regional districts. It can be described as nothing less than an insulting approach by order-in-council. There was no discussion. The only discussion that the people had was a discussion with a Minister and a cabinet that would not listen, and says, "No."

Mr. Speaker, another section of that order-in-council has put all the lands in British Columbia in deepfreeze. The only reply that we get from the Government and the only thing that we get from the media out of the agricultural meeting is, "These people are all land speculators." A member of the NDP said, "A farmer is a farmer until he wants to sell his land and then he becomes a swashbuckling land speculator."

How naive can you be? There are cases all over British Columbia — and certainly I have them in the area that I have the honour to represent — of people who are very elderly. There are over 50 per cent of the people in agriculture today who own the land, who have worked the land, over 50 years of age.

I'll give you one example in our area of a family that came over after the war. There are all the traditional very sad features of their life, which I won't go into, including the baby son dying in the mother's arms in a bombing raid. They came to British Columbia with nothing. They rented a little house in Vernon, and there was a patch of ground at the back. He worked at anything he could get and she cleaned homes, and they grew beans in that back garden, Mr. Speaker. And they would harvest those beans — it was just a small amount — and take them to the local cannery.

This is the story of their life. Slowly they worked and worked and worked, and they now own 30 acres of agricultural land. And you would call it, Mr. Speaker, — the Premier would call it — prime agricultural land. But it wasn't prime when they bought it. They made it prime by working it, by understanding what they were doing with the land.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: You know, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley), if your mind kept up to your lips you'd be a genius.

These people are in their later years and they want to retire. He has kidney problems and she doesn't want to work. Their land was up for sale. And you know, somebody was going to buy it, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't a speculator. And the lips over there — it wasn't going to be subdivided. Another farmer was going to buy it. And their sale is frozen. The option is now dropped.

Interjection by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: Oh yes it is. If you say no, you go and tell them it isn't. Because that's one of the other things that's concerning the farmers. There have

[[Page 34](#)]

been some exceptions made and they want to know why, who and when.

But the point is, the option is dropped. They want to retire. They have ill health. And the people that were

going to buy it have gone to Alberta. He now has no chance to sell his land until this whole area is cleared up — this cloud is removed.

I'm just amazed, Mr. Speaker. All the city slicker, black-top farmers and the lawyers over there know everything that's going on. Boy, that lawyer over there is a fine example of why there shouldn't be many lawyers in a Legislature. It's not the legal technicalities, Mr. Speaker. It is the job-creating potential of this land, and the fact that these human beings are being threatened and having their possessions and their freedom steel-heeled, confiscated by this Government.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and give you any number of examples but I hope your Minister will bring it up in your caucus. I hope that your Minister will cause that Government to take a long, hard, second look at what they've done.

Mr. Speaker, a section of this order that I would like to read.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, if you did more speaking through the Speech from the Throne and less in the corridors and claptrap across this House, we wouldn't be having to debate this amendment right now.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure you're not referring to me, Hon. Member.

Interruption.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please. Members in the gallery are not permitted to debate in this House. Order!

The House took recess.

The House resumed at 4:20 p.m.; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member proceed.

MRS. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think we have all been very distressed by what happened in the House and I would just say for those who think that that I am not trying to tell this House how concerned the people of British Columbia are — that man is a farmer and I've never seen him in my life before and I doubt that I'll ever see him again.

HON. MEMBERS: Get off it! Get off it!

MRS. JORDAN: I would just like to make one more reference to order-in-council....

MR. CHABOT: The truth hurts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MRS. JORDAN: Yes, this is not a court room, Mr. Speaker, this is a Legislature. A people's forum where the people's concerns and problems must be aired no matter how painful it is to those who clang and cling for power.

I would like to mention one more point in this order-in-council which was shocking and of great concern to the farmers of this province. It is on the last page and it says: "Where a person having any interest in farmland is aggrieved by any action taken under authority of this order he may appeal to the Environment and Land Use Committee who may hear the appeal and vary, amend, rescind or confirm the action." It is very interesting that the same court that made the order hears the appeal. This literally denies the rights under British justice and I'm sure the Member across the way is aware of that — it leaves the avenue open and it's of great concern because of the actions of this Government since it's been in office, for patronage and special favours. It is hypocritical because it offends all

fair competition, all fair reward and all fair and reasonable use of one's lands and assets. It is expropriation by order-in-council and it is a fear-inducing document to the people who are the victims.

Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, in this Speech from the Throne there were loud, loud noises made about the creation of 100 jobs in the civil service as the big thrust. The Premier in this province has stated that the NDP has a no-growth policy and as I said before, he has proved that he has a no-job policy. The NDP seems to think that migration to British Columbia is a political myth. Mr. Speaker, you can talk about a no-growth policy, you can talk about all these great ideas, but as I say, you've got to produce them. To suggest with no growth that there is not going to be migration to British Columbia is utterly ridiculous and I would like to just review a few of the facts over the last three decades. In the last three decades British Columbia has had a growth increase in population above the national average.

In the 1940's B.C. was 3.5 per cent, Canada 1.9. In the Fifties British Columbia was 3.5, Canada 2.7. And in the 1960's British Columbia 3, Canada 1.8. Mr. Speaker, migration to British Columbia is not a political myth. It is a fact. From 1950 to 1970, 59 per cent of the increased population of British Columbia — 586,000 people — came to British Columbia from elsewhere. Of the 100 per cent, 41 per cent or 414,000 new population between the years of 1950 and 1970 were born in British

[[Page 35](#)]

Columbia.

In practical terms of governing a province and making a policy, you must recognize that this course of events has taken place and will take place. If you review the figures, Mr. Speaker — which I won't go into now because of time — you'll find that this migration was not necessarily concentrated in the lower mainland and lower Vancouver Island areas. It was largely scattered around the province. In the interior, the Kootenays, the northern central area and the northern part of the province. These people, Mr. Speaker, are not going to go away. They've got to have jobs. They have to have power. They have to have services and this all requires thrust, stimulation, encouragement, confidence or whatever you want to call it from this Government.

I would predict when one looks at these figures, when one looks at these figures, when the Minister of Payout — as one must now call the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement — raises the benefits to able non-workers, that not only will the migration to British Columbia rise above the projection, but it will attract a greater share of the people who have no intention of working and who will get to know where the gravy train in Canada is. The only way the Premier of this province can adopt a no-growth policy is to literally put up gates on the Rocky Mountains. I would suggest that that hardly makes us strong members of Confederation or is the type of Canadianism we want. I would suggest also in all fairness to him that that is not the Premier's intention.

But the Premier does know that British Columbia has had an accelerated migration of people because during the Social Credit government British Columbia became an exciting and lively climate in which to live. It has stimulating people with initiative and it had a government....

AN HON. MEMBER: And high unemployment.

MRS. JORDAN: 6.3 is not bad compared to 8.3.

MR. CHABOT: What've you got now?

MRS. JORDAN: Because people knew that in British Columbia they could be and have an opportunity to be free. To expand their thinking, to be individuals and to have a selection of jobs in remunerative areas.

Mr. Speaker, that Speech from the Throne, that took 40 years for the NDP to write and took seven minutes for His Honour to read, shows no awareness of the natural migration. Where it will grow. No plans for growth. No plans for power and no plans for jobs. The Premier also knows that the federal Liberal Government has failed miserably to recognize that with positive people will always come some non-workers. No one denies this. This does create social

problems. Our government was aware of it. The Premier knows it and he knows that the Social Credit Government constantly battled with Ottawa to recognize this. We would suggest and we know he will that the Premier will continue this battle.

But, Mr. Speaker, he cannot introduce a no-growth, socialist philosophy that discourages capital and productive people, that discourages job creation, that drives away people with initiative, and then cry to Ottawa that the problem is getting worse and that Ottawa must solve this problem. I would suggest with all due respect that the Liberals may not be very bright but they're brighter than to buy that. If the Premier does not want jobs and wants to introduce a "lazy-faire" attitude and ethic in British Columbia, then that is his business. But he must, Mr. Speaker — the Premier must show how it can be done. And he must lead this province. He cannot become a hero to a non-work ethic and weep because someone else won't pay for it.

We move this motion because the Speech from the Throne was barren of any statements to the high unemployment in British Columbia and the resulting burden on welfare and unemployment insurance which comes from the workers' pocket.

There can only be two startling reasons for this startling omission. Either the Premier and his cabinet really don't know what a serious problem there is, and they really don't have a plan to combat that problem, and they really don't know how to bring confidence back to the economic climate or, heaven forbid, they are guilty of the most odorous and cynical form of politics. In canceling the previous job creating programmes. In canceling the jobs of people who co-ordinated those who don't know how to look for a job or have problems in finding a job with private industry. In canceling many of the other programmes that were a partnership between private industry and government to create jobs for people. And in not introducing new policies and up until now allowing thousands to lose their jobs, they have ignored the problem. They have ignored and are ignoring the uncertainty, hardship and confusion for one of the two reasons mentioned. If it is the latter and they say, "Wait until the budget, and the budget will burst forth with all the answers," then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that neither reason has any semblance to great honour.

Those Ministers across the way who increased their own profits, should be hiding their faces in shame in light of that unemployment figure today.

We on this side of the House and the working people in this province demand that the Premier and his cabinet act on this problem now. Stop playing politics with the jobless and the resulting burden on the B.C. taxpayer. Or, if you don't know, be honest about it and come out and say so. We will help you —

[[Page 36](#)]

all the people in British Columbia will help you, you will just make clear which it is you are doing.

We want to see you restore today the confidence of small business to get on with job-creating projects and investments. We want to see you dip into that bulging treasury and provide cost-sharing programmes to create jobs for the semi-employable. We want you to legislate, to insist that those who are able to work and do not want to work are put to work before they receive the taxpayer's money. We want you to legislate to insist that those who are able to work and want to work get a fair return for their efforts, and that includes the farmers. We want you to reactivate or bring in new job co-ordinating programmes and reactivate the people who are now sitting in the civil service waiting, waiting, waiting for that word to go ahead. We want you to reactivate and to instigate programmes in highways, in parks and recreation, in the health department — to provide legislation as Social Credit has provided for such things as on-the-job training — pay half the salary for those and see that the employer guarantees a long period of income in return for the assistance.

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) has, I know — because I have seen many of them — hundreds of proposals on his desk outlining joint job opportunities. And you know it, through you, Mr. Speaker. These opportunities are put forth by some of your own very able people and they combine efforts of the Government and private industry. The employees are sitting on their hands waiting for you to pass the word — to say, "Go ahead, boys. Put people to work."

In many areas — and we will dig out figures to show it — the unemployment roll was way down and the demands on welfare were down. They are now up because these people are spending their time revolving and recycling people through welfare, rather than being able to continue with their job-creating programmes.

Answer their letters, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker. You know what they are. If you promise me today that you will answer those letters and let them get these programmes in forestry and in the lumber industry going with these unemployed people on work, I will say no more about it. Will you give us that commitment, through you, Mr. Speaker, to sign those letters today and get these people to work — get your own employees in a position where they can do their job and do their best? Is there no answer from the Minister? Well, then we say, Mr. Minister, get up off your comfortable chair and stop spending your time preoccupied with neighbourhood pubs and get on with this business of creating jobs for people who want to work. Get on with rehabilitating people. Pubs are not the best place to rehabilitate them. Sign those documents.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we demand of the Premier that you stop laughing and shrugging your shoulders and that the Premier of this province start being a prudent and responsible manager of this province. That you stop destroying the fiscal integrity of this province and that you stop the gravy-training for the few that your Government has started.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has proven that he does not understand the fiscal policy of government itself and that it is a prime factor producing the kind of economy that will produce jobs. The Premier has proven that he is either unaware of the current job crisis or that he is being what can be described as less than charitable and playing politics. It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we ask that you private Members on that side of the House, to demonstrate their concern and to demonstrate their awareness of the needs of the people who elected them by supporting this amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I say to them — take your traditional roles as legislators seriously and inform the Executive Council that you cannot accept an address from His Honour that does not provide for an expansion of jobs in this province — that does not even acknowledge that there is an unemployment crisis in British Columbia. Take your courage in hand and let the Premier know, because you must be concerned, as we are concerned. Let the Premier know in no unmistakable terms that you intend to carry out your duties as guardians of the public interest and as watchdogs of this cabinet, which has given no direction, no thrust to the people of British Columbia. Come and join the concerned Members of this side of the House and the public, who want to see in British Columbia not a bankrupt, lethargic welfare state but a vital, confident economy that will provide jobs for every able worker. Tell the Premier that if he doesn't understand the need for jobs, you do. And, through you, Mr. Speaker, tell him that you know how to produce them. Let the Premier and his Ministers know that if they are confused and tired after four months in office, to go back to their jet-set holidays and vacations and to let you people into the cabinet so that you can meet the needs of the people of this province.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, the Attorney General weeps out and says, "I didn't even get to Mexico." (Laughter). Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of the working people of this province could afford to go to Vancouver for a holiday from the north, or could afford to go to the State of Washington. I wonder how many of the unemployed in this province could afford to go anywhere.

