

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

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

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1974

Morning Sitting

[[Page 239](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

Budget debate (continued)

Mr. G.H. Anderson— [239](#)

Mr. Morrison — [243](#)

Division on motion to adjourn debate — [247](#)

Mr. Morrison — [247](#)

Ms. Brown — [251](#)

Mr. Lewis — [256](#)

Privilege

Amendments to budget. Mr. Bennett — [259](#)

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [259](#)

Mr. Speaker's ruling — [260](#)

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to stand and represent that great riding of Kamloops — the big sunshine sky country — in this House.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Yay! R-r-r-right on!

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: And I was wondering if I'd be able to, because I was watching television a week

ago Tuesday after the abrupt end of the throne speech debate, and I heard the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Bennett) say that that was it for the backbenchers. They wouldn't have a chance to speak now for the rest of the session. But it looks as though his information, as usual, was not quite correct.

I've had the impression, Mr. Speaker, as a new Member since this session started that someone must have been reading Lewis Carroll's books. Because I get the feeling that instead of coming through the door I've come through the looking glass. This is quite often supported when we have our own Queen of Hearts from North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) get to her feet periodically and yell, "Cut off their heads! Cut off their heads!" I'm expecting any time to enter this chamber and find a tea party going on in that corner.

I'm impressed with the fact of the opposition having so very little to criticize both on the budget speech and on the throne speech. I've watched, as I waited for my turn at the microphone, which I didn't think I was going to get, and I see the opposition Members with very sharp pencils leaping through the budget, red-lining and penciling and desperately trying to find something to criticize the government on that has some meaning to it.

The result has been, of course, that most of the criticisms have been facetious, frivolous and frantic. You have a government that can compare its performance after 18 months of office with the pledges it made before coming into office, and I feel that there hasn't been one for many, many years in the province with the record of the New Democratic government.

One of the things that I appreciate in the budget is the beginning of the removal of school tax from homeowners' property.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Double the homeowners' grant.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: This has been one of our pledges for years and years and years, as elections came up. We're in a position to put it into effect now and the criticism is, of course, that it doesn't go far enough. Well, that's a natural opposition statement. Nothing ever goes far enough. But we said that we would progressively remove school taxes over a five-year period and we have taken the first step in that direction. I am very satisfied to see that come about.

One of the things that I have observed for the last 18 months is how there is a little bit of order overcoming the disorder that has been prevalent in various government departments. The one in particular that I would like to mention is the Human Resources department.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): What about the Education department?

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: The idea of a human resources council in Kamloops that is on the scene, and that knows the various organizations that apply for funds and that will approve all applications for funds before they come into the buildings in Victoria and to the Minister (Hon. Mr. Levi) is another step forward. This is the best example of local input that I can think of. We had situations in the past where organizations would apply to three different government departments for grants. In some cases I hear that the grants would be received from two but not from the third. But none of the three departments knew that an application had been made to any other department. This human resources council is going to take care of that.

When the provincial government took over the Human Resources department from the municipalities, it was of great benefit to the riding I represent. At one time there were two offices, one for the city — but with the city growing so fast they extended the boundaries out into the unorganized territories — and one for the rural areas.

You would have the picture of some unfortunate person who had to apply for welfare making a 40- or 175- or 100-mile trip into Kamloops to make the application, and being told that they were at the wrong office. Well, they only had three miles to go over to the other side of the river to apply to the other office, only to be told on finding exactly where they lived, in looking at the line that was drawn on the map, that they were at the wrong office there, and had to go back to the other one. Now we have one office in one location, and this is certainly a thing

that is going to be appreciated by the people who have to use this service.

The Pharmacare programme was introduced by the Minister (Hon. Mr. Levi), I've had many phone calls and letters in appreciation of this effort. I'm sure all Members of the House support free medicine and drugs for people over 65 years old.

However, like anything else, Mr. Minister, it can be improved. When these people were paying for their own drugs they were able to order them by mail — a matter of 70- or 75- or 100-miles away. And the problem they are running into now is that they have to present their Pharmacare card before they can receive the medicine they require. I would ask the Minister with his staff to try and arrange some kind of a system so that elderly or ill people can leave their card on file with the druggist and order the prescriptions by mail as they did before. It is a hardship in many cases for some of these people in the outlying areas.

We've heard many criticisms of municipal aid; there was not enough help for the municipalities. And I agree that if you take each item separately of the aid to the municipalities, it doesn't amount to an awful lot. But with the removal of the cost of the courts from the city, a per capita increase of \$2 which is added to the \$2 increase last spring, the 5 per cent drop in the share of welfare that the cities have to put up — I'm certainly not an expert on civic affairs or taxes, but it would seem to me on a rough calculation in the Kamloops area that this is going to amount to about one or two mills, which in a 15 mill tax basis is going to be quite significant. The interesting thing will be to see if the municipalities pass on this saving to the residents of their areas.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): That sounds like vintage Bennett!

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Check your taxes.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: On the municipal question, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows of course about the unification of Kamloops last year. I'm glad to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) is in the House, because there are problems in that area, Mr. Minister, that I'm sure are not being brought to your attention forcefully enough.

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Some of the municipalities were never so well off.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: One of the areas that came into the new City of Kamloops was an area called Westside. I moved to Kamloops in 1956; the growth was slow till about 1962, but then it has grown at a faster and faster rate until we're looking at a population of about 60,000 people. The Westside area is in the area of 8,000 people.

There are two subdivisions out there that have flooded two years in a row from melting snow coming down off the hillside. People are looking at cracked foundations. People are looking at damaged electrical circuits. They're looking at refurbishing to do in their basements for two years in a row.

Now I know that the government cannot be responsible all the time for people who build houses in a creek bed or a river bed. I would feel also that that is their responsibility. But in this case it is a natural run-off from a gully on a hill that the developer filled in that has caused the flooding in the area, plus the fact that there aren't sufficient culverts underneath the highway to carry the water away.

The new City of Kamloops is not in a financial position to put in a storm-drain system or a drain-off system that this area requires. These people didn't build their houses; the developer built them. The development was approved by the Highways department. The permits were issued by the provincial building inspector, and the people that are in those homes now bought them not knowing what the future held. We are looking at a relatively small amount of money for the provincial government, but a large amount of money for the city faced with all the problems that it has on its new and enlarged basis.

The Highways department has agreed that they will look after the drainage under the highway and down to the river. The problem is in the subdivisions themselves, and they are quite small subdivisions. I don't believe it would affect the budget that much if the provincial government were to assist, and at this time I am urging very strongly that the provincial government assist in this matter in these two particular areas.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Get the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) before he buys all those Datsuns.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: I enjoyed particularly the speech given by the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams). And I enjoyed particularly this reference to the old tenures in the province. We have a unique situation, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned last spring that in the north river area, extending about 150 miles north of Kamloops on No. 5 Highway, because of the moving in of a large pulp and timber company, smaller sawmills have shut down and the area is in a bad financial situation.

One of the biggest tenures in the province is located in Blue River. It was taken out about 1908, and has been held in almost a fee simple basis ever since. There hasn't been any logging done; there was a little high-grading after the way. But people are

[[Page 241](#)]

sitting in a depressed area with a timber base, looking at 21 timber claims comprising an area of 30 miles by 20 miles, that is not being used and could be used to supply employment in that area.

It has always been a question of which should come first, the population or the services. But this area of Blue River is looking at a situation where they have no doctor, no ambulance, no high school, no liquor store, and a 150-mile trip every day for the high school students to go to Clearwater on the bus. Fortunately, they are probably having time on the bus to do homework or something of that sort, because they're doing very well in their studies in school. But a 150-mile round trip in the bus is bad for any students to have to go through at any time.

I realize that there isn't enough population of high school students there to have a complete high school, but there are two empty classrooms in the present junior high, and perhaps the teachers could come on a semester system to Blue River instead of the busload of students going down to Clearwater. Or perhaps if we can get those 21 claims in the Blue River area loose, I am sure that we can get industry to go in there, employ enough people, and the population would then warrant the amenities everyone should have in these days.

We have seen many problems, with the agricultural committee when we travelled, of the conflict between grazing interests and forest interests. We were taken to see a particularly good area of range management in the Sullivan Valley near Kamloops, and we were also taken in the early spring to see an entire clear-cut that has been reseeded to grass and trees on a seven- to nine-foot span.

It was an experimental plot. It was felt that this would be an attempt to see if grazing cattle would damage the young seedlings. I'm happy to report to the House that I saw that area this fall. It had been cross-fenced in two areas. The cattle had been moved when the grazing was down far enough that they felt they would endanger the seedlings, and a relatively few seedlings were stepped on. They were not browsed in any way.

Yet I believe at the present time there has been some kind of stop order come out that these clear-cuts cannot be seeded to grass. In my estimation this is something that has to be done. We have to have more forage. We have to have more protein and one of the best ways we can have it is by seeding grass to a clear-cut area. The cattle can graze until the trees get to the point where there won't be enough light to support the grass, but by that time there'll be other clear-cuts that can be seeded, and the production of beef and badly needed protein can be increased.

I'm still not clear, Mr. Speaker, on the diking situation. I saw that the Hon. Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston) was very happy with the programme announced for diking. But we're looking at a very bad situation in the Clearwater and Birch Island area where no one can build below the 200-year flood plain, unless they build their lot up 10 feet in the air and perch the house on top of it. There is nothing being done at the present time to dike the area

so that it can be used.

If a person has a fire and is burned out, he cannot rebuild without bringing in earth to build up the lot 8 or 10 feet in the air. This would not require the type of diking that is on the lower mainland. I'm hoping that in future discussions with the government we can find some way that at least these two areas can be diked and can be used again by the citizens and property owners of the area.

I know that as the Member for Kamloops I'm supposed to have the greatest highway grid in the whole province within that riding. But it just is not so. Our primary highways, I would say, are not too bad — No. 1 Highway and No. 5 Highway.