If you think it has been pleasant complaining because you couldn't go to Mexico for a winter vacation when the employed people of this province

[[Page 37](#)]

couldn't go to Mexico, then I suggest that we have a very different idea of pleasantness.

But, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Members of the NDP Party on the floor of this House and in speaking to this amendment, I would say to you in all seriousness, let your conscience be your guide. Let your constituents who speak to you be your guide. When that division bell rings, stand in your places and correct this incredible omission

from the Speech from the Throne. Then I say to the Hon. Members, through you, Mr. Speaker, you will then show the people of British Columbia that the Premier's arm-waving philosophy and jokes are not enough. And that even if he doesn't, you do intend to produce jobs and to earn your salary and your position in this House.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the people of British Columbia will thank you for it as I thank you for this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Victoria and I would remind the Hon. Members we are speaking solely to the amendment henceforward.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that caution. I wondered whether it had been forgotten.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I must point out to the Hon. Member that the seconder is permitted to deal at large as well as upon the amendment.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: That's right, Mr. Speaker. I am fully aware of that. Thank you very much, though, for reminding me of it. I will restrict myself to this amendment of the motion and I will not, therefore, be giving the speech which I had prepared for this. Except perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could beg the indulgence of the House as it is the first time I am speaking, simply to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address and reply for their fine speeches. I thought they did a good job and I trust that we will be hearing much more from them in future debates. I am sure they have a great deal to contribute, as shown by their speeches yesterday.

Having said that, I will return to the amendment to the motion, which we in this party feel we have no option but to support, Mr. Speaker. The amendment reads, "This House regrets that the speech of His Honour fails to provide any adequate proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the province affecting many thousands of our citizens and their families and fails to deal with the impact of widespread unemployment upon the social and economic life of the province." We feel that it has been a great disappointment to us that since this Government took power, despite the rather brave talk in some of their election material, some of which I have here — "Dave Barrett, A Message to the People; new development needed; too many jobs are being lost" — I am quoting, Sir, from the NDP campaign material. Despite that, despite a mini-session of the Legislature which we had last October when we heard time after time from Government Ministers and Government Members, "Give us time, we need more time to do these things. You can't rush us. We've only just taken office."

Despite all that, we have waited and we have waited and we have waited and we have not yet seen any positive programmes to deal with the problem of unemployment in this province.

First, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should outline what is the problem.

I have here a great headline, "B.C. unemployment reaches 8.3 per cent." By contrast in other provinces we have unemployment remaining the same in the Province of Quebec, not going up in the period immediately prior to this. We have unemployment going down from 5.2 to 5 per cent in the Province of Ontario. And we have a slight reduction in the 4.9 to 5.2. And we have a slight reduction in the Maritimes. British Columbia is the one area of all of Canada which has had this substantial increase and I think that for us in this Legislature not to deal with this matter, would be very grave indeed. And it is with that reason that I, Mr. Speaker, noted with surprise bordering on incredulity the fact that the Speech From the Throne had virtually no references to this.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention a statement made by a former Leader of the Opposition sitting in this House now as the Premier. He was speaking at 100 Mile House and I believe this was in May of last year. I'm sorry I don't have the exact date of the quote but I can certainly get it for you if necessary. He said, "The B.C. Government is creating the best trained pool of unemployed anywhere in the western world. Provincial NDP leader David Barrett said here Tuesday night." Correction, Dave Barrett, not David Barrett. He said, "A Government with ideas and imagination could draw world attention by putting young trained people to work on such problems as rapid transit methods, electric powered automobiles, to help solve the pollution crisis and reclamation projects to boost tourism." Well, we've had a change of government, we've had a number of months with this government at the helm, and unemployment despite those brave words of approximately 6 months ago has continued to soar.

I think we should start, Mr. Speaker, by looking at the intentions of the Government again. I'm quoting again from the then Leader of the Opposition, on January 26, 1971. I quote from our own *Hansard*. It's an interesting quote, on page 70, and he says, "We have found the executive group that has recently enjoyed a sunny vacation in southern climes" — How times change, eh? — "has come to a serious unemployment situation in the Province of British

[[Page 38](#)]

Columbia and refused to participate in a debate as to what this provincial government can do to alleviate unemployment." It goes on to say, "it's all very well for the Members to get up and blame Ottawa."

We have at that time a clear indication of his desire to alleviate unemployment problems, a clear criticism of the situation as it was then. But nothing since then has come out from him, or his Ministers, which has done very much to increase employment except of course his statement regarding 1,000 civil service jobs. Mr. Barrett went on to say at that time, I quote his name, Mr. Speaker, because it's written down here in front of me in *Hansard*. The now Premier went on to say, "certainly an aggressive campaign should be waged seeking industry, and I know that the competent, aggressive Minister of Trade and Industrial Development with his fantastic travelling expenses has been very busy producing jobs." That was of course the previous Minister. The present Minister of Trade and Industrial Development (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has only had one trip to California, unlike his predecessor. He at that time succeeded in closing up the office we had there which was designed evidently to do precisely what the now Premier was talking about two years ago. A very curious situation indeed — a difference perhaps which overcomes our Hon. friend from Coquitlam when he moved from this side of the House to the other. But he was talking about the need for an aggressive campaign seeking industry. He said that this should be done by the Minister of Industrial Development and we have the performance so far by his own minister which is simply to close down the one office there — the other is the tourist office — which is trying to do precisely what the Hon. Member was talking about two years ago.

A curious reversal which has overcome the leader of the NDP when he moved from this side of the House, to the other.

My Hon. friend to my left says that all he does is blame Ottawa. Which again is reference to the earlier speech where he says, Ottawa should not always be blamed.

What are the causes for this? There is no question we have a problem. What are the causes, and what can we do about them? There is, as I've mentioned earlier, the question of people moving to this province. My ancestors moved to this province years back, one at least well over a century ago. This is not a new problem. This is not something which has suddenly descended upon this province. It's been going on for over a century. It's a problem we've had to live with in this province, year in and year out and to use that excuse again simply doesn't wash. It just cannot be accepted. It's not something that can justify an unemployment rate of 8.3 per cent.

Other areas, we have civil service hiring. The Premier has indicated in the throne speech that we will be hiring another 1,000 civil servants. We again, do not object to this if these people are justified and there is useful work for them to do. But we might point out that the average annual increase in the civil service is approximately a thousand jobs a year in any event. Indeed it went well higher than that under the administration of the Hon. Member for South Okanagan (Hon. Mr. Bennett) when he was Premier. And therefore it really is no new thing or something which will deal with our problem of 78,000 people unemployed. Hiring 1,000 civil servants only reduces it to 77,000 unemployed.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: In 20 years it is up 15,000.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: In 20 years it went up to 15,000? Up by 15,000. It may, but I fail to find relevance of that figure for here and now, for the people who are looking for work here and now.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, no I'm sorry I said, "the average was." It was approximately 1,000 and on one occasion at least, in one year I believe it went up almost 2,000. I apologize to the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Hon. Mr. Strachan) if I didn't explain myself correctly. But the average has been approximately 1,000 a year; it has been substantially larger than that in at least one year. In actual fact the Speech from the Throne is only an acceptance, if you like, of the inevitable. It is not a new job creating policy of any sort.

We had the figures and they came out, and instantly of course the headline here again is, "Ottawa to blame — Barrett."

I don't think that's good enough in this province — just as it was not good enough when the Hon. Member was Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Barrett) and when he was criticizing the former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) for doing precisely that. It isn't good enough simply to say that it's another jurisdiction's fault. That doesn't find jobs for people. It doesn't explain why in this area, in this jurisdiction on the West Coast of Canada the increase in jobless has been so substantial while in another area it has been minor, it has been declining, or it has stayed still as I indicated earlier in my speech.

There are other quotes of his that I think are instructive to look at this time. On August 3, 1971, "The Government must lay out its plans to deal with unemployment, Opposition Leader Dave Barrett stated..." et cetera, et cetera. Another quote, from September 24, 1971. "NDP Leader David Barrett called Wednesday for the Provincial Government to put \$75 million into a winter works programme in B.C. municipalities." And then it goes on, during the

[[Page 39](#)]

last election campaign Opposition Leader Dave Barrett, "Jobs will be the most important election issue." Well, if it was the most important election issue, Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed it didn't come up in the fall session, the special session. But we were charitable at that time because we realized that the Government was new as they said, and they did need time. But if it was the most important election issue in the Summer of 1972, then why is it of such little importance that it's not even mentioned in the throne speech here today.

The argument's been put forward by the Premier, that he's reverting to traditional form of throne speech. Well I checked all the recent Canadian throne speeches of the federal House. I checked the British throne speech given by Her Majesty the Queen at the last session and I have yet to find any support for the curious statement that one does not put forward the general thrust of one's economic policy in a throne speech simply because a budget will be following. This is not a tradition of British Parliamentary system. I suggest instead, it has been used as an excuse because of the failure of the Government to do anything in this area.

Why have we this problem? Why is this problem so acute on the west coast and in British Columbia? First we have the difficulty facing this province because of uncertainty. Now I went into this once before in the mini session, in the fall session, but obviously the problem still remains and I'm going to have to deal with it again, at least briefly. We have uncertainty in this province because the people who might invest in this province, be they British Columbians or others, do not know what the government's intentions are. Now it's true that efforts have been made to downplay the damage done by the Premier's statement to the financial writers of British Columbia. But there is no question that now people are still delaying investments in British Columbia. Or if they have an option of putting investments in other provinces such as Alberta they will choose Alberta.

It is not often that I quote, and I certainly don't quote him approvingly; but it's not often I quote the Conservative Leader, not unfortunately my friend to my left, but a gentleman who is not in the gallery today. But I'm quoting from the Toronto *Daily Star* of December 17, 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: The president is here.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: By golly so he is. I would like to welcome the President of the Conservative Association of British Columbia. Peter Hyndman is. an excellent fellow and only his politics are wrong. Nevertheless, the paper Toronto *Daily Star* says "Conservative Leader, Derril Warren says there is a danger".... et

cetera, et cetera, "of the socialist menace being upon us." It goes on to say that he had warned clients — executives of five companies recently asked for his advice about expanding or opening new operations in British Columbia and he said, Mr. Warren said, "I sent them off to Alberta."

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Shame is right. Shame is right for a man....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The Hon. Premier has evidently rejected a suggestion that he join that party. But no, the fact of the matter is, regardless of whether or not this is the right thing for a person who aspires to the Premiership of this province to do — the fact of the matter is that people are being advised not to invest in the province and...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: ...which is surprising. Your efforts, Mr. Premier, have reduced my capacity for shock due to your callousness in the face of these enormous unemployment figures. Nevertheless, whether or not it's the right thing for him to do, there is no question that the investment has been reduced in this province. Investment has been reduced in this province. Investment has been reduced and the result is that less jobs have been created.

There are plenty of opportunities for businessmen or big companies, in particular in the forest industry, to delay investment from one year to the next — in machinery replacement, for example. Expansion in certain areas can all be delayed if there is uncertainty, and there is plenty of uncertainty at this time. I know that the press, The Vancouver *Sun* in particular, has been accused in this House of alarmism and that they are the cause of much of this uncertainty. But I don't think that is really fair, Mr. Speaker.

The press was called in. The financial press was called into the Premier's office for their first press conference — and he talked about taking over the two natural gas companies, Westcoast Transmission and Inland Natural Gas. And he talked about taking over B.C. Tel which is in line, of course, with the NDP policy as outlined in the campaign material I mentioned earlier.

The page is page 6, Mr. Speaker, where the reference is to bringing natural gas transmission and distribution under public ownership. It is not the fault of the press that they happened to comment upon a statement made by the Premier when he called them into his office. And it has had a serious effect upon employment in this province.

Quotes on this are numerous. I would refer you to

[[Page 40](#)]

the Vancouver *Sun* of Saturday, October 14 and the statement there, "To put it bluntly, Premier Dave Barrett is unintentionally creating a wave of terror in the stock market." I think it is unintentional. I don't think that our Premier intends to create a climate in which investment and employment is so reduced. Nevertheless, it has been created. And he must take steps, as he has been the author of this uncertainty, to establish the correct climate in which investment can once more be made with some sort of certainty as to the Government's policies.

It's difficult of course. He has a party which, at least in their last convention, were kept in check on resolutions dealing with nationalization of such companies as MacMillan Bloedel. But who knows whether they'll be kept in check again. And who knows whether this will become party policy on a year-by-year basis, depending on the success or failure of the true socialists to get their motions debated at NDP conventions.

The second area of job creation is, of course, some sort of assistance given to private industry for job creation opportunities. I know that regional development expansion grants are questionable. You can question them; you can argue against them; you can argue in favour of them. But certainly it's something that the Province of British

Columbia should consider.

My own view is that if the Premier is talking, as he has, of increasing jobs — and talking, as he has, of an industrial development corporation for B.C., I think that a great deal can be learned by the successes and the failures of other schemes of regional development, be they provincial, or be they federal. Some have not worked, but some have. I feel that here is an area where we should obtain something in the Speech from the Throne.