When the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Hon. Mr. Strachan) was Minister of Highways, I mentioned to him the secondary roads in the area, and now I would like to convey the same information to our new Minister of Highways. There is \$32 million more in the budget for highways. It isn't going to take but a small fraction of that. We're looking at 18 miles of road from Lewis Creek to Admas Lake, and I hope you'll note these, Mr. Minister. We're looking at about 40 miles of road on the east side of the highway and the river for about 40 miles from Barriere to Clearwater.

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): That's \$31.5 million right there.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: And the Wells Gray Park Road. These are all gravel roads. They are all secondary roads, and there is no one in the area that wants or needs a super highway built out of them. But the logging activity has been increased over the years in these areas, and it is impossible, particularly on the curves, to keep gravel on the roads. The gravel trucks throw it off into the bush and the residents of the area and the school buses have got to travel over a road with large rocks sticking through and many potholes. Frankly, it's an impossibility for your department to maintain in proper condition with the increased traffic that's on them.

We're talking about 125 miles of road with a small amount of upgrading, a little cutting away with a bulldozer at some of the bends to straighten them out a bit, and a layer of cold mix on top. With \$32 million, I think that 120 miles of a little bit of upgrading and a covering of cold mix that would be of such benefit to the area should be fitted into that budget.

The Wells Gray Park Road for 16 miles has quite a population on the way into the park. I've been over it

[[Page 242](#)]

many times. It's in terrible condition. The school district bought a brand new bus and put it on there in September to bring the students into Clearwater to school, and before Christmas arrived that bus was in the shop to have the frame fishplated and the cracks welded in it, because of the condition of the road. The warranty, of course, would cover a problem with the motor, but the warranty would not cover the damage to the frame of the vehicle.

We are moving a little bit in Kamloops on the hospitals, I'm glad to say, since I stood last year in the same debate. As I said, before our election we were trying for five or six years to get an addition to the Royal Inland Hospital, and I'm pleased to report that tenders have now been called for another floor on the hospital which will bring it to its maximum capacity of 475 beds, which most people agree is the size for that area. It is a reference hospital with patients being referred for a long distance around Kamloops. We have a good array of specialists there now in the various fields of medicine.

So now we have to move to an extended- or secondary-care hospital. We only have one — privately-owned Mount Paul Hospital — and in many cases when an elderly person has to go there, there is no room and he has to go to Vernon, or Kelowna, or the Cariboo, or the lower mainland, with the resulting splitting up of people who have lived together for many years, because in many cases the partner cannot afford to go.

There has also been movement on that. I believe it was a 12-acre site that was purchased a month ago, and the approval, I understand, was given by the B.C. Hospital Insurance for a 12- to 14-acre site for the building of an

extended-care hospital in the Kamloops area.

You notice, Mr. Speaker, that I address myself to various Ministers when I talk about the problems in my area. One of the things that raised a lot of criticism before with the previous government was that it was a one-man show. Unless you could get the approval of the former Premier nothing could be done, and he just didn't take assistance from his other Ministers. Well, after listening to the criticism in this House over the last few days, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why he couldn't accept advice from that group. He would have to take it on his own. So I have altered my opinion a little and decided that it was something that had to be due to the circumstances that he was in.

The Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) talked at length about the plans for Prince Rupert — those great and glorious plans for Prince Rupert. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've lived in the Prince Rupert area for a while and many of my family live in that area, but if you talk to any of the old-time residents of Prince Rupert you'll find that they've been living on promises for at least 40 years. This is the history of the area.

I wonder if any of the Members here remember when the Hon. Member for Prince Rupert was a man named Pattullo. He used to come to Prince Rupert about every four years, just before the election. Here was a community that was connected to the Interior by rail but no highway, and the only way that you could get out of there was by boat or train. It was all of 90 miles to Terrace, but it was the longest 90 miles, I suppose, in Canada, from the way the money was being spent to build that road. Mr. Pattullo used to come up and promise that there was going to be a tremendous amount of work done on that road if we just sent him down to Victoria.

Well, of course, this was done a few times and the result was that about 40 men got work to build about a half-a-mile of road with picks and shovels and dynamite, and that happened every four years. At a half-a-mile every four years it is no wonder that we had to have a war with Japan and the Americans come in and build that road from Terrace to Kamloops, because it didn't look as though it was going to be done by any government in Canada.

We've heard some pretty strong criticisms of the auto insurance. I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that certainly there are bugs in the plan. You cannot set up an insurance company of that size and train your computer programmers and train your keypunch operators and have everything come out as smooth as silk as though it had been operating for 50 years. These few little kinks will be taken out. There's no doubt about that.

I suppose I shouldn't mention my own insurance because then they would say oh, well, yes, he's got a special deal arranged somewhere. But I did buy it from a private agent and it came right off the books. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I was faced with \$254 for two vehicles with Allstate Insurance, \$23 for one licence, \$25 for another, for a total of \$302 with a teenaged driver. This year I am looking at \$94 for the car, \$73 for the van, \$10 for my driving insurance — \$177 for a saving of \$125. And I still have a teenaged driver.

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

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: I deliberately bought this from a private agent, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that no one could say that there must be a special rate for MLAs down at the Motor Vehicle Branch.

[Mr. Liden in the chair.]

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: I've had a few complaints come into my office in Kamloops. I was on an open-line show this morning for an hour in Kamloops by telephone, and there were some complaints about the auto insurance but there also were many, many

[[Page 243](#)]

compliments. From my own experience I cannot agree with the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) that 60 per cent are facing higher charges. I think you are looking at more like 15 to 20 per cent, and they have been promised rebates so that they do not pay more.

Before the session started, Mr. Speaker, I had a truck driver who owns a tractor and trailer and does contract work, and he also moves mobile homes with the tractor when there isn't the other kind of work. He made a special trip, took some time out of his day to come up to the office and tell me that he was looking at \$470 instead of \$1,100 that he paid last year.

MR. McCLELLAND: No way!

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: No way? He would make a trip to the office just to tell me a lie? Impossible. I don't understand the reasoning. It sounds like some of the criticism we've heard in the House up to now.

MR. McCLELLAND: Bring it here and show it to us!

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see the advances in the housing field, and I certainly appreciated the speech of the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) the other day in this House. Housing in an area like Kamloops, which is growing as fast as it is, has brought tremendous housing problems. There has been a tremendous rise in land costs, and these land costs were going on for the last 10 years that I have lived there and did not begin in any way with the introduction of Bill 42. That had nothing to do with it.

I said last spring that we had a new gold rush in Kamloops, but the land was the gold, and it is still the same situation. Fortunately, I say to the Minister of Housing, we have much Crown land in the Kamloops area and we are not going to be faced in that area with the purchasing of high-cost land such as in some areas of the lower mainland. The Minister mentioned the project that was being started in Kamloops. I'd like to add a few details to that.

There are 65 acres of Crown-owned land that have been up behind the Royal Inland Hospital for years and years and years and used for nothing. On this acreage the Minister of Housing, in combination with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) and the City of Kamloops, is putting in 65 acres of housing — 65 acres of a variety of housing based on income, based on best land use. The cost of servicing is going to be taken care of by the Department of Housing, and the leasing of the lots left up to the civic authorities.

I know that this was an experiment and I know that there are some people in this country who do not believe in the theory of leasing land. They believe that if you don't own your own land then you just might as well return to Europe or somewhere. This is understandable; in an area like Europe it is impossible in many areas to own land, and the urge there is to purchase and own something you can call your own. But it is my understanding from talking to some of the people at city hall that there are already over 40 applicants to lease these lots in that subdivision. So everyone does not have the same hand-up and I am looking forward to a successful completion of that project and some badly needed housing in Kamloops.

And I would also say to the Minister that we also, on the North Shore, have 2,000 more acres of Crown land surrounding the subdivision that is going in at the present time, and I look forward to the time when this can be developed for the assistance of the people of the area. And it will be badly needed. In the next eight years it is fully expected that we will move from 60,000 to 100,000 people in that area.

To the Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young) I didn't see a great increase in the budget for the Minister but I understand that she will be opening some offices in the province. I would say to her that she cannot find a better place than Kamloops. It's the home of the rip-off artist.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Yes, there's one speaking.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: Ms. Minister, we'll just ignore that. It's the Queen of Hearts again — "Chop off their heads! Chop off their heads!" (Laughter.)

I don't know how often the Minister has been to Kamloops, but I say to you with the city growing to the extent of 100,000 within the next eight years, we service an area for 150 miles in about four different directions. With the shopping centres, the stores, and the businesses that are coming in it's almost impossible to keep track of them all, and I cannot think of a better place to put an office for your department to assist the citizens of the area —

particularly the new ones coming in who do not know the businessmen to avoid.

We've been trying for years and years to get a Better Business Bureau, and we've simply been talking in deaf ears. The businessmen say "we can't afford it." I would think they can't afford not to. But when you're considering an area for these openings, Madam Minister, I would suggest that you give Kamloops very serious consideration.

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to represent the beautiful city of Victoria, and take my place in this budget speech debate. Only history will tell us whether this budget was a realistic budget or just simply another piece of fiction, similar to the budget we had a year ago. Our

[[Page 244](#)]

Finance Minister likes to talk about his wise fiscal management of the economy, and this budget is predicated on the booming economy, created, incidentally, by private enterprise, continuing in British Columbia.

Strangely enough, the very day this budget was brought down, the newspapers were headlining the spectre of the possibility of a world-wide depression, being stressed by Mr. Kissinger. He brought to the attention of the world that day the dangerous game that we're playing. There it is, the spectre of a depression, as stressed by Kissinger. And yet, we like to have our head in the sand.

We're a resource and export economy and we are so dependent on world prices. It's true, we may have some long-time sales commitments to Europe and to England. But it may very well also be impossible for England to live up to her past commitments. The problems with the Common Market and the problems with the English economy could very well affect us in the near future.

Everywhere we turn, the world economy is at best, shaky. Yet, we pretend to believe that next year will be at least as good as last year. Mr. Speaker, this budget is all based on our present prosperity with particular emphasis on resource industries. Our Finance Minister likes to call this a Robin Hood budget, but history records that Robin Hood was still a bandit.

He talked about no tax increases. But everyone knows that Big Brother B.C. Government has its hand in his pocket. Somehow, some way, that hand seems to be taking more out of our pockets every day. He talked about no increase in tax rates. But what he doesn't say is that inflation is increasing and taking out of our pockets more money for everything we buy.

He knowingly underestimates revenues by 25.6 per cent. Yet we know that before long we'll be faced with Hydro rate increases, natural gas increases to B.C. users, and that property taxes will take more dollars. Before long, even the mill rates will have to rise. He gave the municipalities a per capita grant increase of \$2, which is about a 7 per cent increase. But with inflation last year in British Columbia of almost 10 per cent, this did not even cover or keep pace with inflation.

There are no new revenues reflected in the budget from all our new acquisitions. Perhaps our Minister should attend a few seminars on mergers and acquisitions, and find out that the theory does not always work. Sometimes these mergers and acquisitions so overtax the abilities of the parent company as to sink the whole programme. Acquisitions can be a very dangerous game; if the economy slows down or slumps, the whole thing collapses.

But the important thing in examining budgets in today's world is to seek out whether or not the budget tries to come to grips with the problem of inflation. Inflation has been described as the cruelest tax of all. Many economists today suggest that the kind of inflation our world is experiencing is the result of activities of large industrial unions and large corporations being in the position of seeking to get out of the economy more than is really there. The principle of a fair share for everyone is sometimes lost when the conflicting power interests of large industrial concerns are lined up against large industrial unions.

However, in this part of the 20th century, it is an oversimplification to suggest that the root cause of inflation is to be found in the activities of these two groups. In my view, the root cause of inflation here and around the world

is found in the activities of government itself. Inflation seems to be the inevitable consequence of big government. As governments in this century sought to do more and more for people in a central way, political goal posts are set far beyond the ability of the economy to absorb it.

In the view of our party, inflation must be laid at the doorstep of government itself. We view the British Columbia scene today as an example of how inflation can be described as the cruelest tax of all. Early in the life of this government clearly inflationary taxes were levied. For example, the 20 per cent increase in corporation taxes was quickly passed along to the consumer. The consumer immediately paid more for goods and services in British Columbia at a time when the government itself was boasting about increasing surpluses, and that it did not need such taxation to meet its needs nor its goals. Therefore, inflation was the inevitable result.

Having set its goal as an inflationary government, the consequences of establishing inflationary psychology were quick to appear on the British Columbia scene. British Columbia led the nation in an average wage increase last year of 14 per cent. British Columbia led the nation last year in the price of basic commodities — butter, eggs, milk. British Columbia led the nation last year in spiralling land costs....

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): You're picking on the farmers.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just the chicken farmers.

MR. MORRISON: ...up over 50 per cent of the increase experienced in urban Ontario. British Columbia led the nation in escalating housing costs — up over 40 per cent of the national average.

In short, this government itself the stage again with extravagant expenditures inflating the civil service by over 8,000 people in a single year. Extravagant attention to the salaries paid to the hierarchy of the government set examples throughout

[[Page 245](#)]

the province. Extravagant salaries were set to induce people into new Crown corporations. As a result of setting the psychological stage for inflation, the government is admittedly in good shape financially; but the people are not.

If one just takes the situation as it affects Mincome recipients who now receive a minimum of \$213.85 — if those people were to have a fair deal, this budget would require a lift in the Mincome payments of 14 per cent which would require a \$30 increase. But even if this were done, it is clear that this government has set itself upon a course which will require, at a minimum, a 15 per cent increase in the cost of salaries for government employees in the coming year. If this is the case, we would find that in order to do right by Mincome recipients, we would have to increase the \$213.85 by the \$30 catch-up, and to protect them from what is happening to the British Columbia economy this year, we would have to add, at the rate of 15 per cent, a further \$36 to Mincome payments.

In other words, because of this mismanagement of the British Columbia economy, this budget really requires that the Mincome payment be increased by \$66 simply to reflect what the management of our economy has brought about.

The longer-term implications of inflation should not be lost on this Legislature because the implications of inflation in just the last 10-year period are frightening, to say the least.

Using the Canadian Cost of Living Index, a fixed-income person in 1965, if he had a pension of \$290, would by 1974 find that fixed-dollar income reduced by \$49. No matter what activity of people we talk about, again using the Canadian Cost of Living Index, if this government continues its present pattern of financial management, the inflation created will look like this in just six years from now:

Food for a family of four by 1980 will rise from \$52 to \$75 per week. A new house will rise from \$33,000 to \$52,000. A hospital room in British Columbia averaging \$68 will rise to \$126. A man's suit averaging \$94 will rise to \$129. A package of cigarettes averaging 60 cents will cost 92 cents. Bus fare averaging 30 cents will cost 61 cents.

A pair of shoes averaging \$26 will cost \$39.

These are serious facts with which government today has to deal. Government can look after itself but not all the people of British Columbia can look after themselves. Inflation hits hardest those people in the province who are least able to foot the bill.

The quickest cure for the inflationary course upon which this government has set itself is an immediate tax decrease. This would have two immediate effects:

First of all, it would deny the government money which it admits it does not require and would therefore slow down the activities of this big government.

Secondly, it would deflate the inflationary psychology which this government has permitted to permeate the economy. Therefore, this province can help its people by tax policies over which it has direct control.

The tax on business, which passes taxes on to the consumer anyway, should be reduced by removing last year's 20 per cent increase.

The Province of British Columbia should enter negotiations with the federal government calling for a lifting of the exemption called for in personal income-tax purposes. A family unit of two should have exemptions of \$4,000 and, for each dependent, an exemption of \$1,000. The sales tax should be removed from all activities associated with construction of a home.

I am amazed that this budget does not have any evidence that the government understands the consequences of its inflationary activities to this date. However, the man on the street understands this very well because the people instinctively and fundamentally would prefer to look after themselves. Instinctively people want to have a high proportion of discretionary income in their own hands and less of their income in the hands of the government and in the hands of a stockbroker Finance Minister.

If the government deliberately sets out on an inflationary course, all these instinctive feelings of people are lost. That is the basic condemnation that can be levelled against the financial management by the government opposite on the economy of British Columbia to date.

In my riding in Victoria, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many people who have been prudent over the years, who have saved for their old age, who have put money in pensions, life insurance and investments of all kinds. Today they see these savings eroded away by inflation. They are helpless to combat inflation. It was not their intention to be placed in a position of having to look to the government for their needs. They resent, and resent bitterly, the waste they see and sense in this budget. They want you to show leadership and to show it now.

The size of this budget of over \$2 billion is impressive, but they resent the careless, wasteful way in which it is spent. They know that they end up each day with less.

Over the years parity bonds have always been considered a good investment and I'm surprised to hear the Minister of Finance announce that he's worried about them, so worried that he has taken upon himself to redeem \$74 million of them. Perhaps a prudent Finance Minister, if he was so worried, should have used some of that surplus revenue to redeem the balance of \$179,515,000 of parity bonds. Frankly, I hope he has some form of contingency plan prepared if 1974 does not come up to his expectations.

[[Page 246](#)]

I see in reading the budget that there is not even an explanatory note of caution concerning the pending labour problems facing us in the months ahead. There are about 400 major contracts, affecting over two-thirds of all the unionized workers in the province.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on the fact that, once again, school children are being

used as pawns in a labour negotiation. Last year here in Victoria our children were denied their right to attend school due to labour problems. Now in Vancouver our children are used unfairly to force a labour settlement. Is this an example of the things we can look forward to as the bulk of our labour contracts come up for settlement this year? A full-time strike is one thing but the method of rotating school stoppages is impossible. Working parents cannot plan for certain their children's care when they do not know whether school will be in or out.

Now, for a minute, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about ICBC, or icky-bicky as it's known on the street.

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: Well, there are a lot of good names for it.

Frankly, it's no wonder that the people are confused. The rates are changed practically daily. Even this morning there were notes on my desk of some more rate changes. Even if the rates aren't changed, the schedules are absolutely ambiguous.

I'd like to have you look with me, if you would, for a moment at *The British Columbia Gazette* of January 22, Part II of regulations, wherein they list the descriptions for rating purposes of various passenger vehicles and commercial vehicles under 8,000 pounds. I'd like to have you refer, if you would, to the classification on Chevrolets, a subject I know a little bit about. You will notice at the bottom of that classification it states that if a vehicle body style is either a convertible or a station wagon you add one to the rating group.

Now, if you will, imagine the agent who is confronted by a customer who comes in to have his vehicle rated. Let's assume for a moment that that customer is driving a Chevrolet station wagon.

Before we go any further, I'd like to ask the Minister (Hon. Mr. Strachan), through you Mr. Speaker, if he would care to tell me exactly in that rating group what a Chevrolet-Chevrolet is. In rating group for 1973-75 they list a Chevrolet as rating group 05; in other words, a Chevrolet-Chevrolet, whatever that is.

But look at the customer who arrives with a Bel-Air station wagon. If the agent looks in that rating classification, a Bel-Air is listed as rating group 06. But if that happens to be a station wagon, the note at the bottom says you upgrade it by one and therefore make it a rating group 07.

However, about three lines further down we come upon the description of the word "Brookwood" which, in fact, is a Bel-Air station wagon. That is its definition by the manufacturer. That particular model carries a rating group 05. Now, therefore, if the agent knew what a Brookwood was, he would rate that vehicle at rating group 05. If he didn't know what it was, he might rate it as rating group 06 since it was a Biscayne or a Bel-Air, But then if he took the note on the bottom he would therefore upgrade it to rating group 07. Can you wonder why people are confused and why the agents haven't any idea what's going on?