Another proposal that I put forward is that we have in this province an economic council. For example, there is a sharp debate on at the present time concerning the relative merits of the northern coal route as opposed to the southern coal route. In other words, taking out B.C. coal — Northern B.C. coal — by way of Prince Rupert, or taking it out by way of Howe Sound. The distinction is really, I guess, whether you want to use the C.N. Railroad or B.C.R.

Well surely, an economic council, an independent body, could be able to assess some of the difficulties that we face in this area, outline some of the options and tell us which is the most job-creating of the two possibilities — in other words, assist us in an industrial strategy and economic strategy designed to take care of the problems that we face at the present time.

Statements have been made earlier — I don't want to repeat them — about the problems, the uncertainty in agriculture. Of course, this will ultimately affect employment as well. Once again, I feel there is an important area here for the Government to step into

to end the uncertainty and deal with this, I trust, in a rational and fair way. I'll be discussing more on this tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. But if they would do something along that line, we'd have the possibility of increasing employment in that field as well as others.

Housing is another area which I think is most important at this stage. It's true that there has been uncertainty as to the NDP Government's intentions. There is uncertainty regarding rent controls. There is uncertainty regarding the valuations that can be placed upon these things — uncertainties which have led certain people, including at least one Member of this House, to sell off apartments to the tenants as condominiums. It's uncertainty which, in my mind, is having a serious effect upon the employment in the construction industry which, once again, could be settled fairly soon.

We understand that there are difficulties at the present time in the light of the conflict, apparently, between NDP policy and NDP actions. Nevertheless, we do feel that a firm statement by the Premier dealing with this problem might once more get housing construction and apartment construction back on the rails and allow, by this method, adequate employment in that industry.

I don't feel personally that the embarrassment that may have been caused by any Minister's activity in this area should result in delay in enunciating what the NDP Government actually intends to do in this area. Because it's this type of delay and uncertainty, Mr. Speaker, added on to the other delays that I've talked about — added on to the other uncertainty that I've talked about — which has boosted our unemployment rate up to its 8.3 per cent. I've tried to restrict myself as best I can to the amendment before us. We trust that, despite the failure of the Government to come up with positive policies, either in the fall session or in the Speech from the Throne — we trust that there will be something done in the near future by way of bills, by way of the budget speech, to deal with this important area. We can only repeat the dissatisfaction and disappointment that we felt when we discovered that the extra months taken had not materially improved the NDP policies in this area — and indeed they did not have material available for the throne speech.

I believe that if the Government will realize that the time is now to deal with this problem; if they will realize the time is now to settle their differences with business and stop hanging over the head of business the threat of expropriation or nationalization; if they will deal fairly with farmers, which I think will have an effect on the confidence of the small businessmen and other people in the province — if they will do this, then there is a chance quite quickly of getting British Columbia at least back to where the other provinces of Canada are with respect to employment.

It's a dismal shame, a real admission of failure,

[[Page 41](#)]

that this province, which has so much of the wealth of the country, should have such a deplorable record with respect to employment. I will just add, Mr. Speaker, that prairie provinces have a very, very slight increase in unemployment.

The reason is — and it's now borne out by statistics of the Manpower Department, that workers are leaving those provinces. There has been a substantial drop in people employed in Saskatchewan, for example, in the last three years. People are leaving those provinces — some for here, most for Ontario. I feel that it would be most unfortunate for this province if we had to adopt the same policy — or at least if people had to follow the same practice in British Columbia — that if you want to get work, you have to leave the province.

The opportunity is there, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to grasp. But I trust that we will have no more of the self-congratulatory speeches from the throne which fail to grasp and deal with these real problems. I trust we will have now a serious working Government, dealing with specific problems — one of which, and perhaps the most important at this time, being unemployment.

The option of opportunity rests on him, not on the Members of the Opposition. We intend to watch on this issue as closely as we can and see indeed whether we can, through constructive criticism, improve what Government policies may come forward.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me say that we will support the amendment. The question of unemployment and poverty were the two main themes which I mentioned in the throne speech last year.

It's also interesting that in the throne speech last year the former Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier, laid great stress on unemployment and castigated the Government of the day for figures which were considerably better than the figures we now have. So I think at least that amount of fact should be established.

He also went on, because of its failure to grapple with unemployment, to describe the throne speech as a "hollow document." Certainly for a Government which has promised so much to the people of this province, particularly in the realms of unemployment and poverty, I think it is indeed very disappointing to find that the throne speech can only make one positive proposal to increase jobs — and that is by expanding the Civil Service.

And in fairness, Mr. Speaker, I think there are many areas — I will reserve judgment on the use of these 1,000 civil servants until we have more specific information — but certainly there are areas in Government departments where they can be very wisely employed, particularly in the new Department of the Environment — and hopefully, in particular, in the Fish and Wildlife Branch, where I understand the damage to streams and rivers is always investigated after the event. In point of fact, adequate staffing of this department would perhaps prevent some of the serious damage to spawning fish. But that's a little off the point.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech certainly does nothing the least bit exciting or constructive, other than the increase in the Civil Service.

It's very easy, when talking about unemployment, to zero in on what is the most politically suitable part of the problem. I think, Mr. Speaker, that any informed and fair-minded observer would agree that unemployment in 1973 is a tremendous problem, because of some of the facts of our present-day world — not the least of which is the tremendous increase in technology and automation with which it is very difficult to keep up when we think of transportation and the containerization in the docks, and some of the drastic changes that have taken place. So, of untrained workers who formerly carried out many of these jobs, unfortunately many of them remain untrained — and yet there are no jobs to replace the job they lost.

So, to take a balanced approach to unemployment, I think we have to look at all the facts and try and apportion the responsibility where it belongs. I would say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that obviously one of the main avenues of solution, or partial solution, is a more adequate and more sensible retraining programme than I can find presently existing under Canada Manpower.

Again it's with some difficulty that I resist criticizing the federal government, because one is immediately accused of not being hard enough on the Government across the way. But nevertheless, as I have said in this House before, I am not here specifically to make political points. I think it's important to try and cover all the aspects of something so all-pervasive and damaging to human beings as unemployment.

But the Canada Manpower plan, in passing, certainly does not work. I have referred many people to that office and the percentage of success really depressed me. But at any rate — the technology and the automation and the urbanization — the fact that, regardless of what is being done in the farming community by this Government — and I certainly oppose what has been done, or at least the manner in which it has been done — farm workers are leaving the land. They again are relatively untrained for other jobs. Therefore this whole question of retraining has to have a very high priority.

In this regard, the Department of Education

[[Page 42](#)]

should have a very active role to play in attempting to look a few years down the road and consider the kinds of new jobs that are emerging in society because of the automation I have already mentioned and the technological changes — and attempt to have more people trained for the appropriate job at the right time. Now I am not aware of any particular federal or provincial study that's being carried out. But it makes a lot of sense to me to try and spend part of the research dollar into unemployment by carrying out this kind of study.

Mention was also made a year ago when we discussed unemployment that the cost of borrowing money was an important factor; and not the least in addition is inflation — that jobs are being lost, in fact, by businesses that cannot survive because of inflation. When I raised this point about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, at the special session in October — when we discussed the minimum wage — I raised the point that some businesses might well go bankrupt. The answer I received from the Government was that if the business was that uneconomic, it really meant that it did not deserve to survive — and that it was surviving only by unfair treatment of the employee.

If we project that argument to the farm, it's very interesting to read the statistics produced by the farmers which point out that 82 per cent of farmers earn an income less than they would receive under federal unemployment insurance. And if this is the case, considering the hours that farmers work, I think the farmer must finish up with a great deal less than \$2 an hour.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the farmer is receiving this very unfair treatment in society, there can be little doubt there will be a considerable movement, both of farm workers and farmers, away from the land. They are not trained to take other readily available jobs.

I won't repeat what has been said already on the opposition to any great degree about the whole matter of the economy and how the economy should be stimulated. All I can say, and I'll try to say it briefly, is that if anything today has clearly demonstrated the difference between the Conservative philosophy and the socialist philosophy, it is that we believe in freedom of choice and incentive to the individuals in society. We would believe in providing financial incentive to stimulate business. On this point we find it very difficult that with one voice the socialist Government should be seeking a no-growth policy, and with another voice saying that it will deal with unemployment. It is extremely difficult to imagine how you can limit economic growth and, at the same time, find more jobs for an ever-increasing work force.

It is often said, and I think all sides of the House would agree, that at the special session we produced good social legislation which provided better benefits to some senior citizens and to the handicapped. But I know from speaking to many people in society that they were distressed at the vague way in which the Premier tabulated the

cost of such social services. And, even more so, individuals are wondering how this will be financed. This brings us back to the fact that if we have a stagnating or static economy and an increasing population and increasing unemployment — I just wonder, as everyone I have spoken to on this subject wonders, where the money is coming from to pay for the social services — however desirable these social services might be.

To be more positive, our suggestions — and as a matter of fact we will be introducing a private bill dealing with unemployment — would be to encourage an energetic programme in some of the areas which are so important to our natural resources, particularly reforestation. I can well remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the present Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) was in the Opposition, he made a very eloquent and forceful appeal to the Social Credit Government to deal with reforestation in a realistic way. I remember him pointing out that the programme and the number of trees they were going to replant and the time these trees take to mature and so on — that they were merely scratching the surface and the programme was totally inadequate. And I see him nodding in agreement.

This gives me hope, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government will, in fact, embark on such an energetic programme — which does not just produce jobs but indeed provides hope for our natural resources into the next 100 years.

The same could apply to a vigorous expansion of highway planning. Much is said about the tremendous resources which exist in our northern territory and which are waiting to be tapped. But of course they cannot be tapped without communications and I would hope that very soon the government would announce its plans in regard to highway development with the specific purpose in mind of providing jobs doing highway construction but at the same time looking further ahead to the better development of our resources in this province.

One of the earlier speakers played down the idea of population growth but I think that there has to be some truth in it — not only truth but importance in it if it's going at twice the rate of any other province. These are people who have to be housed and clothed and fed and it would seem to me that surely there are ways in which this influx of people can be given service and, in giving them service, give them employment.

I'm thinking particularly of retirement as it applies to this province. I know that in the greater Victoria area we have twice the national average of individual citizens over the age of 65. In referring back to

[[Page 43](#)]

succession duties and gift tax, I would repeat the suggestions that from two points of view we can encourage people to retire to this province if it is financially attractive. Furthermore, by removing succession duties we can bring investment capital into the province which would be of tremendous value in developing secondary industry.

The leader of the Liberal party mentioned the fear in the minds of investors. He said that they were uncertain about the Government's motives. I don't think anybody can be uncertain. The Premier has made it very clear not only in regard to B.C. Telephone and West Coast Transmission, but the Hon. Member who moved the adoption of the Address said that the automobile insurance was just a first move — they will be moving into every phase of insurance in this province. If it is to be a monopoly situation regarding auto insurance, presumably — again accentuating the difference in our philosophy — that Government believes in monopoly, we believe in competition.

Therefore, since at least 60 per cent of the voters don't believe in monopoly... I think this is a point in passing that should be mentioned. This government holds office because 40 per cent of the voters voted for socialism but 60 per cent believe in the other method. And the other method is encouragement of the individual, the providing of incentives and the encouragement of competition.

Therefore, I think that all these points of difference between that side of the House and this side of the House have been very clearly demonstrated on the whole subject of unemployment. We believe in encouraging the private and independent sector to create new businesses, new industry, new jobs. Human beings respond best to the system of incentives and rewards, and this brings us back to that other word "profit" which I know the socialists say is a bad thing for society. But society has always functioned best when there is encouragement and reward.

When there is uniformity, the human individual does not give of his best. The famous Prime Minister of Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, compared the Conservatives and the socialists and he said: "The Conservatives believe in the ladder and the socialists believe in the queue." But we encourage people to climb and rise above themselves. The socialists encourage everybody to get into line and try and keep in line. I think that this attitude to business — the attitude that the government can take over private business and do a better job for society compared to the individual and the private concern and the private business, has been very, very clearly demonstrated today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think that the question of creating jobs calls for some of the measures I've suggested provincially. But in all fairness to this Government or any government, it calls for a high level of cooperation with the federal government.

Many of the programmes put forward by the federal government are nothing less than shocking. The Local Initiatives Programme is paying for puppet shows and some of the Opportunities For Youth are little more than a permit to grow grass. This kind of thing is creating a false solution to the unemployment problem at the federal level.

I have also said that the cost of borrowing money and the effects of inflation are mainly under federal control and so that while there is much we can do in the province along the lines I have mentioned, I would hope that the goodwill which the Premier has received in his approaches to Ottawa on other matters will be used to the best possible effect in dealing with unemployment on an immediate basis.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate. I appreciate the remarks of the Liberal leader and the spokesman of the Conservative Party. I will come back in detail to some of their comments and suggestions, my agreements and disagreements.