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: Well, I'm quite sure the Minister of Transport is going to be out before long.

Then you go through the rating groups — all the way through — you'll find those kinds of impossible situations. When the agents ask for explanations from the Minister, even he doesn't know what it's all about.

MR. FRASER: You take it over; you take it over.

HON. MR. LEA: We're going to call Waldo back in. (Laughter.)

MR. MORRISON: He couldn't do any worse. (Laughter.) Furthermore....

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: It's really no wonder. Why should anyone have to pay in advance for your mistakes?

Let me give you an example of a man who owns a small fleet of trucks. His premium amounted to about \$4,000. Being a conscientious type, he went to the bank early in January, borrowed \$4,000, went to his agent, paid his premium, got his licences and his insurance and went home. A week ago, a friend of his who owns the same size of fleet, whose premium was almost exactly the same, went to get his insurance. He was told that he did not have to pay the full \$4,000, because he was entitled to a \$1,500 interest-free loan, which would only have to be repaid if he had a poor accident rate. So he paid, borrowing again from his banker, \$2,500.

Now the first man wants to know what happened. Here he is, out of pocket \$4,000. He's told that the only way he'll get his \$1,500 back is to wait till next year, and that that amount will apply towards the premium. The Minister says that he can apply for a rebate, but he qualifies that by saying that he may

[[Page 247](#)]

not qualify if it's a commercial vehicle. So that man, again, is out of pocket \$1,500 for the full 12 months, simply because this company cannot make up its mind what the rates are, cannot make up its mind what the rating schedules are, cannot make up its mind who pays for what and when.

I'd like at this moment to quote a letter which was sent to the Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr. Strachan) from the Prince George Jaycees. I'll read just a part of the letter:

"In the effort to provide a community service by making public officials aware of trends in public opinion concerning seriously controversial issues, the Prince George Jaycees have conducted three public opinion surveys in the past two years. As Minister responsible for the provincial auto insurance programme, we believe that the results of our latest survey will be of interest.

"On three occasions during the latter part of January, copies of the attached questionnaire were passed out to the general public at an area shopping centre — 710 of the forms were deposited in the ballots. A summary of the results and additional breakdowns of the data are attached.

"In short, the results show a substantial shift of public opinion against auto insurance, particularly among car owners who believe their insurance rates have increased under Autoplan."

Now, the survey itself is attached and, if you wish, I'll be happy to file this with the House.

Of the total survey of 710 replies, with six spoiled, the questions were as follows:

The first question was: "Do you own a car?" Ninety-four per cent of those people — 664 — replied yes.

The second question was: "Do you know your rates?" Eighty-seven per cent of the people who replied knew their rates.

The third question was: "Have your rates increased?" Fifty-eight per cent of those people replying had, in fact, had a rate increase. That's 58 per cent of 664 people.

MR. LEWIS: Who conducted the survey?

MR. MORRISON: The fourth question was: "Will you request a rebate?" Fifty-four per cent of them replied that they would request a rebate.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move adjournment of this debate to the next sitting of the House.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 14

Bennett Richter

McGeer

Smith McClelland Anderson, D.A.
Jordan Morrison Gardom
Fraser Schroeder Wallace
Phillips Curtis

NAYS — 23

Macdonald Levi Gorst
Strachan Lorimer Rolston
Nimsick Williams, R.A. Anderson, G.H.
Hartley Lea Barnes
Nunweiler Young Steves
Brown Radford Kelly
Sanford Gabelmann Webster
Cummings Lewis

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: State your point of order.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Despite the fact that the Member has now lost his right to speak, I would ask that he be given the permission of the House to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it should be pointed to Hon. Members. that once a Member has unsuccessfully moved the adjournment of the debate, he has lost his right to speak and sits down. That is the rule. In order that he may continue, he must have the unanimous leave of the House.

Leave granted.

MR. MORRISON: I'm happy to see that the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is back now so that I can continue reading to him the letter which was sent to him.

I was referring to the Prince George Jaycee letter, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Transport, wherein they were recording a survey of people in their area concerning how they felt about Autoplan. Fifty-four per cent of them were asking for rebates. A year ago, they asked how many people were in favour of Autoplan, and 50 per cent of them said yes. But today they asked how many were in favour and only 27 per cent were. The survey is fairly comprehensive, and I'd be happy to file it with the House.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You're not reading it correctly.

MR. MORRISON: Would you care to have it

[[Page 248](#)]

correctly? I'd be glad to go through it in complete detail, and I am reading it correctly.

HON. MR. LEA: It's his letter.

MR. MORRISON: I said they took the survey in January. The letter was sent to you on February 11, 1974. The survey was conducted in January, 1974. Perhaps you ought to open your mail.

MR. FRASER: Your mail, your mail!

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: Well, I'm glad to hear that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do you always turn your back on the Speaker?

MR. MORRISON: I believe that somewhere between 100,000 and 250,000 drivers will be without insurance on March 1 of this year.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You hope.

MR. MORRISON: I didn't say I hope that. I simply say that you set impossible goals for your people to meet, and you're sticking your head in the sand and refusing to make any kind of a contingency plan for those people who will be without insurance on March 1. You've made a last-minute change for those people to get insurance for the last two weeks of February at the expense of those people who were already insured.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General): Standard practice.

MR. MORRISON: Standard practice? Nobody ever kicked the insurance companies out of a province before as you did. How can you call that standard practice?

Where does the money come from if someone has an accident between now and then? Do you take it out of your pocket or do you take it out of the people's pocket? It's an absolutely ridiculous argument that it is standard practice.

MR. PHILLIPS: Substandard practice!

MR. MORRISON: I believe that we will not have a single claim centre open on March 1, and apparently we will have very few body shops willing to accept your rates on March 1. I'd like to ask you, Mr. Minister what you will do in your City of Duncan if you should have an accident after March 1 and there's not a body shop in Duncan prepared to accept your rates. Will you have your car taken to Victoria or some other centre? And if so, who will pay the towing charges and who will pay the extra costs? You've got a problem in your own riding and you don't know it.

I find it also interesting, Mr. Speaker, to notice in last night's *Vancouver Sun* a very interesting article, and I'd like to quote some of it to you. The headline is: "Premiums Rise as Manitoba Loses on Autopac." It's datelined Winnipeg:

"Autopac, Manitoba's compulsory government automobile insurance programme, has increased premiums, zeroed in on business with still higher rates, and has warned that drivers will pay heavily if they make more than one claim a year."

Is this the direction we're heading?

"The (Manitoba) government claims an \$8 million loss on last year's operation, but private companies..."

MR. PHILLIPS: Who picked up the loss?

MR. MORRISON: "...say accurate accounting would place the figure at \$14 million.

"Manitoba motorists fear that with the NDP government's insurance they face decisions that could use financial pressure to force many of them off the road."

Is that a new lever for this government?

"There is no denying that Autopac has had its troubles. But many of the troubles are self-inflicted.... Being politically sensitive at the time the plan was started by Premier Ed Schreyer in 1971, it squeaked through the Legislature only with the support of a defected Liberal Member."

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Defective. (Laughter.)

MR. MORRISON: Well, you're probably correct, although that wasn't the word they used. Then it says:

"The government didn't want trouble with body repair shops, towing companies or claimants, so, initially, adjustments were generous, as were dealings with tow truck operators and repairmen. There were holes in the original scheme...."

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: No, I'm not. I'm merely telling the public that they can anticipate the same sort of things that are happening in Manitoba.

Interjection.

[[Page 249](#)]

MR. MORRISON: Oh, no, I'm not. You put your own head in the sand. I didn't force it in there for you.

" From the start Autopac insisted on charging everyone who drove his car to work a higher rate, reversing what had been the policy of private companies. This year an extra new rate has been added at an increase of 40 per cent for everyone who uses his car for any business movement other than to and from work.

"The trucking industry" — which we talked about just a little while ago — "claims that new conditions imposed on it this year may force many operators out of business. Each firm will be surcharged if they have claims exceeding 80 per cent of their premiums in a scheme described by Truckers Association president Jack Veitch as guaranteeing the government a profit on every policy."

MR. FRASER: Your truck company went on strike this morning. Why don't you do something about it?

MR. MORRISON: "But the real blow will come to every Manitoba motorist who attempts to treat the government insurance as insurance — a pooling of money to offset individual losses. Everyone in Manitoba who is at fault 50 per cent or more in two accidents within a year will be surcharged \$50 on his driver's licence. A third accident will cost him an extra \$100 and so on."

Are these the things that we can look forward to next year, when it is impossible for anyone to be able to compare what their rates should have been, because there are no independent insurance companies around to compete with?

Mr. Speaker, I think that ICBC is a pending disaster, and I predict it will be a money loser — another bad decision of this inept government.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You hope, you hope.

MR. MORRISON: No, I don't hope, because I know that it is, and I predict that it will be. All of us — even you — will pay, unless of course the government pays your premiums for you.

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: Yesterday our Housing Minister (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) told us of some of the programmes we could look forward to from his department. And let me tell you of one scheme proposed for Victoria. It is called the Springridge-Pembroke Transplant, and I would like to give you an example.

Now, at this moment I have no way of knowing whether this plan has been accepted, approved, will proceed or what, but it is a proposal that has been submitted. It was submitted by the Urban, Design Centre on January 7, 1974. At this moment I don't even know who the Urban Design Centre is, because I can't find a listing for them, nor do I really know what this Springridge-Pembroke Transplant is, except that it is to take place on Pembroke Street, about half-a-block off Fernwood, near Victoria High School. And the government owns a lot described in this plan

as lot 1 and partial lot D. I'd like to give you just an example of the proposal. There are eight various proposals, and I won't go into all of them, but I will describe the first one.

This proposal suggests that they will take five houses, which are now located in Oak Bay in an area which is going to be redeveloped by the Oak Bay council. The houses which are to be used are coming from 1975 Foul Bay Road, 1911 Foul Bay Road, 1932 Erie Street, 1956 Bee Street, 1924 Bee Street and 1965 Foul Bay Road. Now, those houses are to be removed from their present location, and moved onto this lot 1 and partial lot D. In other words, we will have a zero-lot line proposal with six houses on one lot and a small portion of another one.

It is suggested that one of those houses be converted into a duplex. In the proposal they suggest that the moving and insurance costs will be about \$1,700 a house; the servicing costs, which I assume mean foundations and water and sewage, will be \$6,092 per house; the additional foundations, repairs, redecorating and landscaping will be \$3,360 per house.

For this they propose to get a mortgage for 10 years at 8 per cent and repay it at the rate of \$120 per month. Now, you can assume that if they are getting a 10-year mortgage on the houses they have, in their opinion, a remaining life expectancy of about 10 years. I want you to realize that these houses that are being moved are already old houses. They have pretty well lived their life where they were built but obviously they are good enough, or someone thinks they are good enough, to move them to a new location.

The land, which I believe is currently owned by the province, is in this proposal at \$48,500 and apparently is to be paid for at 4 per cent over a 60-year period. Now, here I find a rather strange situation. Here are houses which are going to be mortgaged for a 10-year period, which have a life expectancy of about 10 years, but for some strange reason this group of Pembroke Transplants, whatever they are — and I understand it is some kind of a co-operative organization — are being given land which they don't have to pay for completely for over 60 years at 4 per cent interest. But I'm a little curious

[[Page 250](#)]

to know what the land will be used for after the houses are long gone.

Then they go on to say that the taxes on each unit will average about \$160 a year. Now, on this first proposal that means that in order to recapture just their out-of-pocket expenses, those houses will have to rent for \$158 per month. There is nothing in there for maintenance, for insurance, for depreciation, for all the other expenses that a normal householder has to face. Some of the questions that I am curious about on this particular proposal were: Where did lot I come from? Who owned it? Who bought it, and how much did they pay for it? So I did a little search at Land Registry, and I think you might be interested in knowing a little of the history on that particular lot.

The lot size of 1 is 123.6 by 140 feet, and lot D is 32 feet by 60.9 feet. It is now owned by the Crown provincial. It was purchased on November 8, 1973 for \$36,750, and yet it appears on this proposal to be listed out at \$48,500 — a rather nice little profit for Crown provincial.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you against profit?

MR. MORRISON: No, I'm not against profit. I'm just against people who try with one hand to say they aren't and with the other don't mind taking it.

There is another lot next door. It is 1251 Pembroke Street. Incidentally, I suggest that anyone who is interested take the time and drive by Pembroke Street, have a look at the lot I'm referring to and the houses around it. That lot next door is owned by the Victoria Self Help Society and that particular lot is 44 feet by 143.04, and that was purchased in 1972 for \$13,000. This proposal suggests there are other lots in this immediate area which are vacant and can be purchased and used for play space, et cetera, for easements, for public property or public space, but there is no way I can find out what they are worth or whether they own them, or whether they intend to own them, or whether they are, in fact, negotiating with people who now own them.

But it looks to me that we have an interesting proposal and I would like the Springridge group, whoever they are, to tell us — I would like to find out who they consist of, how they propose to rent these houses and who they propose to rent them to. Will they in fact become members of the co-op, and what will happen when the houses are no longer of any value and yet they still have the land and the rights to that land for 60 years?

The other question I would like to ask is: how did we get these houses apparently for nothing? If the municipality of Oak Bay didn't want them and wasn't prepared to tear them down, how did we acquire them? Was there a value paid for them and, if so, where does it appear in the proposal? Who negotiated it? Does the city council of Oak Bay know what happened, or is this just another wild proposal? I'd like to know how we acquired lot 1 and lot D and for what reason, and why those prices should vary between the \$37,500 which was recorded on Land Registry and the \$48,500 they propose to charge for it. I want to know again what they will use that property for for the balance of that 50 years, and whether they will acquire the property around it.

MR. FRASER: Tell us, Mr. Minister of Public Works.

MR. MORRISON: I would also like to know who the Urban Design Centre is. Apparently it is based in Vancouver. I'd like to know who paid for that proposal, and I'd like to know who authorized it.

I notice a newspaper clipping where they announced the employment of a design consulting team to bring in proposals to the government in 30 days. I notice that the 30 days are up today and that the head of the consulting team was to be paid \$125 a day plus \$1,500 and some in expenses for that 30-day period. I'd like the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) to give us a report as to the results of that team, and of the money that was spent, and exactly what we can look forward to from that proposal.

I believe that this is probably a sample of the type of co-operative housing programme that we are going to be faced with in the next few years, and probably will be repeated over, and over, and over again throughout the province.

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works): Are you against co-operative housing?

MR. MORRISON: No, I'm not against co-operative housing. I'm just against not knowing the facts. I'd like to know where the money comes from, who subsidized it, where the LIP grant came that may have paid for those proposals. I'd like to have all those facts laid on the table, because you prefer to say that you can be competitive with private enterprise, and yet you subsidize your own enterprise and you bury the facts.

Well, there they are. Bring them out. Show me where I am wrong. I hope I'm wrong. I hope I am wrong, because if I'm not wrong, it's disgraceful.

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: Well, I say I hope I'm wrong, but there are the facts. I'd be happy to show this to you after. There is the proposal — it's a factual proposal. And you already own the property, so obviously there's something there. Why did you buy

[[Page 251](#)]

it if you didn't intend to proceed? There's your answer. But I'd be very happy to take the Attorney-General this afternoon and drive him by that piece of property and we'll go and walk over it. I'd also like to have him tell me after we walked over it why anyone would pay \$48,500 let alone \$37,500 for it.

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: Do me a favour and have a look at it.

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: We also keep hearing well-founded stories of a proposed satellite city to be located in the highland district of Saanich.

AN HON. MEMBER: I don't think it's in Saanich.

MR. MORRISON: Well, wherever it is. I gather that part of it is in the edge of Saanich. Maybe he's just as glad it isn't and he's probably just as glad he isn't mayor any more because the details of the proposal tell us that none of the property will be available for private ownership — that the entire city will be a rental proposal.

Interjection.

MR. MORRISON: Well, we've got some pretty detailed facts on that one too. I can produce some of the people who have sold the property and the stories they were told when the property was acquired.

But what I'd like to know is who is going to administer the satellite housing and, particularly after the bill that the AG brought in yesterday or the day before, I'd like to know who is going to police it. Because here we have the opportunity for the government to establish, completely within their own jurisdiction, an entire city. I wonder if this is a pilot project which again is to be repeated and repeated throughout the province.

Today I'd also like to talk about assessments, but having taken considerable time I'm going to leave that to another day. But I would like to close in saying that this government has taken control of our lives so quickly and in so many ways that most of us cannot believe that it has happened. To top it off, the Finance Minister has become a stock market player, a speculator and a corporate manipulator in front of our very eyes. He's learned a whole new language. But I don't think he has any comprehension of the forces he has let loose or the eventual outcome of the dangerous game he is playing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention to concentrate in this debate on those items in this very exciting budget which specifically affected the riding of Vancouver-Burrard. I had intended to be as brief as possible.

However, in the daily *Province* of yesterday, February 14, there was an article which so distressed me that I feel it is impossible for me to speak of anything until I say a few words about this article. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the article by Nicole Strickland on page 44 in that section of the paper dealing with life styles. In this article one Nigel Nixon, supervisor of probation services at the Vancouver family and children's court and one Jack Gillis, chief probation officer in the same court, have viciously slandered all the women of this province who have had the great misfortune to have had to pass through that court.

Now I have always been very careful not to express my true feelings or opinions about the Vancouver family court publicly because, quite frankly, my opinions have been and continue to be very negative. I have never been able to find anything good to say about that court or about what it does to people who, because they are poor, have no option but to use it.

However, the statements of these two gentlemen, officers of the court, have brought into the open the attitude and philosophy of some of the people involved in that court system who have served to make the whole experience such a destructive and psychologically brutalizing one for the women who have had the great misfortune to find themselves there.

The fact of the matter is that the attitude displayed by these two men in their statements is not only punitive, but also serves to imply that all women who are poor and all women who have to apply for welfare are dishonest. The only thing that has kept poor women from ripping off the welfare system was the careful scrutiny which their application used to get before the Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) of this government put an end to that degrading practice. I'd like to quote Mr. Nixon:

"As a result of a letter to court officials last April from Human Resources Minister Norman Levi, separated and deserted women are no longer required to appear in family court before making application for social assistance. In consequence, they

charge, unknown numbers of women are now drawing welfare cheques who formerly under examination by this court would not be eligible to obtain assistance."

I'm not surprised, of course, that their attack is launched against women, because most people in this country who find themselves deserted with children are women. Most deserted parents who find

[[Page 252](#)]

themselves without financial resources are women. Most deserted parents who have to apply for welfare are usually women. That's the way our system has always worked.

We have always extolled the virtues of motherhood. We congratulate mothers for their wonderful contribution to our society. Then when they are deserted by their spouse, we drive them onto the welfare system. And not satisfied that welfare has honoured them enough, the past government used to humiliate these women further by forcing them to appear before people like this Nixon and Gillis for these men to decide whether these women and their children were worthy of support.

Well, in April of last year, this Government put an end to that. The Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi), a more humane human being than the probation service of the family courts will ever be able to understand, decided that these women were entitled to some dignity.

This decision apparently so enraged these two men that they are now laying this accusation of fraud on us — fraud not against the wheelings and dealings that are going on in the boardrooms of this country; not against the wheelings and dealings that are going on in the stock market, but against the poor desperate women of this town who find that they have been left to raise their children without any financial assistance, without any moral support, and without any help whatsoever from anyone.