I want to touch a few moments very lightly on my friends, the official Opposition, who feel so strongly about this problem of unemployment that the official Leader of the Opposition doesn't even deem to come to the House when the House is sitting, whose party is without an official spokesman at a time they describe as a crisis and, when we are debating unemployment, the leader of that party is not even in this House.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh well, "Order." It's you, my friend, who should put that party in order because the touch of cynicism has yet to leave that group. It is interesting to note how they cast their minds back to a year ago when they were in power, and they say this, and they say that. Never once have I heard the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) ever speak in this House about unemployment other than defend the Government's record. Never once did I hear that passionate plea as we got from the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) about unemployment. The performance, the day after 20 years of neglect in the secondary industry field makes one wonder about the incredible turnabout that exists with that party.

What is the record with that party? What is the record? What was it a year ago while that group sat over on this side of the House and we discussed unemployment. In March, it was 8 per cent. They wouldn't even let us have an emergency debate on unemployment when they were in power. We have a

[[Page 44](#)]

debate this afternoon. Then it goes to April down to 7; May, 8.1; June, 7.8; July, 7.8; August, 7.7; September, 8.2; October, 7.8 — what did we inherit? We inherited a pattern of unemployment for 20 years created by that group over there.

The cynicism of announcing that they have discovered this problem after they are in Opposition. The people of British Columbia discovered the problem and that's why they are in Opposition.

Now I want to leave that group that's disappearing into some kind of political vacuum, that is desperately

scrambling around trying to find some new political alliance — and perhaps that's the best thing to do, the three of you get together. Because the leader of the Conservative Party talks about his philosophy and conservatism. If you want to lay it on that basis — socialism versus free enterprise — then get together. The only problem you'll have is picking a leader.

Now my friend, the Liberal leader, says that it's very good that we should discuss this in the context of the provincial scene. I agree with him. I agree with his remarks about the statements made by the leader of the Conservative Party — today's leader of the Conservative Party — publicly saying to a Toronto newspaper that he advised five people to go to Alberta. Five companies.

That's not a British Columbian talking. That's not someone who has the best interests of British Columbia as his primary desire in politics. That's someone playing cheap politics in a Toronto newspaper. That's what it is. And if he intends to be the leader of that party, he should never make statements like that.

I recall the former Premier of this province standing up in this House, attacking a former Liberal leader. They had a spat. The former Premier stopped and he pointed at the Leader of the Opposition at that time and he said: "At least, Mr. Member, you have never attacked British Columbia or made statements to attack the economy of British Columbia."

And the word was "undermine". And I think the Conservative leader would be well-advised to understand what his responsibility is if he considers politics in British Columbia.

All right, now let's go on to the federal policy on unemployment. The Liberal Party is what you reflect — their philosophy.

The federal Liberal Party embarked on a policy of unemployment across this nation in an attempt to fight inflation. The European Economic Council said of that policy that this is a demonstration of how not to fight inflation. The Liberal Party embarked on that policy.

When I was first elected and throughout the campaign I said that I believed in a policy of "no growth for growth's sake." I wanted growth on a rational, meaningful basis. I spoke during the election campaign of using the resources of this province to provide employment for the people of this province, I attacked the previous Government about allowing coal to leave this province at 25 cents a ton royalty and that's all. The previous administration made no effort whatsoever to rationalize the mining industry.

I had the opportunity of meeting with the Prime Minister of this country for the first time on December 11. I said at that time that I would give him some proposals as I saw it in terms of British Columbia's needs and rationalizing growth on the basis of providing jobs here in British Columbia. I chose not to make these letters public before but I think it is necessary now for the people of British Columbia to understand the position of this Government vis-a-vis Ottawa and employment and suggestions.

My friend talks about LIP grants and other programmes and I agree with him. If Canada has that kind of money to spend and Canada can't take the position that raw materials leaving this country should go in Canadian ships built by Canadian men and manned by Canadian crews, there's something wrong with Canada in Ottawa.

Last year we shipped out \$3 billion worth of materials from this province. Did it go on a Canadian bottom, manned by Canadian crews, ships built in this country? Not on your life. MacMillan-Bloedel registers its ships in Bermuda and hires crews outside of this country and that was before the advent of socialism, my friend — a long time before socialism.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Why don't you wire Lewis and pull the plug on him, then?

HON. MR. BARRETT: This is what I said on December 11:

"Dear Mr. Prime Minister: Regarding our discussions on December 11 in Ottawa, this will confirm my request for

restoring the federal government ship construction subsidy to the original level of 40 per cent when the programme was introduced in 1961."

The rate, I understand, was set by order-in-council. Quebec has a subsidy for its railroad — a 17 1/2 per cent subsidy — and yet the grants were given...I don't want to go into that argument, Mr. Member, through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to get involved in that nation-wide argument about Quebec. But if you force it in terms of the alienation that does exist, you are asking for a comparison.

We receive absolutely no subsidy in the Province of British Columbia for operating our ferries while other provinces do.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: That's what he said. But

[[Page 45](#)]

I'm going back to Ottawa because I believe there is a hope that they will begin to listen rather than argue.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: All right. I'm developing a sense of frustration. I'm looking forward to the Western Economic Conference. I'm not going to leave an empty chair there; I'm not going to walk away from it. Empty chairs don't solve anything.

I asked the Prime Minister that:

"...there is an urgency to restoring and sustaining employment. Any suggestions, in my view, would materially assist in achieving this goal.

"I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your cordial discussions and wish you the compliments of the season."

December 19:

"On behalf of the Prime Minister, I acknowledge receipt of the letter from the Hon. D. Barrett."

That's from a Mr. Lawless, the correspondence secretary.

January 10, I sent a wire to the Rt. Hon. P.E. Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario:

"PRESENT UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA MAKES IT MOST URGENT YOU ACT IMMEDIATELY TO IMPLEMENT MY REQUEST TO YOU PERSONALLY IN OTTAWA IN DECEMBER AND ALSO IN MY LETTER TO YOU OF DECEMBER 14 TO RESTORE THE 40 PER CENT FEDERAL SHIP CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDY OVER A SEVEN YEAR PERIOD TO ALLOW EFFECTIVE LONG-TERM EMPLOYMENT PLANNING IN THE SHIP-BUILDING INDUSTRY ."

It is my position, it was my position then, and it was my position during the campaign that we should have federal policy to allow us to have our shipyards building ships here in British Columbia so that the ores and the lumber leaving these shores go in Canadian ships built by Canadian workmen and manned by Canadian crews, rather than relying on charity and hand-outs.

A positive suggestion to the federal government and what has its response been? I haven't had a reply to the wire.

We are not asking for welfare in British Columbia. We are not asking for extended programmes that are reviewed by boards on a year-to-year basis. We are asking for long-term, rational programming so that we can

provide our workers with jobs that last more than just projects that have been dreamed up.

Nonetheless, it is a serious problem and I tell you that we come to office after five months and we find that a deaf ear exists in Ottawa in terms of trying to get some responsive programmes.

Even the United States has a law that says no manufactured goods can leave an American port to go to another American port unless it goes on an American ship manned by an American crew.

Federal leadership? I'm asking, I'm hoping, I'm looking forward to assistance.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, my friend, we have a study of ship construction that I ordered in November before I went back to the Prime Minister. My study was prepared for the Prime Minister. It is feasible for us to embark on a major ship-building policy in this province. It is. Then why in the world, if everybody know it, doesn't Ottawa get the message and help us get going?

You give us the option of LIP projects. Give us the option of some of the other kinds of programmes that go on in this country. Give us the option. Let us have some western say and let us do some long-range economic planning, rather than the kind of year-to-year hand-outs that Ottawa is involved in.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, I would rather have people employed in a subsidized ship-building industry than having people subsidized on welfare and unemployment insurance in this country. We are only asking, while we sit at that table, for a fair share of what is going on in this country. And we will continue to ask. The Prime Minister has not replied.

Now we come to British Columbia. What is the purpose of asking for a ship-building programme? What is the purpose of moving us into long-range planning of the economy? As my friend, the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), indicated when he took over office, there was no planning in the secondary industry field. You will acknowledge that. You weren't here but the other Members will acknowledge that.

The only reason you got elected, my friend, is because the previous Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce got productive and punched somebody. That was the first sign of action we'd seen from him for years. (Laughter). I wonder now if he is regretting his aggressive action. (Laughter).

Nonetheless, in the throne speech we made the statement — I made it clear. "Major administrative and legislative changes will be made in the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce and you, the Legislative Assembly, will be

[[Page 46](#)]

asked to discuss measures to complement these changes."

So what is the situation? This afternoon I phoned over to a Mr. Fred Moreley, the head of the regional office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The House will be pleased to know that there has been a change in pattern of unemployment. Hopefully, a sustained change in pattern compared to previous years at this time. Mr. Moreley informs us that the intake is easing down in all seven B.C. and Yukon areas and that this easing is taking place earlier in the year than it normally does. The usual peak is in February.

Now, we are embarked on a number of propositions that relate to the industry of this province and the ores of this province and the development of those ores. I have no intention of discussing negotiations until they are

completed. But I will say as I have said before, coal will no longer leave British Columbia at 25 cents a ton royalty.

My friend referred to Sukunka and I refer to Sukunka — that deal we inherited from you. I say and I say clearly that we are in discussions. But let you understand that as long as I live and breathe, no deal on coal will go past my desk at 25 cents a ton while it sells on the world market.... And no deal will be committed on coal that allows jobs to be exported. I won't say anything further on that.

I'm not asking you to trust in me. Obviously, you can't anyway. What I'm suggesting to you is that in terms of that group's approach, it is nothing but a native response to gut politics. Because that's all they are — gut politicians. If they had the commitment to the industrial development of this province, we wouldn't be in the kind of unemployment mess we have now, that we inherited from that group. And we have a mess.

I say to the Liberal group, "Get on the phone and tell Ottawa we don't want welfare, we don't want charity. We want a share in the productivity of this country and the potential of this country. We have offered the proposals. We can't even get a response to a telegram."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You want to get into that? Sure, I get along with Ottawa. I get along much better than the previous administration, but maybe, maybe somebody back there might begin to get the message. And I hope that the Western Economic Conference is the beginning of that message.

We regret that the Opposition has found it necessary to flounder around on its own record, but nonetheless, we oppose this amendment to the throne speech. I suggest to you that we were sent here by the people of this province to straighten that unemployment mess out and if we haven't done in 5 months what you created in 20 years, then of course we can be blamed a bit. That only leaves us 19 years and 7 months to go.

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

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Premier has had his say, that he welcomes this debate, a debate which I believe would not have been necessary had the Government been fulfilling their role to the people of this particular province, unemployed in this province. He said he inherited an unemployment situation. Well, I'll read you the record as well, the figures from Canada Statistics on unemployment in British Columbia. In August of 1972 unemployment was 6.2 per cent, 6.2 per cent. In September it was 6.6 per cent — this is not adjusted figure. I don't have the adjusted figure. I have always consistently used the hard core figures of unemployment without being adjusted, seasonally adjusted.

So it was 6.2 per cent. It went to 6.6, 7.1, and I was very happy to see it stay at 7.1 for 2 months in a row, the month very happy to see it stay at 7.1 for two months in a row, the month of October and of November. But what happened in the month of December? Unemployment climbed when normally it decreases, because of the increase in employment in the service industries in our province and the social services. 8.3, the unemployment figures, the regional unemployment rates, unemployed as per cent of labour force. Those are the figures I am reading. You can use your own figures some other time.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. CHABOT: I have the floor at this moment. He's had an opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I ask you to stop while I find out what the point of order is. What's the point of order?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, that Member is deliberately misleading the House by jumping from one column to the other, and he really made it, the statement that it was the adjusted figures....

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Mr. Premier, it isn't a point of order. Would the Member proceed.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Speaker, what the Premier has just said is deliberate nonsense. Deliberate nonsense. Because these are the figures that are issued by the Department of Labour of British Columbia and they're headed "British Columbia labour force employed," and "unemployed," and "regional unemployment rates." Don't you have any faith in the

[[Page 47](#)]

figures that are issued by the Department of Labour of British Columbia?

AN HON. MEMBER: Stop jumping columns.

MR. CHABOT: I'm not jumping columns. You ask the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King), he knows these are authentic figures. You can twist them for all you want, you can blame Ottawa all you want as well, but unemployment is on the increase in British Columbia, and who knows where it stands today. It was 83 per cent in the month of December and it might even hit 10 per cent in the month of January. And I say that the rate of unemployment in British Columbia today is alarming, tragic and unnecessary. It's increased from the month of November to the month of December by almost 25 per cent, almost 25 per cent. In a month that normally unemployment decreases in this province. It's quite obvious why it has increased.

One year ago, when we compare the figures of the month of December, we have to look back at the figures for December of the previous year — and I am using the same figures, the same row of figures — the Premier can twist and turn all he wants. But unemployment was 6.9 per cent in December of 1971 in British Columbia.