I do not want to labour this point, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that there are a number of things that I should clarify for those people here who, like these two men, Nixon and Gillis, may be labouring under the impression that the life of a mother on welfare, who is the sole support parent in the home, is one long carnival at the taxpayers' expense.

But first of all, I'd like to quote again from Mr. Nixon. He goes on to say:

"A woman may leave her husband and apply for social assistance. The husband, however, may own three apartment buildings and be worth \$1 million."

Point No. 1: what a married man in this country owns is his. What a wife in this country owns is also his. If Mr. Nixon and Mr. Gillis doubt this, I'd like to draw their attention to two recent court decisions which prove this.

The first one was that of the Supreme Court of Canada in its decision in the Murdoch case. The other was that decision recently handed down by Mr. Justice Didsbury of the Court of Queens Bench in Saskatchewan in the Rathwell case. Both of these decisions maintain that the wife, one of them of 23 years and the other of 25 years duration, had no claim and were not entitled to any of their husbands' extensive assets — even though in the Rathwell case it was Mrs. Rathwell's cash which was used to purchase the first half section of land which finally became the family farm.

So it is quite possible and indeed I know that it does happen. I know of many cases where the wife of a man with considerable assets can find herself left destitute with children with no alternative but to apply for welfare.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, surely it is the husband and not the woman who is guilty of abusing the taxpayers' purse.

But even that case is an exception. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, 99 per cent of the people who use the family court are not millionaires. Most of the families who use the family court have so little income that the men are often not able to pay more than a mere pittance towards their maintenance, and the women and children end up on welfare anyway.

So after all the hassle and all the scrutiny and all the time involved, the women and children usually end up on welfare anyway.

Mr. Nixon stated — and here again I quote directly from his article: "In my view the family court appearance is not an ordeal. This is a conciliation court."

If this were not such a tragic situation, one would have to laugh at that statement — at anyone referring to that court as a conciliation court. Mr. Nixon should be reported to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Ms. Young) for being guilty of misleading advertising. The family court of Vancouver is not a conciliation court; it is an ordeal and a psychologically brutalizing experience for the women who pass through it. It is destructive; it is degrading; it is anguish.

Before entering the political arena I worked for two years as ombudswoman for the Status of Women Council in Vancouver. During that time, and since then, I have been in contact with many women who have had the misfortune to pass through the family court. Without exception, without one single exception, Mr. Speaker, they were scarred by that experience. Without exception they stated, in one form or another, that they would do anything they could to avoid ever repeating that experience.

Through its policy of what Mr. Nixon euphemistically refers to as "applications for maintenance by women," which correctly is interpreted by the husbands as laying a charge against them, that court has been responsible for destroying any chance of conciliation in more families than we will ever dream of.

Why the hue and cry by so many people to look at that Vancouver family court? Why the recommendation of the social service blue book to wipe out the probation service? Because people who have worked with that court over the years have known that the punitive attitude reflected in the

[[Page 253](#)]

statements of these two gentlemen have been rampant in the court and in that service for years.

It is an attitude that reflects a lack of respect for people simply because they are poor. It is an attitude that questions the integrity of people simply because they are poor. It is an attitude that makes people look with hope to the Family Law Commission, headed by Mr. Justice Berger, for an alternative. Surely, we cannot continue to tolerate the attitude reflected by these two gentlemen toward people, female or male, any longer.

It is precisely to eliminate the necessity for deserted or divorced women having to go through family court, it is precisely to eliminate the necessity for widows to end up on welfare that I suggested last fall that the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia address itself to the matter of income support for the spouse who works in the home caring for the family and the home.

The Insurance Corporation of British Columbia has been in the business of selling general insurance. The budget tells us that, to date, over \$12 million in general insurance has been sold. Surely it is time that they took my suggestion seriously. Surely it is time that they involve themselves into seriously looking at the matter of supplying income support for the spouse who remains in the home.

No ideal family court, no increased welfare payments, nothing can guarantee the deserted wife or the widowed mother the kind of financial support without humiliation that would be possible under a general insurance scheme like the one which I outlined in the fall of last year.

This is a matter of urgency, I say to my government. This is a matter requiring priority attention if we are serious about our commitment to the dignity of the individual.

Having made that brief statement, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to the budget.

The first area I'd like to talk about is the area of housing. This section of the budget most affects the city

ridings, and certainly it most affects Vancouver-Burrard.

I greet with pleasure the allocation of the more than \$100 million to help meet the need in this crucial area. And I listened attentively to the Minister's (Hon. Mr. Nicolson's) outline of his policy and the direction which he intends to take in dealing with this crisis.

I am satisfied that through judicious utilization of the neighbourhood improvement allocation we may be able to stop the rampant destruction of the older homes in our area and their replacement by monstrous high-rises and condominiums.

We in Vancouver-Burrard feel there is a unique character about our part of the city. We have been watching with helpless horror while bulldozers have been razing some of our more beautiful older buildings — replacing many of our senior citizens and lower-income families.

Our citizens have taken the first step in helping preserve this area by forcing the City of Vancouver to downzone much of the area. Now that these funds are available it is my hope that they will help us to preserve it while creating additional housing through the conversion plan, the duplex plan and the plan to legalize and upgrade some of the suites in the area. Hopefully Kitsilano, Mount Pleasant and Fairview will continue to be livable for a while longer.

But that alone is not enough; government housing for lease must be built. We have no land left in our area for single-family housing, but there is space for low rise multiple-family dwelling. And we hope the government will acquire even more land in this area and become aggressively involved in the business of building rental units for families.

Although I support the idea of co-ops, it is my firm belief that co-ops will never meet the needs in our particular riding. The private sector, Mr. Speaker, is not interested in the needs of low-income families. One only has to read the article which headlined the *Vancouver Sun* yesterday: "How to Get Really Rich in Real Estate." I was horrified as I went through it and read all the addresses....

MR. GARDOM: Written by Bob Williams.

MS. BROWN: Unless he's been christened and changed his name ... to find that most of the homes which were sold....

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Jealousy will get you nowhere.

MS. BROWN: Despite the levity, Mr. Speaker, the fact that my riding is an endangered riding and is threatened by the private developer was amply demonstrated by this article. And those fantastic profits that were made on the buying and selling of property — most of it went on in Vancouver-Burrard.

These people who do this, the private sector, are not interested in addressing themselves to the needs of low-income families. Their needs can only be met by government-built housing. Not on the size and the scale of the infamous projects of the 1950s and the 1960s, but lowrise multiple-dwelling units compatible with the surrounding neighbourhoods.

We do not believe that the core of the city should be the private preserve of the near-rich, the rich and the super-rich. But we are aware that only through government-built housing will we ever be able to reverse this trend which is forcing all but the most affluent out of the city core into the suburbs and outlying areas.

Before I leave this topic.... And I really would recommend that everyone read this page 1 article in

[[Page 254](#)]

the *Vancouver Sun* — a perfect description of the kind of abuse my riding is taking from the private developers.

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): Is that free enterprise?

MS. BROWN: Free enterprise.

A short statement, Mr. Speaker, addressed specifically to the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson).

To the Minister of Housing re the proposed high-rise on the corner of 7th and Maple: As the duly elected representatives of this constituency, both Norman Levi (Minister of Human Resources) and I have already conveyed to the Minister that the residents of this riding do not want a high-rise to be built in that particular parcel of land.

They fought for and succeeded in having this area rezoned. Unfortunately, the city's approval was given prior to the downzoning, so by law this high-rise can still proceed. However, if the provincial government gives funds to help with this project it will be doing so against the express wishes and against the best interest of the residents of this riding, both old and young.

This is a government which prides itself on the fact that it listens. I hope it will listen to the people of Kitsilano who have given an over-riding no to this project and who have worked hard to prevent it going through. As their duly-elected representatives, both Norm Levi and I respect the wishes of the residents of this neighbourhood, and we can only hope and ask that the Minister do so too.

Most of the people who live in my riding are tenants, and so the renter's grant was greeted with much enthusiasm by these residents of my riding. Indeed, many of the people living there have already taken the time to phone and ask me to convey their congratulations to the government on recognizing the contributions which they as tenants have made to this province, to its growth and to its development. They welcome the decision to share the resource dividend with them.

For many, many years, this government when it was in opposition and people outside of this government asked that tenants, the people in rental accommodations, be recognized in the same way homeowners are recognized, and finally this is done. This renter's grant, coupled with the amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act which we were promised in the throne speech — an excellent speech that, because the opposition had nothing to say against it, closed down before I had a chance to take my place in it, Mr. Speaker — indicates this government is still attuned to the needs of the people and people still count before things.

Our social services, Mr. Speaker, are among the best in the world and they continue to improve. One has only to compare our health-care system with that of the free-enterprise system to the south. In this regard, I would like to recommend to everyone an article called "Hospitals for Sale" (*Ramparts*, February, 1974) which described in detail what is happening to the delivery of health care in California. Once it became evident that the private hospitals were losing money, the government closed down the public hospitals, forcing people to use the private hospitals which actually meant that poor people who couldn't afford to pay for hospital care had to do without. Everybody in California is now being billed for hospital care whether they can afford it or not. This kind of free-enterprise health-care delivery system is not the kind of system this government would ever tolerate.

I really think everyone in the opposition should read that article. Specifically, I would like to address it to the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) and the First Member for Vancouver-Point Grey. (Mr. McGeer).

The Member for Oak Bay criticized us because we are not immediately meeting the need for intermediate hospital care. He's not in his seat, but if he were I would like to assure him that we have recognized that this need exists — and to recognize it is to meet it. The past government didn't even recognize that the need existed. We recognize that it exists; we will meet that need. We may not meet it today, we may not meet it this afternoon, but that need will be met.

On page 17 of the budget we learned that an additional \$5 million is to be added to the B.C. Cultural Fund; a very modest addition, a welcome addition, but a modest one. The interest from that \$5 million means another \$350,000 will go toward supporting the cultural development of this province.

The fund, as you know, was started in 1967 by the previous government with an endowment of \$5 million. In 1969, this was increased to \$10 million; in 1972, to \$15 million; and now has been increased to \$20 million. What this means in terms of our overall population is that approximately \$1.4 million annually, or 60 cents per person, will be spent in this area; not an over-generous amount, especially when one considers the importance of the contribution which the arts and culture make to the quality of all our lives.

Yet in his budget speech, the Member for Oak Bay accuses the government of depriving the old and the sick of this province and squandering its money on culture. Not only can 60 cents hardly be referred to as squandering but it really is unfortunate that that Member should attack the government for wanting to enrich the lives of all the people of this province through making our heritage more accessible to all of them.

[[Page 255](#)]

The rich have always been able to afford to enrich their lives, Mr. Speaker. Now this government is saying all people should have equal access, and that's what this is all about. It is our belief that this province is greatly endowed with talented people, and further, it is our belief that all the people of this province should benefit from their talents. So I applaud the decision to add \$5 million to this fund, and I ask all the Members of the House to join me in exhorting the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) not to stop there but to commit an additional \$5 million to the fund each year for the next four years until the investment per person is well beyond the 60 cents figure.

I'd like to mention the State of New York, Mr. Speaker. Every now and again the free-enterprisers surprise us, and this certainly is one occasion on which they do so. There's an article in a 1972 issue of *Forum* and I want to quote from it: "New York state under Nelson Rockefeller has been appropriating truly astonishing sums each year for the support of the visual arts." It goes on to say that he appropriated in 1970, \$20 million, and in 1971, an additional \$14.4 million.

It turns out — and this is the interesting thing about this article — that this is not merely good policy but was also very good business. Somebody figured out recently that the new space programme proposed by President Nixon will create 50,000 jobs at the cost of \$100,000 per job, whereas the New York state council with its appropriation will create 2,000 new jobs at a unit cost of \$7,000 per job.

The article goes on to say:

" I'm not suggesting that the space programme be turned over to the New York state artists, though the prospects of having Bob Rosenberg rather than NASA explore outer space is an exhilarating one. What I am suggesting is that the massive infusion of dollars in the general direction of the arts may be one way of making the recession recede. The sums dispersed by art councils not only support artists, who themselves pay taxes like everyone else, but also electricians, carpenters, stagehands, ticket takers, popcorn sellers and even, in one instance, tent makers, when a tent was rented to use to display an exhibition in."

So it's good business. The old attitude towards the arts was that this was kind of a handout thing to keep artists from starving. But we're beginning to see that all of us benefit from it. Not only are our lives enriched by it but, because these people and all the peripheral people who deal with them pay taxes, in the final analysis the money keeps going round and round. So it's good business.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Arts Access conference in the fall of 1973 generated a great deal of excitement and enthusiasm on the part of all the creative people and many other people in this province.

MR. ROLSTON: Many Socreds there?

MS. BROWN: No, now that you mention that.

Interjection.

MS. BROWN: He wasn't there. I'm going to keep trying; I'm not going go give up.

As you may also know, the government is now struggling to design a really comprehensive cultural policy for

the province. This increased funding is, I hope, only the beginning indication that we are taking seriously our commitments toward the enriching of the lives of all the people of the province.

Interjection.

MS. BROWN: Like I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the rich have always been able to afford it. We want to make sure that everyone else enjoys it too.

I've lost my place.

MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen): Take your place then.

MS. BROWN: Forever more. (Laughter.) And that goes, Mr. Speaker, no matter what their economic status, no matter where they live, whether it's in Golden, B.C., Fernie, the Stikine country, or even Victoria which is so richly endowed.

Interjection.

MS. BROWN: Point Grey, even Point Grey — why not Point Grey? Let's not discriminate against Point Grey — especially Point Grey. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

MS. BROWN: A brief word, Mr. Speaker, about the Orpheum Theatre. I understand the Royal Theatre is in the same position in Victoria.

I support all attempts to save the Orpheum Theatre. The Vancouver MLAs were sleeping on that one. I have been assured, however, by the statements of the Mayor of Vancouver that he is going to save the Orpheum Theatre. I certainly wish him all the good luck in the world in his endeavour.

I understand that he has already raised \$4,000 of the \$6 million that he needs. (Laughter.)

However, I am not going to have a closed mind on this. If the decision is ever made that all of us together should save the Orpheum Theatre, then I will be very willing to appeal to this government to

[[Page 256](#)]

support this effort on behalf of all the people. As long as the mayor finds that he can do it single-handedly, of course, then there really is no need for this government to interfere.

Interjections.

MS. BROWN: No, he said he's going to save it, so let's not interfere with him.

MR. GARDOM: You don't believe it?

MS. BROWN: Oh yes, yes I do. (Laughter.) I believe it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: More, more, more.

MS. BROWN: ...I would just like to make one brief statement about the appropriations being made to the universities in this budget.

I support completely the decision that any additional funding for the universities should be tied to the universities accepting their responsibilities to the community. I support completely the freezing of funding until this

is achieved.

However, I am in a dilemma, Mr. Speaker, because here again, as so often happens when budgets are frozen and funds are cut, it is the people at the bottom of the pile who suffer the most. The people at the bottom of the pile in the universities are the women. In the universities like Simon Fraser and UBC, for example, that is the only place you will find the women — at the bottom of the pile. The clerical and the support staff at these two bastions of higher learning have just begun to organize. In some instances they are trying to reach the minimum wage level, if you can imagine that, Mr. Speaker.

This decision by our government to freeze funds will deal a severe blow to their efforts. The women on the teaching staff who are organizing and fighting for parity with their male colleagues will also be dealt a severe blow.

The tragedy of the situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration of these two major institutions have never cared about women. They have exploited them shamelessly over the past. They have refused their request for resource centres, women's studies, relevant courses, equal treatment in all of their faculties. Now these two administrations will be able to claim this government as an ally in their continued exploitation.

So I appeal to this government; I appeal to this government to find some other way of getting these institutions to live up to their responsibility to the community. I appeal to this government to find some other way of getting these institutions into line, because it is my belief that if we all put our heads together we can come up with a plan to make the universities accountable without giving them the licence to continue their shameless oppression of women.

This is a great budget, Mr. Speaker, and it's been a pleasure to speak in support of it. Thank you.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining this budget debate representing the beautiful constituency of Shuswap.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't lay an egg!

MR. LEWIS: Before I go into my prepared speech I would just like to respond to the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) in regard to ICBC. He has letters that he read out. Now I would like to read one out that I received from an agent that's selling the insurance. It starts out....

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a relation?

MR. LEWIS: No, I haven't got many relations. It says:

Dear Don;

Autoplan is going well with us. We have seen many new faces and we have seen many happy faces when the dollar amounts are shown. We have had a few whose premiums are more than last year, but they are very few. We have now remitted well over \$30,000 to ICBC — not bad when you still have the majority to go.

Keep up the good work.

I would also like to say that the Minister in charge of this programme has my complete support. In my view he is doing a tremendous job against tremendous odds. I think we hear all the criticism in regard to this Crown corporation because many, many people in the opposition don't want it to work.

But you know, it's funny — mistakes are made among free enterprisers as well. They've been in the business for years and years. You know that I even once had a chartered bank put \$600 in my bank account that I never had coming. (Laughter.)

This government has only been in power for a matter of 18 months. It's taken on a tremendous task in many areas and ICBC was one of them. And I'll stand or fall in my riding in support of the plan.

MR. GARDOM: Bye, bye.

MR. LEWIS: No, I'll be here long after you've left. (Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker, this 1974 budget....

[[Page 257](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: Where's Willis?

MR. LEWIS: Oh, he's around yet. As a matter of fact they've even elected him to run against me next time.
Interjections.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this 1974 budget is not only the first budget to exceed \$2 billion, but it's also a budget that will allow the Ministers to proceed in a planned economy.

This budget is generous enough to allow the Ministers' departments the latitude they need in hiring qualified consultants to take this province in its proper direction.

The decisions that will be made by the cabinet with the advice of these consultants will be decisions that are made for people. This is what this party has stood for, and this is the direction in which we are going. The great strides to be made in planning the future development of the north will not only benefit this generation but also future generations that are to follow. The actions taken by the Hon. Minister of Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) and his staff in the past 18 months is clear evidence that the money spent on consultants and planning will bring the desired results.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on. Right on.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, while the Hon. Minister of Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) was outlining the programme for the north, I happened to glance down towards the opposition. You know, to my surprise, there was a look of admiration in every one of their eyes. As a matter of fact, I even saw the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) smiling at him. I think that this has to be a vote of confidence. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, if there were an election tomorrow I would predict that 75 per cent of the opposition Members sitting in this House would vote for us.

MS. BROWN: Yea!

MR. LEWIS: I would just like to mention a few items of the budget that impressed me. I believe that No. 1 in the budget would have to be housing. Now I come from a rural riding where probably this programme won't have much effect. But I do see the problems in the urban ridings, the very great problems that exist there at the present time. I'm sure that under this Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) and the amount that is made available to him we can look forward to great things in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the 42 per cent increase in funds directed to the resource sector is most gratifying. At long last we have a government that realizes that if we wish to harvest our trees on a cropping basis, we also must see those trees are replaced to have a new crop coming. Actions were taken in this budget to assure this. Last year we had \$5.116 million in the budget directed towards reforestation. This year we have \$12.925 million for reforestation, an increase of 152 per cent.

There have also been substantial increases in Water Resources, Lands Branch and in funds for the environment. I think this is what this government's all about. We realize that if we are going to have a future population, we must have something there for people to live on in the future — something for them to enjoy.

Increases in the Fish and Wildlife budget are also most gratifying. A \$2.958 million increase in the Wildlife budget: this is an area that has been really neglected throughout the last 20 years — an area nobody seemed to worry about. There was also an increase of \$7 million for the acquisition of new parks, and I certainly hope the Minister uses some of this money in the Shuswap area.