I'll never forget when those Members stood in this House and spoke on that very question of unemployment, when unemployment was 6.9 per cent and the kind of abuse they threw across the floor at the cabinet. There was the czar of smelters speaking; there was the czar of ferries, the czar of health, the czar of the civil service and the czar of the cabinet — those in particular stood up in this House and heaped abuse upon the cabinet because of a 6.9 per cent figure of unemployment when one year later it's 8.3 per cent. Where is their concern today for the unemployed of British Columbia? I remember the Hon. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) in saying that the cabinet, "You're quite comfortable. You're quite comfortable because you're sitting in a cabinet chair, you're drawing \$40,000 a year and maybe you're not concerned."

Where is your concern today? Are you unconcerned because you happen to be occupying a \$40,000-a-year job, sitting in a comfortable chair? You indicated just a few moments ago, Mr. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources, you indicated you're not overly concerned because you said that 8.3 is no higher than it has been in the past. But you've indicated from the Opposition benches just one year ago that it was a tragic thing. But now because you occupy the role of cabinet Minister in this province, you're no longer concerned with the unemployed. And I think that's a tragic thing indeed. Very tragic.

No, there's very little consideration for the latest figures available of the 79,000 people that are unemployed in British Columbia. I remember just last October we warned that Government that because of their policy statements and the failure to issue statements that would create jobs — because of the naive statements relative to investment capital in this province — that unemployment would accelerate in British Columbia, and it has accelerated. Your statements of last October — or I should say your statements from the day you became Government — are coming back to haunt you today.

No, investment capital is not coming to British Columbia. Investment capital is very hesitant indeed to come to British Columbia. Or industry as it presently stands is hesitant to expand its plants, because of the failure to tell people of this province the philosophy of that socialist Government over there.

I might say that there is a black cloud — and I can't say a black cloud because people would tell me that black is beautiful — but I do want to say that there must be some other type of cloud hanging over British Columbia. The only other description that I could use, if black is described as beautiful, is that there is a red cloud hanging over British Columbia, over the investment people, over the potential investment in British Columbia. There's a red cloud hanging over jobs in British Columbia today and there's a red cloud hanging over the farmers and their land in

British Columbia today.

I'll never forget as well that when unemployment in December of 1970 was considerably less than it was in December of 1972, the tremendous demonstration that took place just on the lawn and in the galleries of this particular Legislature, a political demonstration led by the B.C. Federation of Socialism. They were here. They were here demonstrating on behalf of the unemployed. Yet unemployment in December of this year is considerably higher than it was in December of 1970. Where were they on opening day this year, or where have they been since when unemployment is higher in December than it ever has been in the history of British Columbia? Where were they? There were two of them at least were sitting on the floor of the Legislature with big smiles. They're no longer concerned about unemployment, because their Government has been elected. The B.C. Federation of Socialism is nothing but a political organization.

No, this Government, because of its philosophy and lack of philosophy, is really unable to produce jobs. It's very foreign or alien to their way of thinking — the job-creation aspect. And no wonder jobs are diminishing in British Columbia today.

I remember the very positive statements you used to make in this Legislature about what should be done for job creation in British Columbia. I want to

[[Page 48](#)]

assure you that those statements that you made in those days are shallow indeed today; very shallow. You had all the answers when you were in opposition regarding job creation. You failed to demonstrate your ability to create jobs since you've become Government.

You've made two major decisions since you've been Government. In one is the arbitrary amalgamation of the municipalities and the surrounding municipalities of Kamloops and Kelowna. And the other was the land freeze against the farmers of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CHABOT: In all other matters, in all other....

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order.

I would ask the Hon. Member first of all to address himself to the motion before the House; secondly to cease talking directly to Members across the floor and address the chair.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Speaker, for your information, I am addressing the chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I see.

MR. CHABOT: Must I constantly look at the Speaker, for you to interpret it as my addressing the chair?

MR. SPEAKER: No. No. Well, it's a question of interpretation. I take the interpretation when you keep saying across the floor "you" that you are not addressing the chair.

MR. CHABOT: Well, if you want to ...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. CHABOT: All of the matters relative to job creation in unemployment and employment, Mr. Speaker, have been delegated to committees, to think tanks, task forces and consultants. The only thing that they fail to do in British Columbia in order to become another Trudeau type government is to issue White Papers — that's the only thing they fail to do.

When I listen to the statements of the Premier blaming Ottawa — what did he say not too long ago about unemployment? On August 3, 1971, he said "the government must lay out its plans to deal with unemployment". To deal With unemployment. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, he was speaking about the provincial government not the national government. Then on September 24, 1971, he had this to say. He called Wednesday for the provincial Government to put \$75 million into a winter works programme in B.C. municipalities. Where is his action today? Why is he blaming Ottawa instead of doing something at the provincial level to alleviate unemployment in our province? Then he went on. He said, "If Bennett says it isn't there, I say go borrow it." Unemployment is high in British Columbia, go and borrow the money but create jobs, Mr. Speaker. He has inherited a treasury of \$70 million and if he is really concerned about job creation he'll use some of those surplus funds which he inherited to create jobs, Mr. Speaker, for the people who are unemployed in the highest numbers ever in the history of this province for the month of December.

He'll take some of the advice. One of the pieces of legislation that was introduced today, the B.C. Industrial Development Corporation — and I know, Mr. Speaker, you are listening very carefully to ensure that I don't deviate from the amendment that has been presented here and I want to assure you that I will not go into the subject matter of the bill that was presented this afternoon. But I think that if he uses that particular type of approach that jobs can be created. That there will be incentives to ensure that investment capital does flow to British Columbia to create jobs.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Why didn't you do it since you had 20 years?

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Speaker, again addressing you, not too long ago — just a few months ago — there was a very beautiful brochure issued, very expensive. I don't know who paid for it but nevertheless it's union made and it's very expensive. It shows two who are now cabinet Ministers — one is the Attorney General and the other is the Minister of Lands, Forests, Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) and Condominiums. Now this is a very colourful and expensive brochure but let's see what this Attorney General who just a few moments ago said "What did you do when you were in office?" He talked about unemployment. And I'm asking him, what is he doing about unemployment. He says, "jobs, more of them."

There are 75,000 unemployed people in British Columbia. People who want to work but can't find a job. Part of the reason is that every day we let raw materials leave the province, creating thousands of jobs in foreign countries. Many of those secondary industries could be developed right here in B.C. and create a lot of new jobs for our own people. Financing this secondary industry would be easier than you might expect. The NDP policy on car insurance would keep those premiums in B.C. where they could be invested until needed for insurance payment. The NDP policy on taxing the natural resource industries would provide even more capital.

[[Page 49](#)]

More jobs. The NDP believes that a job is not a privilege but a right, but a right. What are you doing to honour the rights of the unemployed in the Province of British Columbia? The people are waiting for that new deal which you've spelled out in this very expensive election brochure.

MR. SPEAKER: Address the chair, please.

MR. CHABOT: They're waiting to hear from you, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, as to what you expect to do. You can talk all you want about your philosophy of secondary industry but I assure you that you're not going to create many jobs when you have a part-time Minister. You've indicated that you're interested in development of jobs in British Columbia. You have a Minister who probably devotes something in the neighbourhood of 10 per cent of his time — is that correct? 12 per cent?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No. No, that is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Please address the chair.

MR. CHABOT: He devotes very little of his time. I hope that this session will bring a full time Minister to

an area that is so critical to job creation in British Columbia — the portfolio of Industrial Development Trade and Commerce. We need a full time Minister. It's time the jobs are created — that the programme should be in a process of being developed at this particular time. But unfortunately it's not being developed because we lack a full time Minister. A Minister who spends a minimal amount of time looking after that particular portfolio. I want to assure you, with your attitudes as well, you won't create jobs. You won't create jobs in the field of secondary industries.

The people of British Columbia are very disillusioned. Very disillusioned with the lack of action on the part of your government in the area of creating jobs. The business community is alarmed as well. I know you people are not overly concerned about the business community. But I want to assure you that the business community does play a role in job creation by the investment of capital and this helps the working man. It helps create jobs.

Because of the drift and the lack of a clear-cut policy on the part of your government jobs are not coming on line. Jobs are not coming on stream in British Columbia today because you've frightened investment capital. Some have been frightened away. Others have been frightened temporarily and are waiting in the wings to see really just what the philosophy of your particular government is, Mr. Speaker. Now, you've created a lot of fear and uncertainty in the community and in the province as well. I have to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech is shallow indeed when it comes to talk about jobs. Shallow indeed because it mentions just the creation of 1,000 jobs in the civil service which has been criticized by the secretary-manager of the B.C. Government Employees Union. It is not enough. It is not keeping pace with the growth of the civil service in our province. You've faded in your throne speech to discuss the vital issues facing the people of British Columbia. Those vital issues, Mr. Speaker, are unemployment and inflation. Until such time as this Government is prepared to face up to the responsibilities as a Government, I'm supporting this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I was certainly amazed to listen when the Premier of this province stood on his feet just a few short moments ago with a continuation of the same act talking about unemployment that we had last fall. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province would come to grips with the fact that he is now the Premier of the province and no longer in Opposition. I must say, Mr. Speaker, when an issue as important to the people of British Columbia as the issue of unemployment is being discussed in this House that our Premier stands up and puts on an act and talks about many other things but unemployment and talks as though he were still the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it will do the Premier of this province no good whatsoever to condemn the previous government about what he says he was left with. I would suggest to the Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he realizes here and now that he is the Premier of this province — that he has to solve the problem of unemployment. And by continually criticizing the previous government he will not help the unemployed in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the Premier on his feet just a few moments ago, I began to think that the group on this side — the Social Credit group — are the Government and that he was still in Opposition. I want to tell you Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, that this group over here is not dead and that we intend to bring the issues that face the citizens of British Columbia before you. I hope that you will discuss those issues with the amount of concern that you should show for them, being in Government. To continue to say that the problems were handed to you by the previous administration is not going to solve the problem, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, but you are going to be forced to solve those problems and in another six months or another year, you are not going to be able to give those same excuses. It is time now, Mr. Premier, that

[[Page 50](#)]

you started some long-range planning to provide jobs for the unemployed in British Columbia.

Now, I'm not going to go back like the leader of the Liberals did and discuss and go through your campaign and how jobs was one of the issues. **There were two major issues in the election campaign. One was jobs and one was car insurance. You have said that you are going to bring in the car insurance but you have done absolutely nothing to provide jobs or any long-range form of planning to look to the future.**

During the federal election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the aspirants to the federal NDP caucus in Ottawa placed an ad in the newspaper, the *Province*. The ad shows our smiling Premier and the ad says that "NDP action in British Columbia puts people first." But this ad, which is a couple of months after the actual campaign in August, is a sort of a fictitious ad too because there has been no action on the part of the present Government to put people first and to provide jobs that people need. Now, if you are going to put people first, Mr. Premier, you must first of all provide them with employment. You stood up on your feet just a few moments ago and you blamed Ottawa and stated that you had been to Ottawa and, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier asked Ottawa to implement certain policies that would provide employment.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, could I have the permission of the House, if agreed, to carry on the debate past the normal closing hour?

AN HON. MEMBER: Past when?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Because of "schmockey" tonight, Mr. Member, I'm asking permission of the House to carry on past 6 o'clock. If it is not acceptable by unanimous consent, fine. We'll come back at 8. Whichever the House wants.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, am I playing on that same team? (Laughter).

HON. MR. BARRETT: Is it agreed, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, I'll just sort of carry on here. I promise not to be long but I do want to point out to the House — I know that Members of the Government would much prefer to play schmockey or go eat than they would prefer to discuss the most important subject before the people of British Columbia today. I know that. You just witnessed that. However, what I want to point out, Mr. Premier, and I hope you will stay and bear me out, because what I want to say is that rather than taking some long-range view of what is going to happen and an understanding of what creates jobs, you have done just the entire opposite thing.

How in the name of the forest industry — how are you going to create jobs in the forest industry when you scare the industry that provides the most jobs in this province? And you scared them, Mr. Premier, when you said, "We are going to increase our revenue from the forest industry." But you didn't say how. Consequently, many projects in the forest industry are going to be delayed. Now there is one thing that you have done that is not creating jobs, not working towards the creation of jobs, but is having the entire opposite effect.

Let me give you another example, Mr. Premier. You have said and said continuously since you came to power that you are going to get more revenue out of the mining industry — that you are going to snap your fingers and you are automatically going to have the mining industry process the minerals before they are shipped overseas. Now, Mr. Premier, there are many mining developments which have been delayed because you have come out with no clear-cut policy. This is but yet another example of the way that you have not moved to create jobs in this province, Mr. Premier, but the way that you have moved through the uncertainty created in the mining industry to create more unemployment. Yet you have the audacity, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, to stand on your feet and blame the unemployment in this province at the present time on the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, what have you done to create unemployment in the agricultural industry? There again, you have done absolutely nothing but the uncertainty that you have created in that industry has added to the unemployment in yet another industry.

I have given you three instances, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, where the Premier of this province, who had the audacity to stand on his feet just a few moments ago and make mockery of this very serious situation, has come up with three specific instances where you have aggravated the unemployment situation.

Now I could go on but due to the hour I won't. I could point out where there are other instances, Mr. Premier,

through your unqualified remarks to the Press, through the news media, that you have created uncertainty in the major industries in this province — the industries that create the major amount of employment. You have made no statement that gives direction to industry and business. The segment of the province that provides the greatest amount of employment and provides the greatest amount of jobs — you have given them no clear-cut direction as to what direction your Government is going to take. Therefore again you have created uncertainty and added to the problem of unemployment.

[[Page 51](#)]

That is the reason, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment figures are increasing. No matter what anybody says in this House and no matter what you say, Mr. Premier, these are cold hard facts. You have scared the entire population of the Province of British Columbia. Indeed, certainly nobody is going to invest in plants that create employment when they don't know whether they are going to be able to get a return from their investment.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that all segments of the Province of British Columbia are having many sleepless nights because they are worrying about what is going to happen in the future. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go, due to the hour again, and quote what our Premier said in *Hansard* last year when he was talking about the throne speech. I'm not going to quote the now Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke), what he said when he condemned the previous Government about unemployment. Now that they are on the other side of the House, now that they are in a position to do the things that they urged the previous Government to do, what have they done about it, Mr. Speaker? They haven't done a thing. They aggravated the situation.

HON. MR. NIMSICK: They aggravated you too.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, now, there's a man who says that running the Government is just like running a popcorn stand. Well I suggest to the Hon. Member for Kootenay (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) that when you run a popcorn stand, there's more to making the corn than just popping off all over the province and making goofball statements. I would suggest to you that if you are going to make good popcorn, you must have the exact right amount of heat and you must have the right amount of oil. So there's more to running a popcorn stand. But when the Government that you're a Member of the cabinet of, Mr. Member for Kootenay, when you continue just to pop off all over everywhere, I would say that when you said that the Government is like running a popcorn stand, you actually believed what you said.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his cabinet have an emergency session tonight after the schmockey game, if necessary, and discuss the unemployment situation in British Columbia. I would suggest that they wake up to the facts. Because every day you delay, Mr. Premier, every day you keep making more statements, Mr. Speaker, he's going to have to answer to the people of British Columbia. When the situation that he is creating comes home to roost, he will not be able to stand in this Legislature and say, "It was the previous Government." You are going to have to answer for your own sins. If you keep on goofing off, popping off, you're creating more sins.

Mr. Speaker, I won't carry on with the remainder of my speech except to say one thing. We have a programme, a development which could be under way which the previous Government again — don't condemn the previous Government. I'm referring to Sukunka coal. This is a very, very serious situation, Mr. Premier. You know it. You have had negotiations. But it is not only Sukunka coal that bothers me, Mr. Premier. You know that there are developments in the north which could create thousands and thousands of jobs. But no clear-cut statement is forthcoming yet and time is running on. You have been in power five months. You have been the Premier of this province for five months and still no clear-cut statements. Why is this, Mr. Premier? Why have you not made up your mind? When you were in Opposition you had all the answers. Then we hear this Liberal group down here — the group who do not work for the Province of British Columbia but for the bankers on Bloor Street and the CNR and the CPR — they don't work for the province. That is why, Mr. Speaker, they will never be the Government of this province. It is the same way with the Members that we send down to Ottawa under the tag of Liberal and Conservative — they don't work for the Province of British Columbia. They go down and they work for the Liberals. They go down and they work for the CNR. They go down and they work for the porter party. You gentlemen don't work for the Province of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt you?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you address yourself to the question and not to the people who work.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time ask for an adjournment of this debate until tomorrow.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Look, the House agreed to continue and now either we have some order in this House or not. Now the House agreed to continue, we're going to continue.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, a motion to adjourn is on the floor.

Motion negatived by the following division:

YEAS-14

Richter Chabot Jordan

[[Page 52](#)]

Smith	Fraser	Phillips
McClelland	Morrison	Schroeder
McGeer	Anderson, D.A.	Williams, L.A.
Gardom	Brousson	

NAYS-39

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member has lost his place, having made the motion to adjourn which has been defeated.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, what standing order?

MR. SPEAKER: That's under May, seventeenth edition, page 444, footnote 1.

MR. PHILLIPS: That's all right for the steamroller tactics of a large Opposition...(Laughter)...of a large Government. That will come back to haunt you.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the clock.

The House took recess at 6:18 p.m.

The House resumed at 8 p.m., Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, we commence where we left off with debate on the amendment to the main motion before the House.

The Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I promise to be very brief. I know everyone wants to go home early this evening.

But I did want to speak in support of this amendment, because I believe it's a very important amendment and must be discussed as fully as possible. I believe, especially as a new Member to this House, that the Speech from the Throne was incredibly vacant and absent of any opportunities for the province's unemployed.

Except for this expansion of the Civil Service — which even the civil servants admit is a smokescreen — there's nothing in the Speech from the Throne that talks about jobs. Even John Fryer, the head of the B.C. Government Employees' Union, says that 1,000 jobs in any one year is nothing. It happens every year. He says there's a natural growth in the Civil Service and it could even reach 2,000. So perhaps the 1,000 jobs that the throne speech has promised is even less than is adequate.

The Government's real lack of concern about jobs has been amply demonstrated in its short tenure in office. We had an agency in this province before for finding jobs. The first action of the Government was to chop that agency in one vindictive move. It knocked off all of the civil servants there — typists and clerks and job counsellors, Mr. Speaker, who were employed at this agency. They're now walking the street and haven't been given the opportunity to continue their tenure in the Civil Service.

HON. MR. LEVI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement): Not so. Not so.

MR. McCLELLAND: Yes it is so, Mr. Minister. They're unemployed today and haven't been given other jobs.

HON. MR. LEVI: How many then?

MR. McCLELLAND: How many have been unemployed? Tell us then — or have been employed.

HON. MR. LEVI: Fifteen were placed....

MR. McCLELLAND: Fifteen were placed....

Mr. Speaker, those people are walking the streets today. They don't have a job. And like so many other instances in the short tenure of this Government there was no dialogue with the department involved. This kind of agency — and I'll accept that perhaps the Government felt it was set up wrong and it should have been expanded. Because it was working.

It was finding jobs for people with a minimum of red tape, which is what really it's all about. Apparently there wasn't enough bureaucracy involved, so it had to go. But it should have been expanded. And it would have

been, I believe, Mr. Speaker, except perhaps the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) allowed a personal vendetta to get in his way of sound judgment in this case.

I admit that what's done is done now with this particular instance. But where is the replacement for that kind of agency? We certainly need in the Province of British Columbia some kind of input from the provincial Government to replace the ineptitude of the Department of Manpower, which is

[[Page 53](#)]

run by the federal government. We need something and we have nothing. Where is the agency provided by the British Columbia Government for finding jobs?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McCLELLAND: They fired a lot of civil servants who are walking the street, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the comments that the Hon. Premier sent to Ottawa. And I agree that Canada must have a working merchant marine — must have more input into the problem of shipbuilding in British Columbia. The industry needs help and we must keep the pressure on, of course. But what is the socialist Government doing right now, right here and right now, to find jobs in British Columbia?

AN HON. MEMBER: Chewing gum.

MR. McCLELLAND: Chewing gum. No mention in the throne speech at all about finding jobs for the unemployed in British Columbia. And, instead of inspiring the economy, this Government has shattered the confidence of the economic community in the province. Investors, big and little, inside and outside the province, are becoming more alarmed every day. All we need do is consider the bewildering statements by the Premier and Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) that sent shock waves of uncertainty through this province — that have cost the investors of this province hundreds of millions of dollars and no one knows how many thousands or hundreds of jobs.

"The stock market is a gamble," says the Premier and Minister of Finance. "Nobody is innocent in the stock market." It reminds me of some other phrases, that "nobody's going to get hurt." The Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) assured us at one time that nobody was going to lose their jobs in the Civil Service. Well, not only are they losing their jobs but we're making no provision for new ones.

I wonder who the Government thinks, Mr. Speaker, are the investors in the economy of this province? It's not the fat cats. It's the little people, the pensioners and the school teachers. I understand even the former Opposition leader said he was a modest investor at one time before he became the Leader of the Government of British Columbia. But those are the kind of people, Mr. Speaker, who have made this province great. And it's the confidence in this economy that has been built up by those kind of people that have made this a healthy climate for jobs. That now is being eroded. The socialist Government seems bound on an almost deliberate course to erode that confidence.

We heard some mention earlier of the takeover announcements that were so casually and flippantly over television and in the newspaper some time ago. Right on top of that, Mr. Speaker, came the "takeover" convention in Vancouver, where the delegates proposed resolutions calling for the takeover of everything from MacMillan Bloedel to the local movie theatres. And I can envision now Mr. Macdonald having come up with a new restriction in his classified announcements in the newspaper, that "these are for NDP eyes only." (Laughter).

The attitude of this new Government, Mr. Speaker, has only served to further foster the fear complex — and there is a fear complex growing in British Columbia — to spread the erosion of that confidence and now to even strike out at the people who have made this whole country so great — the members of our farming community. What's more frightening is that the socialist Government doesn't seem to care what it's up to and what it does to the investment climate in this province. What the Government doesn't understand, Mr. Speaker, is that without investment we can't create new jobs. No way.

The creation of new jobs is the most vital need that we have. As we said in the throne speech debate in October, it's the only pressing concern in British Columbia right now. It's the working man and woman of this province, the people who elected your Government, Mr. Speaker — the very people for whom the socialists claim to be champion — who suffer because of the erosion of confidence in the long run.

Before the socialists became Government it would be possible to laugh off the takeover resolutions. But now they must be considered in abject reality, regardless of the fact that they weren't considered very seriously at the convention. In fact it became obvious from the Press reports that the cabinet Ministers and all of the elected Members were conveniently in hiding when some of those resolutions came to the convention floor. But there's still a clear indication of the direction that the members of the socialist party wish their Government to take.

There are a lot of outstanding political debts, Mr. Speaker, that must be paid off. And a lot of the IOU's are in the hands of the people who are pushing for the takeover of all our resource industries, all of our business in British Columbia, and everything that isn't nailed down. This Government is following the pattern, Mr. Speaker, of chasing investment out of the province. And it's the ordinary taxpayers who are going to be forced to fill the financial vacuum that's left.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support the amendment that calls for some kind of mention in the throne speech for the creation of jobs in the economy of British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

[[Page 54](#)]

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver-Howe Sound.): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to take my place in this debate however briefly, because as other speakers have indicated, there surely must be nothing which is more important to the people of British Columbia today than that there should be a debate in this House on the matter of employment — a debate which the Hon. Premier himself in past sessions attempted to have brought before this House without success.

I must say I've listened to what the Premier said this afternoon and to the contributions from the members of the official Opposition, that I was again amused at what a difference a year can make. The official Opposition in moving this amendment has done its proper role in the course of this debate. Yet I can't help but recall that in previous sessions, the concern that they expressed today for the unemployed, for the plight of the people in the agricultural community is something that didn't seem to bother them very much in previous sessions of this House. Certainly the back of the hand treatment that they gave to the agricultural community in past years must leave some doubt in the minds of the people of this province as to the seriousness of the matters that they raise in debate today.

It has been suggested by speakers today that the activities of this government have left all persons in this province in a position of fear and trepidation. Great mention has been made of the impact which comments of the Hon. Premier and other Members of the executive council has had upon the confidence of the people who must invest in this province. I suggest however, that the failure to make any mention of the problems of unemployment must cast even greater fear in the minds of those people who suffer most from unemployment, and that is the unemployed. These are the people about whom the Government, when they were in Opposition, had the greatest concern — people without jobs, the disadvantaged, the poor. I've heard fine speeches from those who now sit in the cabinet benches about the failures of the free enterprise system to find a place for these people in our society and yet here we have their first real throne speech. making no mention of this important subject.

This is, Mr. Speaker, of course what this amendment is all about. Not about future plans the Government may have. No matter what may come before this House in the course of the presentation of the budget. But the fact is the matter of unemployment, so important to all of those citizens of this province who are today unemployed, was not included in the throne speech — a speech which should have indicated to the people of this province the direction that this Government intended to follow. The very absence of this is enough to cast, as I say, this serious uncertainty amongst those people who form the ranks of the unemployed.

Where are they going to get the assistance that they are entitled to look for from the government of the Province of British Columbia? The government which in the past has spoken out so loudly and so well on behalf of this unfortunate group of our citizens. The only response that the Hon. Premier made in his remarks this afternoon was to suggest that because of some failure on the part of the federal government, we didn't have subsidized ship building in this province. As if this was going to produce the solution to 78,000 unemployed. What monstrous ship building activity we would need to have in order to employ 78,000 people.

Secondly, the Hon. Premier has sent a telegram to Ottawa and hasn't received a response. I criticize the federal government for not responding to this kind of communication. But I'm sure that the Hon. Premier, concerned as he is about this particular subject, knows as well as every other Member of this House must know, that there is today available from the federal government a 25 per cent subsidy for the construction of ships — not on a regional basis, but throughout entire Canada. 25 per cent — 17 per cent....

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: 17 is the extra, which is the export subsidy.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's the export subsidy. If you would communicate with any of the federal New Democratic Members who represent constituencies in this province, they would tell you about the interest 25 per cent construction subsidy available to every province in Canada. Now of course they are not building many ships in Saskatchewan or Manitoba, but it certainly is available to those maritime provinces of which we are one. Now, to the limited extent that ship building could be part of the solution to our unemployment problem, as well as the Federal Government offering this construction subsidy of 25 per cent, where is the subsidy that this provincial government is prepared to offer to further stimulate the activity in this area? No mention of this in the throne speech today.

The fact of the matter is that every person engaged in the ship building industry must realize that aside altogether from the federal subsidy, we have the problem of competing with our other jurisdictions of the world, and with other provinces in this country. Out labour costs, and I'm not suggesting that they're not legitimate costs, but nevertheless — our labour costs, the cost of materials which must go into the construction of ships in this province are significantly higher than in the case in other provinces. Therefore, in order to stimulate this activity which the Hon. Premier thinks is so valuable, we should have had some additional assistance from the provincial govern-

[[Page 55](#)]

ment. A clear indication that at least this segment of our economy would be supported by the provincial government so that those people who are skilled in the ship building industry could look forward, at least, to the shipyards commencing operation again and being able to compete fairly with at least the other provinces of Canada. No answer at all. Only this suggestion from the Premier that because he hasn't got an answer to a telegram to Ottawa, that this is somehow or other an excuse for a failure on his part in the throne speech to clearly indicate at least one course of action available to relieve unemployment in this province.

Now I know that the Hon. Premier and members of his cabinet have indicated that there are not going to be any subsidies any longer. It's one of the reasons that we do not have much activity going on today in the matter of the construction of smelting facilities in this province. That construction subsidy, a subsidy which was promised by the previous administration, has suddenly been withdrawn. The basis is that we don't have to subsidize these big companies and Cominco was named as one.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that we are today engaged in a debate involving the off-shore shipment of one of our energy resources, namely coal from the Sukunka deposit — a deal that was made by the previous administration. I agree with the Hon. Premier that that was a lousy deal. But the Premier is prepared to go ahead and make a better deal still involving the export of that energy resource. In making that deal, we're going to subsidize the people who are being given the right to remove coal from the Sukunka deposit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier shakes his head negatively — no subsidy. I suggest to you, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, that whether it is a direct financial grant and a subsidy in that form, or whether you take the taxpayers' money and pour it through British Columbia Railway — spend something between \$9 and \$23 millions in order to develop facilities for the movement of that coal out of this province, that is a subsidy. However

you call it. You are continuing to use the British Columbia Railway as the previous administration used it — as a resource railroad — and shipment of cargoes over that railroad is a subsidy.

You are not prepared to stand in this House and suggest that the rates that are charged for shipments over that rail line will be competitive rail rates, designed to produce a true profit in the hands of the British Columbia Railroad. You are subsidizing the shipment of coal out of this province. Not only are you subsidizing it with the use of taxpayers' money, but you are prepared to subsidize it by the sacrifice of a significant part of the environment of this province in order to do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is only one small part of this whole matter of employment. I would have thought that in the throne speech we would have seen some clear indication from departments of government which have the responsibility for concerning themselves with matters of the environment. That we would have seen some programme designed to encourage and employ the young people of this province in those projects so desperately needed to clean up some of the messes that exist in this province and to preserve the environment against further examples of which we already have too many. Nothing from the Department of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, or Recreation, or Conservation that would indicate that there is any intention on the part of this government to form that kind of conservation corps which can do the kind of work that the young people in our community indicate that they want to see done. To give them an opportunity to contribute in a positive way towards the environment of which they speak so highly — no indication that the direction of this government will ensure that this will take place.

This is the kind of employment, Mr. Speaker, which can take the young people out of the urban areas and away from some of the unfortunate attractions which result in them becoming a charge upon society and falling within the scope of the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement. We could, if we took some of those dollars that that Minister is obliged to spend, and placed them in the hands of some of the other departments, create meaningful, worthwhile, productive employment for young people, preserving them from some of the pitfalls of our society and at the same time providing a positive, responsible and worthwhile result for the province as a whole. Nothing is said in this respect.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that while some have been constrained to say that the Speech from the Throne offered nothing in the way of the philosophy of this Government, the failure to deal positively with the matter of unemployment is part and parcel of the philosophy of this Government, when taken together with some of the words that did appear in the throne speech. I refer, in the fourth paragraph from the end of the remarks delivered by His Honour, to these words: "The administrative and legislative programmes will be carefully designed and will be based on the clear necessity to plan our future so that we may live in harmony with our environment and at peace with our fellow men and to depart from the acquisitive North American values that have seen profligacy and waste on all sides."

You applaud and I'm glad to see the Hon. Attorney General applaud. Because these remarks — fine statement — together with the failure to make any mention in the throne speech of the matter of employment must really strike fear into the hearts of the unemployed in this province. Because your

[[Page 56](#)]

concern to depart from the acquisitive policies of North America and your failure for having any concern with respect to the unemployed in this province, taken together, mean that this Government really has no plan to reduce unemployment — that those who are unemployed will continue to be unemployed. Because you are not going to provide the kind of jobs that are necessary to pick up the 78,000 or any significant portion of them who are unemployed so long as you are attracted to the proposition that we must depart from the acquisitive values of North America.

You cannot have it both ways. It is all very well to talk about a special kind of growth — a planned growth. But this statement of policy, as I say, together with the absence of any clear indication of where this Government is going in the matter of jobs, put together, means that you are going nowhere. That the economy of the Province of British Columbia will be allowed to stagnate except to the extent that necessary growth in the civil service will take up some part of the unemployed. The jobs that you may produce with our new insurance plan and other such

ventures will provide some employment. But what you will do is squeeze down the standard of living of those who are presently employed and refrain from picking up those who are currently unemployed. It is in that way that you will depart from the concepts that you criticize in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Highways.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It has been an interesting debate around this particular amendment. There has been a fair amount of noise from across the way. The Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) was talking about what was required to make good popcorn. I have to say that it's obvious he had the right kind of corn. He had the right kind of oil. But I think he had too much heat and not enough light. And that Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) waving his little finger. He was indulging in the old numbers game. He was pouncing, bouncing around from column to column between adjusted and unadjusted.

MR. CHABOT: Untrue!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: He said, "I always use the adjusted figure." What was the adjusted figure? A year ago the adjusted figure was 8.7.

MR. CHABOT: I didn't say "the adjusted figure."

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You said, "I always use the..." No, the unadjusted figure, sorry. Yes, you said you always use the unadjusted figure. What was the unadjusted figure a year ago? What was it?

MR. CHABOT: 6.9.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: 8.7 unadjusted! Right there.

AN HON. MEMBER: What month?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: January. A year ago.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: A year ago.

MR. SMITH: Twist, twist, twist!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Using the one line of figures that were used by the Premier shows that — you say December. A year ago December it was 6.9. January it was 7. And he pointed out that contrary to that situation where from December to January it was still going up a year ago, this year it is going down. He phoned the office in Vancouver today and that was the information he was given.

But apart from the numbers game which you were playing is the whole fact that the sickness that has pervaded the industrial operation of this province and the employment situation in British Columbia has been with us for many, many years — partially due and largely due to the failure of governments, both provincial and federal, to recognize what was happening to the economy of British Columbia and the economy of Canada vis-à-vis the economies of other countries.

MR. PHILLIPS: You'll eat those words in a year.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Let's get back to B.C. Bad planning of school construction by the former Social Credit Government has been the main reason for winter construction layoffs in B.C., Bruce Necko, chairman of the Construction Labour Relations Association, said last Friday. That's the spokesman for the Construction Association

of this province — says bad planning by the previous administration is responsible for construction layoffs in B.C. He said there were not enough big winter projects and blamed the former Government for not accepting any time concept beyond their immediate needs. Those are the words of the spokesman for the construction industry of this province.

MR. CHABOT: He denied those words.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: He has not denied them.

[[Page 57](#)]

There they are — right there in black and white. There you are. You say we're doing nothing.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: This province — because of the policy of the previous administration — has always reacted to the greater swing of the pendulum than any other province. When the boom was on in B.C., it swung much higher than the Canadian average. When the recession was on, it always went much greater. Because of the adherence of the previous administration to a resource-based primary industry. Despite the fact that their own advisers in the trade and industry department told them that this would provide a decreasing number of jobs. They insisted on continuing to pursue that way of operating the economy of this province.

One of the areas in the resources of this province, where we have always had trouble in marketing our product is in the plywood sector. Always one of our problems in British Columbia, especially when the market was off a little, was getting rid of our plywood. And there is more wealth created in the making of plywood and the sale of plywood than in any other part of the forest industry. But the present Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has supplied \$660,000 in a joint programme with the industry to sell plywood throughout the world. You say we've done nothing? There's one example of what we have done.

But that does not alter the fact that we still have a basic problem relating to the industry in this province. Apart from the long-term planning required for schools and the long-term planning required for everything else. I have said in this House many, many times that the time to avert a crisis is five years before it happens. That's the time to avert a crisis. And the word has been out for some considerable time that unless there was a change of direction in the economic development — in the way in which we applied our resources, in the way in which we developed our industries — then we were heading for trouble. The Economic Council of Canada told us that years ago and neither the federal government nor the provincial government took any steps whatsoever to change the direction of the economic development of this country or this province. Not one single step.

Here's a report of the Science Council of Canada, October, 1972. Look at the tables in that and you can see why we are on this point on this position in Canada — and especially in British Columbia.

It shows very clearly that until 1966 the number of employees involved in manufacturing in Canada were on a 45 degree raise on the chart. About 1966 it started to level off. And by 1970 the increase in the number of jobs in the manufacturing industry has levelled off completely.

MR. PHILLIPS: Threatening every industry in British Columbia will solve that problem.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: At the same time it shows that community business and personal services continue on the upgrade — which is creating a complete imbalance in the economic and industrial development of this country. You look at the — you say it's the auto pact. Look at the next set of charts. It shows that until 1969 electrical products were on the up. Then all of a sudden they started to go down. All manufacturing at the same time started to go down, slowly levelled off and has remained level.

That same Science Council of Canada points out in this report — this is the "Innovation and the Structure of Canadian Industry" — in this report, "The Multi-national Firm Foreign Direct Investment and Canadian Science Policy" — and in this report, "Innovation, the Cold Climate." What the problem is — and I am going to read this into the record: "Generally, subsidiary operations in manufacturing have been set up in Canada to service the Canadian market. Little thought has ever been given to the use of Canadian operations as a springboard into other world markets. A minor exception is the use of the Commonwealth preference tariff. Where there are exports they are usually allocated especially in the case of the rationalized subsidiary. This market limitation combined with other gaps in innovation in the Canadian subsidiary means that successful research and development done by the subsidiary does not necessarily result in the complete innovation process with production in Canada.

"The rigidity of this structure and the consequent weaknesses in design and engineering undoubtedly inhibit the growth of an infrastructure of high technology industry in Canada." And to talk about the learning curve in this whole matter of industrial development, manufacturing and technological innovation — and the fact that because of the failure of the previous administration in this province and the federal administration to see to it that this sort of captive market in Canada by foreign-owned multinational corporations was stopped, we are in this position today. This is what they say:

"In formulating your industrial strategy we must recognize that Canada has two intrinsic strengths — its growing population of skilled people and its store of natural resources. Both of these strengths can be made to work in our favour in an industrial strategy that stresses medium and high technology manufacturing in fields related to our production of resources."

We cannot continue up that road from which the previous administration refuses to part — of simply

[[Page 58](#)]

relying on a primary resource based economy in this province. This is what we mean when we say we must change the direction economically and industrially.

You talk about creating jobs for the skilled and the unskilled. That is related to this thing too, this report also said when talking about the appropriate balance and decisions that have to be made by elected governments. This applies equally to another important component of any industrial strategy — the provision of employment opportunities for all Canadians who wish to work. Only governments can decide on the precise mix of unskilled, semi-skilled and highly-skilled jobs that will best meet Canadian expectations.

The Science Council has concluded on the basis of the best available evidence that the creation of technology-based employment offers, over a 5 to 10 year period, the best multiplier effect. Employment of unskilled and semi-skilled workers will not follow immediately, but will certainly develop in succeeding years. Without this multiplier we face the prospect of erosion of unskilled employment as the world's established industries increasingly adopt automation techniques.

It is unfortunate that so much of the research and development that should have been taking place in Canada — in view of the massive sums of money that we have been spending all over Canada to educate our young people in the skills required in a technological age — it's unfortunate that within this country — within this province — no Government had the guts to see that the people who were operating the economy developed that economy in a way to use these skills.

That's the tragedy of Canada, and that's why we are in the position we're in today — multi-national corporations able to move masses of figures across international boundaries from company to company, subsidiary to subsidiary, with no real loyalty to this country.

We look at the major corporations and we talk about investment — they could have been developing the technology that is required in this province. Where were they investing the money? Where were they doing the research work? Where were they doing the development work? Not in British Columbia. And MacMillan Bloedel — what do they own? Five corrugated package plants in England and one each at Jersey City, New Jersey and

Baltimore, Maryland, and paper product marketing companies in England, the U.S. and Australia. MacMillan Bloedel also controls a company with lumber, plywood and liner board mills at Pinehill, Alabama, and holds a 30 per cent interest in a Dutch company with paper mills at Maastricht, the Netherlands and Lanac in Belgium.

Noranda Mines — a big operator in British Columbia — what have they got? Through subsidiaries they own an aluminum smelter and manufacturing facilities near New Madrid, Missouri — a plant making aluminum building products near Cleveland, Ohio, controlled companies own a fluorspar mine near San Luis Obispo, Mexico — a gold mine in Nicaragua — a copper mine and mill in northern Chile. In short, I'm talking about the fact that these multi-national corporations who dominate the economy of Canada have failed this country and failed this province.

They own wire and cable plants in Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, the Dominican Republic and New Zealand. But the thing about the tragedy of the failure to utilize the skills of Canadians in research and development is reflected in the final words I am going to quote from one of these reports.

In Chapter 3 it was noted that multi-national corporations, especially those based in the United States, tend to centralize the most sophisticated research in the home country. In addition they may or may not support research and development round the world. In interviewing Canadian companies engaged in international operations a different picture appears to emerge.

Although research and development is firmly established in Canada, and is intertwined with the historic development of the firm, increasing segments of the operation have been and continue to be transferred to the most active market area — the United States because manpower needs could not be met in Canada.

When presented with data on the increasing quantity of highly qualified manpower in Canada the interviewee vacillated and admitted that, while times might have changed and manpower needs could now be satisfied in Canada, it did not seem worth while to transfer research and development back to Canada. So, when these corporations are faced with the fact that we do have available unemployed people in Canada who can do research and development, they vacillate and say it is hardly worth while to move research and development back into Canada.

As long as that attitude prevails then we cannot meet the unemployment situation that faces this province and this country. That is why we say that we are going to be part of the direction of the economy in the Province of British Columbia.

It is obvious from the failures of the past that have resulted in this situation — that left to themselves, the private sector cannot do it or care to do it. That's why. That's why negotiations are taking place. That's why we intend to participate in industrial development in this province.

That's why we intend to see to it that the millions of dollars spent on education in this province will find a place in the future development of British Columbia. I suggest to you that, in view of the sorry record of the previous administration, in view of the sorry record of the federal government, we have this situation today.

[[Page 59](#)]

I'm not happy with it; no one in this House is happy with it. But I suggest to you that because we now have a new Government in this province we will start up the road to prevent British Columbia in the future being in that unfortunate position of being low man on the totem pole and then having a boom which creates the inflation which is part of the problem today.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, it's been an interesting debate, and I've found much that I can agree with coming from both sides of the House. I think that the Government is absolutely correct in attributing much of today's unemployment problem to the Opposition when they were in Government. And I think that the Opposition is quite correct now, as they were when they were in Government, that a great deal of the

problem today is the lack of confidence that the business community has in the socialist philosophy. Both sides have been absolutely correct about the other.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Now let's see where you're going to end up. (Laughter).

MR. McGEER: But the strange thing, Mr. Speaker, to me, is that the people who now sit in the treasury benches — and I remember their speeches so well when they were in Opposition — couldn't wait to say their piece about the unemployment situation a year ago, which was less than it is today. And for those who are new Members in the back bench, they were great speeches. And had you been there a year ago you would have applauded them with a great deal more vigour than the Minister of Highways' speech tonight.

And I suppose had you people been in Opposition then, sitting in this House a year ago, you'd have had a great deal to say about the unemployment figures then, which were less than they are today.

And, Mr. Speaker, I remember the Premier's speech very well — how he castigated the then Premier for taking a vacation over Christmas time in the sunny climes down south when he should have been preparing a throne speech dealing with the unemployment problem.

And I remember him criticizing the Premier and the Government when time for the unemployment debate came up, because nobody on the Government side seemed to want to say a thing about it.

The Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) remembers that quite well. And a year ago, Mr. Speaker, he had an awful lot to say about unemployment. He's got less to say about it today.

And as the Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) says, "What a difference a year makes."

And we're missing the former Premier tonight, Mr. Speaker....

MR. WALLACE: No, we're not. (Laughter).

MR. McGEER: I understand the feelings of the Member for Oak Bay, Mr. Speaker, and I sympathize with them. But I think the old Premier would have been proud of the new Premier. I really do. Because the Premier made a wonderful speech tonight considering the material he had to work with. But he did it in the famous style, Mr. Speaker. He got up and attacked the Opposition, blamed them for the unemployment. The Premier will remember how often, when he was Opposition Leader, the Premier of the day attacked him as the fault for all of the unemployment in the province, blaming it on the socialists.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in the familiar style, attacked the federal government and, Mr. Speaker, the Premier can remember well how often the former Premier attacked the federal government. But he learned a trick or two, Mr. Speaker, and he had those telegrams in his pocket — the kind the old Premier used to send so that he would be able to bring something into the House and fool the Press that he was really doing something about the problem.

But the present Premier knows just as well as the former Premier what the rules for shared-cost programmes are. And the other thing the new Premier knows, Mr. Speaker, really, is that if Ottawa could solve the problem, Ottawa would have solved the problem. We wouldn't have the unemployment today and maybe the old Government would still be in office.

So no matter how hard the present Government attacks the federal government, it isn't going to make the problems of the unemployed go away.

And I think the Liberal leader put it correctly, Mr. Speaker, when he said the real problem was one of confidence. And that's been the difference in a year. That's the chief reason why the unemployment is higher now in British Columbia but not in other provinces in Canada. The change has come in this province. And understandably the business leaders don't have confidence in this Government because you've said so many threatening things to

them. If they win and do well, you want to take them over. And how many proposals have we had from the NDP about taking over the successful corporations? I haven't heard a single proposal to take over a loser, only the winners.

In those industries that historically have provided the most employment, the natural resource industries, you pose nothing but threats for them. And the Minister who should be most on their side, the

[[Page 60](#)]

Minister who traditionally, always in this House has defended the mining industry — they used to have somebody who would boost their morale and stand up for them in Victoria. But that day is past. Not a word to say. He goes to their convention and takes the lash out at them.

And the old Premier, for all his faults — and nobody detailed them at more length than I did — at least industry knew he was on their side. But it's hard for a man in industry today to feel that he's got a friend on the treasury benches.

And as the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) has pointed out, the philosophy of the Government is "no-growth," to get away from the "acquisitive North American values." And you all applauded that. You thought it was a wonderful thing that we were going to have this change of direction. It's a very fine sounding phrase.

But the trouble, Mr. Speaker, is the 80,000 unemployed today, in a labour force that's about 900,000. And that unemployment rate has remained for three or four years at this level.

The Premier popped up and gave the latest breath of encouragement today — and the old Premier used to do that kind of thing too. It really hasn't changed. But whether there's a vigorous shipbuilding industry — and we all hope there will be - or whether there's encouraging words from the unemployment offices, unless there's an industrial strategy which is new and imaginative, there will be no dent in that unemployment figure. And unless you depart seriously from the philosophy you stated in your throne speech, there will be no dent in that unemployment problem.

Because, Mr. Speaker, to pick up those 80,000 unemployed, for the next two years we would have to experience in British Columbia a real growth rate in our economy greater than we have ever had in our past. That's to pick up those who are unemployed today.

But you must remember that over that period of time there will be entering almost 100,000 more. And if you figure on supplying somewhere between 180,000 and 200,000 jobs in the next two years — this is to make a significant dent in the unemployment problem — you have to look at a growth rate that isn't 5 per cent a year, which would be the best we've ever had in British Columbia, but one that is closer to 10 per cent a year, which would be nothing less than fantastically spectacular by any standard of any government.

But that's the challenge that you've got to respond to. And in order to make progress that even approaches that kind of performance, you have to give encouragement to every single industry, every single person who can provide any opportunity at all for employment. It means holding the carrot out, never taking the lash, not threatening, but encouraging that those who can provide employment and work in this province should have the greatest friend in British Columbia sitting over there on the treasury benches.

What so disappoints me about the debates that have gone on over the years in this House is that while the NDP and Social Credit have been blaming each other neither has come up with the kind of exciting, industrial strategy that would see the disadvantaged in this province not on welfare, not on Mincome, but on a steady job — which is what they've really wanted right along. Not government handouts, but work. This is the challenge of government no matter what the philosophical strife. Why can't we find that, Mr. Speaker, today — with this new government?

I looked through the statement that you gave to the people of British Columbia before that last election and I

must say you never promised them a programme. I've looked and I've studied it and I've read and I've reread it but the programme isn't there. The promise to tax natural resource industries — that's there and you're sticking to it. The promise to take over industry in the province, the telephone company and others, that's there. Whether it's at the conventions or individual speeches in this House, the Premier is getting all the encouragement he needs from the party in that direction. I know that he can't wait to take over all these industries. But that really, Mr. Speaker, isn't an industrial strategy. An industrial strategy is growth to provide jobs. I don't care what qualifications you want to attach in terms of clean industry or pollution or location or whatever it may be — but where there are 900,000 people in the labour force and 820,000 working — the policy must be growth.

I don't think anybody need be ashamed or embarrassed at putting forth a philosophy in the House and in the province — no matter what their political stripe, even if it's communism. That we should provide expansion of our industry to see that those who want jobs and are entitled to them as anyone else has that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, for the second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) call it a human right because I think it is.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that with 1,000 new jobs coming up in the civil service that the few jobs that we have seen eliminated to date are jobs belonging to civil servants who are trying to help others get employment in the private sector. The Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation (Hon. Mr. Levi) has just left but his first act was to can those people who represented the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen and claimed rightly or wrongly that they found 10,000 jobs.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You never spoke in favour of that programme.

[[Page 61](#)]

MR. McGEER: Well, I would, Mr. Speaker, if I were the Premier, I would at least have gone around first and checked to see whether the claims were right or wrong, Not just fired them out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has only fired two civil servants. Yes two — when he closed down the industrial development offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles. Those were the two initiatives that the Minister has taken since being in charge of industrial development.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Ron Worley?

MR. McGEER: That's travel industry. I'm talking about industrial development and that isn't helping the situation either.

We had a mini session, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) — who I thought spoke brilliantly this evening — he had the old fire he used to have when he was in Opposition. And it was a good critical speech. But he's in government now and his job is to offer the positive programmes. But there weren't any. It was just a great Opposition speech.

He did say one thing, Mr. Speaker, he told us how important it was to anticipate....

AN HON. MEMBER: Five years in advance.

MR. McGEER: Well even five months in advance, Mr. Speaker. We had this emergency session of the Legislature and many of us came over hoping that something would be said and something would be done about the impending unemployment problem.

The Minister of Industrial Development — he really isn't, he's the Attorney General — but the Minister of Industrial Development had a bill — he had a programme prepared for him. He could at that time have introduced legislation and I know the Members who sit in the back bench would have supported that legislation. They'd have welcomed it — made speeches in its favour to give industrial incentives. But no, we didn't have that bill and heaven knows what we're going to get now.

But in the meantime that opportunity went by to encourage secondary manufacturing industry in British Columbia. The consequence of it is just what the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) said. Unemployment, lack of research in technology, failure to expand in the private sector. All of what he said is true. He just left out one thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is the opportunities he and the Premier and the cabinet colleagues have had in that short time they've been in office to start the wheels in motion in a way that private industry can understand in this province.

Indeed in the years that they sat in Opposition and made these brilliant speeches about how we had to have more employment in British Columbia — should they not have had their legislation ready so that every day would have counted — dealing with what people have acknowledged today is the number one problem in this province.

I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that if those new Members — all of them aren't speaking tonight publicly in this debate; and we suppose that you'll let this opportunity slip by and support those in the treasury benches — say that unemployment really isn't a bad problem in British Columbia. But at least tomorrow in caucus — and our present Premier is still attending caucus — you'll make your views known and demand that this government take positive, definitive action to get industry in British Columbia back on the tracks again. So that the magnificent opportunities that we have in this province for growth and for happiness will not just be bitter memories for the 80,000 people who today are without jobs and are depending on us for action and will be failed if you who now have power do not use that power for their good.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members are you ready for the question? The amendment to the main motion is that the motion in reply to the opening speech of his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be amended by adding the words "That this House regrets that the speech of his Honour fails to provide any adequate proposals to meet the critical state of unemployment in the province affecting many thousands of citizens and their families and fails to deal with the impact of wide spread unemployment upon the social and economic life of the province."

Amendment negated on the following division:

YEAS-15

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

NAYS-36

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

Mr. D.A. Anderson moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

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