In that area we have one of the most beautiful lakes of anywhere in the world, yet we have a very limited amount of land available to the public, that's accessible to the public. I think the figures are that about one-third of it presently is tied up almost completely by private ownership around the lake. Mind you, there are vast areas which are still in Crown hands, but this area isn't available to the public. They can't get to it, there is no road. I would hope that in the future this two-thirds of the lake will be retained for the public. The lake itself has adequate numbers of people living on the shoreline now. The people living on the shoreline and in other areas depend on the quality of that water for their human consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that with a budget like we have, directed toward the environment, towards reforestation, that the children who will follow us will have something to look forward to.

I've touched on a few of the dramatic increases in the budget which impressed me. Now I would like to touch on some things that I think could help the economy of my riding or the economy of the Interior.

I think we all realize that the lower mainland, Vancouver Island part of the province is quite heavily endowed with industrial development, thus leaving the people living in the area a much wider range of job opportunities. This type of thing does not exist in the Interior, and I'm looking for programmes that will change this. Hopefully, this one will be a

[[Page 258](#)]

suggestion that the Minister or Ministries involved will look at.

Many times in the past I've heard Members of the cabinet say that they would like to see the population dispersed throughout the provinces. I've also heard the Ministers of the past government say the same type of thing. Now, up to this date it hasn't been happening.

MR. FRASER: Change the cabinet.

MR. LEWIS: No, it hasn't been happening. Not just the cabinet. Probably you and I would be the only ones who would vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some suggestions in regard to the ICBC.

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

MR. LEWIS: ICBC is a corporation that's going to be here for many, many years and at the present time is operating in rented quarters. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the cabinet and the Minister in charge of ICBC (Hon. Mr. Strachan) take a real look at establishing the headquarters for ICBC somewhere in the Interior.

MR. J.H. GORST (Esquimalt): Sicamous? You won't get my vote. (Laughter.)

MR. LEWIS: Well, don't laugh. I'll have to give you some good reasons why I feel the movement of the ICBC into the Interior would be to the benefit of the whole of the province.

1. Large blocks of cheap land could be purchased in advance to accommodate housing for a new town site or for adding on to an existing town.
2. New towns could be planned to meet the needs of the people with all services being installed prior to street construction.
3. Congestion of the lower mainland would decrease, thus alleviating many costly freeway and bridge projects.
4. Pressure would be taken off the ferry systems and the coastal islands.

5. Many people desire an environment removed from the large cities, thus an opportunity here to alleviate mental distress and many other things that depress a person. And you will have to admit that some of our large cities are depressing.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on, and I believe that now is the time for the government to act, to put their thoughts into action. I can see one way that the government could go ahead and advance this scheme.

MR. FRASER: Look out, Don.

MR. LEWIS: I've lost my place here. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member must have extensive notes.

MR. LEWIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have seen some of the other Members reading completely from their notes. I am putting in the odd word just out of them. (Laughter.)

Summertime conditions in the Shuswap area are some of the best in North America. I think anyone who has been to the Shuswap Lake area would agree on that. Mr. Minister, if you would consider building your ICBC structure in the Shuswap area, you would have the most efficient, happy, healthy employees anywhere in B.C.

MR. FRASER: Build a new office and keep them up there.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking you to take a real socialistic look at this problem. Take a real socialistic look at it. Share some of the wealth. Let some of the people move throughout the province. Let them contribute something to our economy, the same as what is happening in the lower mainland through industrial growth.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to touch on the problems which I have in my riding in regard to the economy. One of them which concerns me somewhat is the headline in yesterday's paper which my friend from Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) held up in regard to \$100 million projects stalled throughout the province. I think many of the MLAs in this room will realize that we have gone through a period of over a year where a large part of my riding has already been frozen due to Bill 42. Now, I totally support Bill 42, but at the same time there are many, many people who are caught in a bind.

If we are now to go into a further freeze, with the Highways department taking control over zoning in the area, it is of great concern to me. I definitely say that the Highways department has to have complete control of their accesses; I believe in planning. But if there's going to be any action taken in regard to the planning away from that highway, I believe that Municipal Affairs and people who live in the area must have an input, must have a decision-making process in regard to that.

In my understanding, and as I said before, I strongly feel that this party is for people, and people first. Not for highways and highways first.

I would like to touch a little on Bill 71, which I think had good intentions by everybody. I voted for it. The Socreds didn't, but they still don't know why they didn't.

[[Page 259](#)]

MR. FRASER: Don't worry, we didn't.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, like you said, it's easy to be smart afterwards. But as I said, we realized we are going to make some mistakes, or some people were going to be put in a position where the legislation would have to be changed if there was a mistake made. Now, I think we are flexible, and the Premier (Hon. Mr. Barrett) has indicated that he is appointing an all-party committee from this House. Now some of the Members sitting in opposition will be in a position where they will be able to put some input into what should happen with the taxes and the tax assessments in this province. Now let's see how smart they are.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: Give him the chance to be constructive.

MR. LEWIS: I'd just like to touch on marketing boards very briefly. You know, in the past I've almost worn this subject out. The Member for Skeena (Mr. Dent) touched on it the other day in the House, indicating how distressed he was about the egg situation in the Prince George area. I support the Member for Skeena in regard to this because I do believe that that area is left, as are many, many areas, with imported products from the lower mainland of the province.

I think a constructive programme has got to be taken by the B.C. marketing boards — all marketing boards, not just the Egg Marketing Board — to ensure farmers in the Interior of the province the same right as anywhere else, that they have the right to produce the products for their consumption.

I was a little discouraged by the amount of funds that were in the budget for agriculture. I don't think too many people realize just how severe the problems are in agriculture at the present time. There are many, many people that are criticized on the prices of farm foods. I think that if they would just take a week's time to go out and work on a farm, go out and work in those conditions and have to live on the receipts they receive from those farms, they may have a little different outlook on what's happening.

I say that we've got to put much more emphasis on agriculture in this province in the future. People are complaining now about high food prices, but they just want to take a look at England where at the present time a dozen eggs is worth \$2.30. I think that they're in some little different circumstances than we are. They're short of land. They import many of their grains.

But in Canada here we have the land, we have the grain and we have the people who can produce the food. The only thing is that those people have to receive a fair return for their production.

I know that some constructive steps have been taken in the past year and some people are benefiting through them. But there is a large majority of the agricultural society out there that isn't benefiting. The organized groups, the dairymen, the producers that are under marketing boards, are in a fairly favourable position in regard to their returns. But the hay producers, the grain producers, the many, many people that are involved in vegetable production out there are left completely without any sort of a support programme.

I would hope that something concrete will come out of this Legislature in the next few years to see that agriculture has a chance to thrive and has a chance to help the rest of the economy in this province as well.

Mr. Steves moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege to claim the traditional rights of parliament that budget details are presented to the Legislature first. The Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) has this morning announced from the steps of the building that more money will be made available for education than is shown in the budget document. The public and not the Members of this Legislature have been advised by radio of the statements of the Minister. I ask the Minister of Finance to withdraw the budget document for amendments and reintroduce it at the next sitting of the House.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I draw the Member's attention to page 134 of the budget for his budget speech of last Monday, and I will quote it to him:

Further, Mr. Speaker, along with this amount of money, we will make available special supplementary warrants for any school district that shows us an exorbitantly high student-teacher ratio. The Minister herself will initiate that action upon completion of a survey, and she has the authority from myself and the Treasury Board to come for special warrants throughout this year if circumstances call for this emergency help. Case-by-case, situation-by-situation study will be given by the Minister."

She has been given the authority by the Treasury Board for those special supplementary warrants, Mr.

Speaker. We want these school boards to become involved directly with the Minister. If they can make the case, the money will be made available. We hope these measures will lead to reduced class size.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, if the budget is to be meaningful, these figures should be contained in the budget. I don't believe that this morning there was any negotiation with school trustees or boards of trustees or anyone else.

[[Page 260](#)]

HON. MR. STRACHAN: She repeated the statement made by the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: I think there is ample evidence of the proposal in the opening of the budget speech that was presented on Monday. I can't quite see what the question of privilege is. I would certainly like the assistance of the Members in regard to that point before any precipitate decision upon the matter.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, in 1949 when the government was confronted by the teachers for not giving enough money to education, the Finance Minister, Anscomb, brought in a special appropriation by a bill, and thus amended the budget. I think the Members of the Legislature here should have the same courtesy from the government of today.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the usual rule in matters dealing with over-expenditure or additional expenditure, whether or not it is forecast in the budget, is for the government to return to the House for a special vote at the next session of the Legislature on any warrants that may have been granted in the interim period between budgets.

Now if there's a proposal in the budget speech forecasting the possibility of special warrants, undoubtedly the matter will come before this House for debate and consideration and approval or rejection at the next regular session where these warrants are reviewed by the House.

MR. BENNETT: That's all I ask for, Mr. Speaker: that they withdraw the budget and amend it to the new figures.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought I clarified the matter of special warrants. I think that the Hon. Member is aware that every year, at one stage during the proceedings of the House, the question of special warrants is taken up in a supplementary vote. Is there any special point?

MR. SMITH: Yes, the point is this: the House is presently in session and anything that is to be added or taken from the educational vote can be done by the Minister in this House because we are here discussing the budget at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out to the Hon. Member that that subject is one of debate. In this particular debate that is taking place now, you discuss the very point that you're raising as if it were a point of privilege — whether or not you wish to give that authority to the government or not. It's really a matter of debate.

HON. MR. LORIMER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the special report of the commissioner in the matter of the Surrey inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this report by way of statutory requirement or order-in-council?

HON. MR. LORIMER: No, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: Then you would ask leave of the House that the report be tabled.

HON. MR. LORIMER: I therefore ask leave of the House that the report be tabled.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

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

Copyright © 1974, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada