

1974 Legislative Session: 4th Session, 30th Parliament
HANSARD

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

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

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1974

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 261](#)]

Seating of new Member

Mr. G.F. Gibson (North Vancouver–Capilano) seated in the House — [261](#)

Routine proceedings

Oral questions

Disposal of Hydro's Jordan River surplus assets.

Mr. McClelland — [262](#)

ICBC survey on motorists without insurance.

Mr. Curtis — [262](#)

Retention of Foster, Young, Ross, Anthony & Associates.

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [263](#)

Culvert cleaning in Sooke by Department of Highways.

Mr. Wallace — [263](#)

Appointments of additional Autoplan agents.

Mr. Morrison — [263](#)

Budget debate (continued)

Mr. Steves — [265](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [276](#)

Mr. Gibson — [283](#)

Mr. Kelly — [292](#)

Petitions

Praying for the passage of An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter. Mr. Cummings — [297](#)

Praying for the passage of An Act to Amend the British Columbia School Trustees' Association Incorporation Act. Ms. Brown — [297](#)

Motions

Motion 9.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1974

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, on October 22, 1973, Mr. David M. Brousson, Member for the electoral district of North Vancouver–Capilano, announced in the House his resignation of his seat in the Legislature effective October 23, 1973.

Pursuant to section 55 of the *Constitution Act*, being chapter 71 of the *Revised Statutes of British Columbia* (1960), I did transmit to L.J. Wallace, Esquire, Deputy Provincial Secretary, my warrant for the issue of a new writ for the election of a Member to fill the vacancy in the said electoral district of North Vancouver–Capilano.

DEPUTY CLERK:

Office of the Deputy
Provincial Secretary,
Parliament Buildings,
Victoria, British Columbia,
February 18, 1974.

Mr. Ian M. Horne, Q.C.,
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Dear Sir:

RE: By-election, North Vancouver–Capilano electoral district, February 5, 1974.

I enclose herewith certified copy of the certificate of Mr. K.L. Morton, Chief Electoral Officer, respecting the election of Gordon Fulerton Gibson to represent the North Vancouver–Capilano electoral district in the Legislative Assembly.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) L.J. Wallace,
Deputy Provincial Secretary.

Mr. L.J. Wallace,
Deputy Provincial Secretary,
Parliament Buildings.

Dear Sir:

RE: By-election, February 5, 1974,
North Vancouver–Capilano Electoral District.

The resignation effective October 23, 1973, of David Maurice Brousson, the elected Member for the North Vancouver–Capilano electoral district, caused a vacancy to occur in the Legislative Assembly.

A writ calling for a by-election to fill that vacancy was issued on January 3, 1974, polling day being February 5, 1974.

From the writ now returned to me, I hereby certify the election of Gordon Fulerton Gibson as the Member to represent the North Vancouver–Capilano electoral district in the Legislative Assembly.

Yours truly,
(Signed) K.L. Morton,
Chief Electoral Officer.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move that the letter of the Deputy Provincial Secretary and the certificate of the Chief Electoral Officer of the result of the election of a Member be entered upon the *Journals* of the House.

Motion approved.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Mr. Gordon Fulerton Gibson who has been duly elected in the electoral constituency of North Vancouver–Capilano, and now claims the right to take his place in this Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Capilano please take his seat?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have another pleasure today, presenting to the assembly the wife of our new Member, Mrs. Valerie Gibson, and the children — Michelle, Mark and Melissa.

Also with us today on the floor of the House are the parents of Mrs. Gibson, Roger and Agnes Gauthier.

Mr. Speaker, if I may introduce two more people: In the gallery we have an old Member of this Legislature — when I say "old" I mean a man who has served with great distinction for many years in this Legislature, but who is still a man very young at heart — the Hon. Arthur Laing, Senator from British Columbia.

As the final pleasure, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you a Member of the federal parliament, the Member for Kenora–Rainy River, Mr. John Reid.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the House to welcome two guests today — Mr. Bajpai, the High Commissioner of India from Ottawa, and Mr. Khosla, the Trade Commissioner for India, based in Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my words of welcome to the Hon. Arthur Laing. Although he does not share the same political philosophy as this government, it

[[Page 262](#)]

should be publicly acknowledged that he has been of great assistance to us on a number of occasions.

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present three guests to the Legislature this afternoon: Dr. Hugh Keenleyside who chaired the commission of electrical inquiry that travelled throughout the province in the fall of this year. I would like at this time to thank Dr. Keenleyside and his associates for the great job they have done for this province.

I would also like to introduce Mrs. Shannon O'Neill of Salmon Arm, one of the commissioners, and Mr. Jack MacMillan.

I'm sorry that the other commissioner, Mr. Ken Bently, was not able to be with us this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I now beg leave to table with you the report of Dr. Keenleyside's commission of inquiry into electrical inspections of this province.

Leave granted.

MS. K. SANFORD (Comox): Mr. Speaker, I also this afternoon would like to ask the House to welcome some guests from the Comox constituency: six residents from Quadra Island, Mr. and Mrs. Malyea, Mr. and Mrs.

Martin, and Mr. and Mrs. Krook.

MR. SPEAKER: I would also take the venture to ask the House to welcome the students from Cariboo School in my constituency. And I hope you will give them a good welcome because I'm not able to do that from the chair.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Hall presents the 55th annual report of the Civil Service Commission, January 1 to December 31, 1973.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, I only have one guest in the gallery to welcome today, but I would ask the House to welcome Mr. Ed Swanick, formerly of the major metropolis of Falkland, and now of Vernon.

Oral questions.

**DISPOSAL OF HYDRO'S
JORDAN RIVER SURPLUS ASSETS**

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs as a director of Hydro. I'd like to ask the Minister if he can inform the House whether or not it is the practice, when disposing of surplus assets of this Crown corporation, B.C. Hydro, to go to public tender.

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Maybe you could ask me what you're referring to.

MR. McCLELLAND: I'm referring to the policy of disposal of surplus assets, Mr. Minister, with regard to British Columbia Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I don't think the question period is for statements on general policy; it is for specific matters of general information.

MR. McCLELLAND: I'll ask the same Minister as a director of Hydro if he is aware that the old power plant and penstock at Hydro's Jordan River installation has been sold without public tender, although competent people in the salvage business have pleaded for months for the opportunity to bid on these assets worth close to \$1 million as scrap. I understand they've now been disposed of without any tender. Could I ask the Minister if he would comment on that, please?

HON. MR. LORIMER: I didn't know, but I'll take the other question on notice.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, could I also ask if the Minister would advise the House that, if the purchase was don without benefit of tender, he will hold up the purchase until the opportunity for other interested parties to tender is made available?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that follows the other question when it's replied to in the House.

**ICBC SURVEY
ON MOTORISTS WITHOUT INSURANCE**

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): To the Minister of Transport and Communications with regard to ICBC. Can the Minister confirm that a form of survey is being conducted, either by representatives of ICBC or commissioned on ICBC's behalf, to determine approximately how many motorists have not yet taken out their insurance for the forthcoming insurance year?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): I have no knowledge of any survey being taken, but I'll check and find out.

MR. CURTIS: Supplementary. Would the Minister then indicate at the first opportunity, through you Mr. Speaker, if he determines such a survey is underway?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know that that is a proper question under the rules.

[[Page 263](#)]

MR. CURTIS: It's worth a try, Mr. Speaker.

RETENTION OF FOSTER, YOUNG, ROSS, ANTHONY & ASSOCIATES

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: To the Minister of Education. May I ask whether the Department of Education has retained the services of Foster, Young, Ross, Anthony & Associates Ltd. for an advertising campaign related to the capital expansion programme of community colleges?

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): No.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I ask the Minister whether this contract of \$60,000 was in any way related to the employment of Mrs. Joan Johnson, formerly a member of the Burnaby School Board, by Foster, Young, Ross, Anthony & Associates as their Victoria representative?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: Yes, it was. Mrs. Johnson is, I believe, an agent for them in Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I repeat my question, which apparently was not understood? May I ask the Minister whether the contract itself was in any way related to the employment of Mrs. Johnson by the firm of Foster, Young, Ross, Anthony & Associates?

HON. MRS. DAILLY: I have no information about whether there is any relationship there, Mr. Member.

CULVERT CLEANING IN SOOKE BY DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Could I ask the Minister of Highways if it is a fact that officials of your department authorized trucks and equipment to clean out a culvert on Sooke Road in the region of Ronald Avenue on February 4?

HON. G.R. LEA (Minister of Highways): That is notice, Mr. Speaker.

APPOINTMENTS OF ADDITIONAL AUTOPLAN AGENTS

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Transport and Communications. Would he like to clarify for the House the government's current policy regarding new appointments to ICBC agents? That is, the policy as of today.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Are you referring to anything in particular?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Everything in particular.

MR. MORRISON: Where have you been for the last little while? Yes, I am referring to something in

particular.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The purpose of question period is for specific information on matters of public concern not otherwise available. If you have a specific question, ask it. If you're asking for general statements of policy, you don't do it in question period. Does the Hon. Member have a specific question?"

MR. MORRISON: I have a specific question then. I would like him to tell the House now what the policy is concerning ICBC appointments as of today. I understand there has been a change in the policy and I'd like to know what the present policy is.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: There has been no change in the policy.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I ask the Minister of Health or the Minister of Transport and Communications whether they or members of their staff made representation to ICBC to accredit Mr. Don Sharpe as an insurance agent for ICBC, despite the fact that Mr. Sharpe did not fulfil the requirements of ICBC by way of carrying out automobile insurance last year?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Oh, I see. You are now referring to a column which I'm told appeared in one of the papers over the weekend.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I'm referring to the appointment of Mr. Sharpe.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Okay, you're referring to this column.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: No, wait a second. I would not like to have a general discussion of the column; I'm asking about the specific case of Mr. Don Sharpe.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the question is understood.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Yes, the question is understood. I don't know where the individual who published that story which mentioned Mr. Sharpe's name got his information but I would like to tell this House the facts.

There has been no influence of any kind used in

[[Page 264](#)]

the appointment of any Autoplan agent. I do not know nor, to the best of my knowledge, have I ever met or spoken to Mr. Don Sharpe in my life.

It is true that he knows the Hon. Minister of Health. That is hardly surprising because the Minister of Health had a prominent career in the insurance world before entering the cabinet, and there must be few, if any, knowledgeable insurance agents in this province who do not know my colleague.

Here are the facts with regard to the appointment of insurance agents. Approximately 45 private agents for one reason or another have dropped out of Autoplan since obtaining designation last year, leaving a total of 830 private-agency firms and their staffs supplemented by Motor Vehicle Branch and government agents personnel. While this is a relatively small attrition rate, nevertheless the Insurance Agents Association of B.C. did express concern to the ICBC board of directors about it. The board subsequently gave authority to Autoplan's management, not to the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles, to appoint new agents, but only if they were qualified to handle general or auto insurance as licensed by D.T. Cantell, Superintendent of Insurance, on the basis of his examinations.

I have checked today and have been informed by Autoplan management that six agents have been appointed so far on the basis of this instruction. I have the names here: one in Vancouver, another in Vancouver, another one in Victoria, Mr. Sharpe in Kamloops, and another one in Port Coquitlam. In addition, 13 other agents have been appointed under provisions in the Act permitting those who were already in the process of qualifying for their licences or have been listed as unqualified by errors to have their situations rectified. I have this list of names too if

anyone wishes to have them read out.

The point of all this is that, despite that completely false column, Mr. Hadfield had nothing to do with any of these appointments. His consent was not required. How anyone could portray these appointments as being the result of any pressure of any kind is beyond me. They were Autoplan management appointments made in the course of ensuring that no injustices to individual agents were permitted and to ensure that there are sufficient agents in the total field force to serve the public.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: May I ask the Minister of Health whether he or, to his knowledge, any member of his staff made any representation to either ICBC or the Minister of Transport and Communication's office to assist Mr. Sharpe in obtaining his ICBC accreditation?

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): As a person who has worked in the insurance business for 20 years, I naturally have a very close touch with any number of agents in the business. When, on the recommendation of the agents' association which said there would not be enough of them to do the job, they came to us at the end of the year indicating quite clearly that they just couldn't handle it, the ICBC at that time made a decision to expand the number of agents who would qualify.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Sharpe came to me as his MLA and asked if I would recommend him.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Now we're getting somewhere.

HON. MR. COCKE: I recommended him to the management of ICBC and I would recommend him again to the management of ICBC as one of the best agents I've known in my 20 years' experience.

But I have never played lacrosse in my life. That crazy story in Fotheringham's column; I don't know where he got all that information. I would recommend you if I felt you qualified because I happen to have some expertise in the area; but that's all. If my recommendation doesn't carry a great deal of weight, after all, it's....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the clear answer of the Minister of Health; I'm sure all Members of the House do. He answered a direct question directly. I would now like to redirect the question to the Minister of Transport and Communications.

Did he or any member of his staff have prior knowledge of the representations made by the Minister of Health to ICBC? And please don't read me a story about six other people.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: (Mike not on.) I have no prior knowledge of Mr. Sharpe, I don't know Mr. Sharpe, I never met Mr. Sharpe. Mr. Cocke didn't mention him to me. I want to assure you that there has never been anything political about this thing at all.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Who said there was?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Because that's the whole bit of it. Every agent who was in business on February 1 was re-appointed, no matter what his political plans were. And that is the way it's going to stay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary on this....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would ask that other Hon. Members have a right to question period

[[Page 265](#)]

too.

I would ask the Hon. Member, do you have a supplemental on the same subject?

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): My supplemental question is to the Minister of Transport and Communications. One John Ward, who I understand is a brother-in-law to the Premier, was he a licensed agent to sell auto insurance prior to February 1, and prior to this designation of agents by Autoplan?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I don't know. I can't answer that question. I'll have to take that as notice. I don't know.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Since the Member wants to go to some form or level of personal participation, let me assure you that my brother-in-law, Mr. John Ward, has been selling insurance in this province for over 20 years with an acknowledged agency. And I resent the implication in any way that there is any connection with his 20 years in the insurance business and ICBC.

MR. SMITH: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of privilege?

MR. SMITH: The point of privilege is simply this: there was no implication made. I asked a straightforward question of the Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMITH: He took it as notice. If you want to make the statement, go ahead make the statement. I take your word as an Hon. Member that he was in the insurance business prior to this date, and that's all I asked.

HON. MR. BARRETT: On the same point of privilege. If the Hon. Member meant nothing politically, why didn't he come to me in the hallway and ask about my brother-in-law instead of rising on the floor of this House? Pure cheap politics, the like of which I have never before seen on the floor of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please! I point out to Hon. Members that each of them must take responsibility for the facts that they convey to the House...

HON. MR. BARRETT: The cheapest kind of politics I've ever seen.

MR. SPEAKER: ...and any inferences are not a part of question period.

MR. McCLELLAND: I guess this is a supplementary as it deals with the same kind of subject. I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware that two full pages for Autoplan were placed in the newspaper, *Juan de Fuca News Review*, which I understand is published and owned by the vice-president of public relations for ICBC. Does the Minister feel there is any conflict of interest in that situation?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: As far as I know, we don't ask the publishers of newspapers what their political affiliations are. They're in *The Vancouver Sun*, they're in the *Province*; they might even be in your newspaper. I don't know. Are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Are they in your newspapers? Is that a conflict of interest?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: How low are you trying to drag this House? How low are you trying to drag this House? I want to tell you....

Interjections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would advise Hon. Members that it is quite permitted, under our rules, to

ask questions on both sides of the House. But when you are answering a question, there is time to answer it; when you want to ask one, stand up and ask your question.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. H. STEVES (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome this opportunity to address the House in this budget debate.

The Premier (Hon. Mr. Barrett) has called this a resource dividend budget, and I think it is just that. The budget redistributes much of the wealth of this province to the people of this province — to the loggers, to farmers, to the wage earners, as he mentions, particularly in the areas of health and human resources. And I think it reflects very much the humanistic philosophy of the Premier. I commend him on that.

To some extent it is also a socialist budget, and our first. Unfortunately, one question I have is that it is also a growth budget and, environmentally

[[Page 266](#)]

speaking, I am a bit concerned about some parts of it which I will discuss later in my talk with you today.

By and large, however, it is an exciting budget, though not without its shortcomings.

The Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) is to be congratulated. I think he is doing an admirable job. People are very happy with Mincome. The stigma of being on welfare is gradually being removed from the welfare department, although there are some complaints still in Vancouver that welfare workers look down on the people who come to them for welfare. Some of the workers, in keeping with previous government policy, are taking a hard line on recipients. I think, fortunately, that this is changing and there is a much better feeling in the human resources area.

I am very much pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the 15 per cent welfare costs to the municipalities has been cut now to 10 per cent. My riding last year paid over \$800,000 as their percentage, and we expect that there will be a considerable decrease in the cost to the riding for welfare.

I would like to suggest, however, to the Minister that Richmond and other areas might, in the future, get the same benefits as Vancouver and Victoria and, I think, Kamloops now receive in welfare, where the province has stepped in and taken over the responsibility for administering welfare in these areas. I note that these areas are paying about 60 or 65 cents per capita to the province to have them administer the welfare department. I think this would be a further saving to my riding of about \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year, and also would provide better provincial coordination of welfare services as well.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) particularly for the forthcoming B.C. Medical Centre and the considerable increases to his budget this year. I expect that we will see considerable additional benefits in health for 1974, and I have very big expectations for his department.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the Foulkes Report. I have long been a "Foulkes"-singer myself and am looking forward to some of the...that didn't go over very well (Laughter)...assets to health that Dr. Foulkes has suggested.

I am a bit concerned about his recommendation for fluoridation, but I doubt very much if that will become government policy as more and more people are becoming aware that there may be some disadvantages to fluoridation as well — the environmental costs are fairly high — and that fluoridation can be carried out by fluoridating milk or carrying out prevent-a-care in the schools.

I welcome his suggestions for reorganization of the Health department, particularly the recognition of mental health as a problem which should be covered in the overall health scheme and under hospital insurance.

I am very, very pleased to note his recommendation calling for community clinics, for health and human resource centres. I look forward to the day when such may be established in my community. And it doesn't bother me in the least if we take that one step further and were to put doctors on salaries, even if they were high salaries at that.

I would like to see decentralization of the hospital services throughout the province — I note that in the Foulkes Report this is recommended — so that in the future we may have uniform health care throughout British Columbia. No matter where you live in the province you will be able to get in and be treated equally — get the same kind of health care whether it is in the urban areas or in the north country.

I would like also at this time particularly to congratulate the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) for the housing programme he brought in. He mentioned that there were 37,627 new housing starts in B.C. In 1973, most of these single-family dwellings. In my area, of those 37,000 housing starts, we had 1,828 of them — about 5 per cent of the housing developed last year was built in Richmond. Most of it was single-family housing, actually 1,400 single family homes were started, 50 duplexes, and 334 condominium and apartment units.

As Richmond, Coquitlam, Surrey, the North Shore, Delta and so on, are the major areas of expansion in the greater Vancouver area, if I am to extrapolate from the budget the fact that we had about 5 per cent of the housing last year, also that we have a major portion of the available land for housing, I would expect probably that about 5 per cent of this budget for housing might be expanded in my riding. This could mean about \$5 million or \$6 million of housing development in my riding.

The Minister also mentioned that the government has purchased 746 acres in 1973. I would like to note at this time that we have in my riding about 2,000 or 3,000 acres of residentially-zoned land available, but this does require a massive land assembly programme, and I would hope that something like this might be started in the greater Vancouver area, in these so-called bedroom communities that I have mentioned, and particularly in Richmond where land is available.

Of this 2,000 or 3,000 acres, some of it is owned by bona fide farmers who are long-time residents in the community. They have lived there for many years and are still farming it. In fact a large portion of it is VLA land from the vets who came back after the war. They have a lot of 1.5-acre back lots to their property which could be assembled by a government land-assembly programme.

In fact, I think that's the only way it will be assembled because private developers have tried in the past and have not been able to reach agreements, or

[[Page 267](#)]

else they have found it is too difficult to assemble the land and haven't tried. So much of this vacant land is just back lots and scrub brush which could be assembled for housing in co-operation with the owners whose houses border on the roads surrounding the various quarter-sections that make up the community.

Some of the 3,000 acres that I've mentioned are also owned by land speculators who are holding on to key lots in order to drive up the price of land. Surprisingly enough, there are quite a few acres in this category, and that is one of the reasons, I think, that the government brought in Bill 71, which called for reassessing of such lands that are being held for speculative purposes. By reassessing it, it meant, of course, that the taxes would go up and that the speculators would be encouraged, through paying higher taxes, to dispose of their land — either to expose it to other developers or to develop it themselves for housing — and therefore to put more housing on the market.

We have a fair amount of key acreage in my riding that is being held by land-development companies. For the information of the House, I would like to read out some of the people that own lands that are in the residentially owned areas — the major acreages that are owned by land development companies. Quite often there are just one or

two of these acreages in each quarter-section, but that's enough to keep the area from being developed because nobody else can get in to buy the property without these key lots.

We have one area, for example, owned by Dayton Enterprises, comprising 47 acres, which is being farmed by a farmer but not by the owner of the property. This property would be paying agricultural taxes, I would assume, and therefore would not be subject to Bill 71.

We have some land that is being farmed by bona fide farmers in the residential zone: around 33 acres by the Laing family. I'm not sure if they're any relation to our honoured guests here today or not. But this one is one of the few... we have two or three farms in the area that are bona fide farmers; this one is one of them.

Then we have groups like Star Developments with 31 acres; Western Realty, 28 acres; Block Bros. contractors, 20 acres; a trucking firm, 18 acres; Laxford Development, 17 acres; a Mr. Fan in Vancouver, a lawyer, 17 acres; Laurel Properties, 15 acres; Pemberton Realty, 15 acres; another person with Block Bros. contacts with 16 acres; Amana Development, 11 acres; Broadmoor Holdings, 10 acres; Mono Holdings, 10 acres; a Mr. Chan in Vancouver, 9 acres; Blundel Holdings, 8 acres; Larco Developments, 7 acres; Conway Richmond Estates, 7 acres; a contractor 6 acres; and so on.

Now these are just examples of the type of land that is available that is not being developed. Some of these acreages that I've mentioned I've not been able to check out thoroughly to find out whether all of them are not being developed. Some may have development programmes underway. But, to date, they are not built upon.

So, Mr. Speaker, our government policy in dealing with land assessments is to lend encouragement to get this land on the market to free the areas that are being held up for housing development, and also to encourage some kind of land-assembly programme in these areas.

I hope also that the government will get involved in these areas and get into government land assembly as well.

One other thing that I think we should look at, however, in our assessments is that some of these particular properties that have been mentioned, although owned by development companies, are being farmed. I think that in our assessment Act we should take a look at bringing in some kind of amendment to ensure that properties that are being farmed in a residential area are farmed by bona fide farmers who actually own and occupy the property, or are farmers on adjacent property, rather than land speculators who are renting the land out to a farmer in order to receive agricultural tax benefits.

The tax benefits by farming land in a residential area are quite substantial. If they were paying the residential taxes that would accrue if they were taxed for residential land, it would probably be about 1,000 times more than what they pay when they are paying farm taxes. As long as they are able to find that out in our assessment laws, then they're able to still hold the land and keep it for future speculation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the Housing Minister's announcement that he has \$50 million in his budget for housing. Particularly, I liked the part where he mentioned that there would be about 2,500 rental housing units created in the coming year, hopefully.

Rental housing is very much needed in the greater Vancouver area and, I think, throughout the province as well. We are facing a rental-accommodation crisis. There are actually hundreds of people in the greater Vancouver area awaiting each unit that is advertised in the papers.

There are times when if you went down to the *Sun* or *The Province* offices, when the paper is just coming out on the stands in the morning, you'd find a couple of hundred people waiting for the first copies of the paper to come off the press. They grab the papers and rush off to the phone booths to phone for the houses that are listed for accommodation.

Quite often they find that the places have already been rented out or are under the control of groups such as

Rentex and other types of rental agencies which require you to pay \$20 before you get the

[[Page 268](#)]

listing. Then, of course, when you get the listing you find that the place you were looking for may have already been rented as well. So there is very much of a rental-accommodation housing crisis and because of this as well rents have skyrocketed anywhere from 20 to 30 to 50, even up to 80 per cent.

I think that because of this we're going to have to look very carefully at rent justifications. I would like to commend the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), in bringing down legislation to the Landlord and Tenant Act this session, that he might consider some kind of rent-justification programme with the maximum rent increases perhaps geared to the cost of living such as has been suggested, I believe, by North Vancouver Council, who suggested that the rent increases should be paid at about 10 per cent.

I would also like to suggest that some form of collective bargaining might also be anticipated.

Secondly — and I think in a major way — we must have a government housing corporation, as has been hinted at by the Minister of Housing, to construct housing in British Columbia in a major way. I think that if we can start a surplus of housing, we might be able to bring the rent and the housing costs down to reasonable levels. Hopefully, we can keep the costs from going up. Hopefully, we can bring them down 10, 15 or 20 per cent less than they are today.

While doing this, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to urge the Minister to be sure, in any developments the government does get in, that we develop a good housing mix, taking care to watch for social and environmental amenities in the construction of any subdivisions in which we might be involved — to be sure that there is adequate park development; day-care centres provided; community schools constructed with recreation centres, educational facilities, facilities for old-age pensioners and so on; and to assure that many different levels of income are represented in each housing development.

Too often in the past we have seen low-income housing where everyone on a fixed income or low income is put into one residential area and where middle-class and upper-middle-class people build their single-family homes in another residential area. This is not too good either socially or environmentally for the social and human environment. I think that we should try to develop a housing mix where people of all walks of life mix together and live together and work and play together.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as well, when we do set up a land-assembly programme, as well as making land available — such as the VLA land and the land that is being held by speculators — there is another added benefit I would like to touch on: when the government assembles the land and develops it there can be a considerable saving in cost to the community, to the people that the government represents.

As an example, I would like to give a property that has just been transferred, I believe, from Dunhill Developments to Imperial Ventures in my riding. There's a 50-acre farm in Richmond for sale for \$3,000 per acre, or a total of \$150,000.

When it was offered to the municipality we did an extensive study of the use of the land. We needed 15 acres for an addition to a park nearby and found that we could get the land for the park, provide all the services to subdivide the land for housing lots, such as putting in roads and sewers, underground wiring and so on, and that we could actually sell the lots for less than the present market value, build a fair amount of recreational facilities in the area and still make a profit.

This was presented to the local council five years ago and was voted down five to four because the council was concerned that they would be getting into the area of free enterprise.

I would like to suggest that this government is not quite so concerned about getting involved in areas that free enterprise is delving into, and that we should consider this type of land-assembly programme.

What happened to this land once it was sold to a private developer? First it went to another businessman who sold it to Dunhill; Dunhill got the land rezoned, and on the basis of rezoning the land went to Imperial Ventures Ltd. I don't know how much Imperial Ventures paid for the land, but I would assume it was probably in the neighbourhood of around \$25,000 per acre — that is what the same type of land is selling for in my riding today for strictly single-family housing. This land is also going to be used for apartments, as well, which is much more valuable.

We see land that five years ago was worth \$3,000 an acre now being worth around \$25,000 an acre and upwards, once it is rezoned. Without a single house being built, without a single road or sewer being put in, it is still the same chunk of farmland that was there five years ago.

If the government gets into a land-assembly programme I would suggest that they will be able to eliminate the middle-man — middle-men, in this case — and that they can directly benefit from the profits of rezoning such lands by putting in the parks, putting in the day-care centres, recreational centres, schools, and so on, as I have suggested.

A little aside from this is that the municipality finally still had to buy the 15 acres for their park. Interestingly enough, the price asked for the 15 acres was \$10,000 per acre, which was a reduced value, for a total of \$150,000, which was the total price it would have paid for the 50 acres instead of 15 if they

[[Page 269](#)]

had bought it in the first place.

This is the type of thing that the province can get into. I think that Dunhill has some experience in doing this, as they were the ones that assembled this particular piece of property. I do hope they will keep out of the agricultural zones, however. ICBC did not do this in my riding and got stung. Dunhill has tried to get land rezoned in agricultural areas before. I would hope the Minister will instruct them very strongly that they should assemble land in the residential zone on behalf of the government and develop it accordingly.

Finally I would suggest that lands that are developed should be developed and provided on a lease basis only. I would like to suggest that this be on a very short-term lease basis — perhaps 25 years with a review each 25 years. If the lease was picked up by the government 25 years later, the owner would receive equity for the buildings he had put on the property, or he would be able to renegotiate the lease.

If we were to put the leases on a short-term basis I think that we could put lots on the market for around \$5,000 per lot in the greater Vancouver area instead of \$18,000 to \$20,000 per lot which we are seeing right now with the housing crisis.

The land for single-family housing costs between \$15,000 and \$20,000 per acre; servicing a lot costs around \$5,000 per acre. If you get five lots to the acre then you would have a cost of around \$8,000 or \$9,000 per lot. So if the lot was leased out at \$5,000 and subsidized for \$4,000, it would save a prospective home builder about \$10,000 or \$15,000 per lot. If it was not subsidized but provided at cost it would still save him around \$10,000 per lot. I think a lot of people would be quite happy to lease land on this basis if it were done at a very low-cost leasing arrangement.

This would have the effect of actually lowering the values of surrounding lands if it were done on a large scale. I think that this is a very desirable effect. It would help to resolve the housing crisis because people would be able to buy land from private concerns for less — the cost of the land would not go up. Even the government, I think, would be able to buy land for less once they had started on a leasing programme such as this, and thereby save in their over-all development programme. Any money that was spent on subsidizing the programme would be returned to cheaper prices for the land and speculative value of the land. Basically this is speculative land that I'm talking about where land has been bought for \$2,000 or \$3,000 an acre and is now being held up for around \$15,000, \$20,000, \$25,000 or \$30,000 per acre.

One other comment on housing: I like the suggestion the Minister has made on duplexing and developing basement suites or, you might say, legalizing illegal suites. This could have a very good short-term effect in the greater Vancouver area. I expect we would find a lot of opposition from a lot of the high-class districts in the greater Vancouver area, but I hope not.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Poor people, too.

MR. STEVES: The Hon. Member says that the poor people would object too. But I would hope that they would accept some responsibility for accepting higher-population density in their areas.

I would urge the Housing department, if they embark upon this plan, to take care that any illegal suites or duplexing that are legalized meet the necessary building regulations and that properties would be adequately kept up, and also to ensure that absentee landlords are not able to take over the properties and to allow them to run down.

I think it is basically a good idea to get more people into the accommodation that is already available. I'd really like to ask the Hon. Member who said that even poor people are concerned about the density of housing — about doubling up in housing — if the question really is a question of housing or whether it is a question of the nuclear family.

If you really make an analysis of the housing we have today, you will find that actually there is more housing per capita available today than there ever has been in the past. What has happened is that instead of having the old folks at home, the old folks are now in the old folks' home. Instead of having two or three generations in a family, families are broken up. We have people with small families in very large homes taking up a lot of the available housing space.

I think that perhaps we have to look very seriously at the question of whether it is a question of housing or whether it is a question of lifestyle. I think that this must be re-examined in the future. It is a subject of ongoing and further debate.

While on accommodation, Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to discuss the Law Reform Commission's report on the Landlord and Tenant Act. I believe that some degree of tenants' rights are possible but relative only to the availability of housing. I'm not surprised at the Law Reform Commission's report. I can't say that I'm disappointed in it, because I really didn't expect that much, but I'm very much concerned about the basic philosophy under which the report is written.

On page 294, I believe, of the Law Reform Commission report they state their basic philosophy that they are discouraging self-help if other means can be found. The means that they suggest is in legalese such as the "rentals-man," instead of having rent review boards, and they discourage the idea of collective bargaining — both of which are party policy

[[Page 270](#)]

and policies that we ran on in the last election.

Basically I believe that this philosophy is disturbing; it's disturbing to me, it's contrary to my philosophy and I believe to that of our party.

There are many, many good points in the Law Reform Commission's report. The clauses on just cause for eviction I think are excellent; they've asked for written reasons for eviction — I think that is an excellent additional clause.

They have said that additional charges for housing — such as costs for parking, costs for hydro, et cetera — should be added in as rent costs. In my riding we have had a considerable number of landlords who have been trying to increase the rent by doubling up on the hydro bills — raising the hydro bills from \$4 or \$5 a month to \$10 or \$15 a month — charging more for parking, and so on. Under the Law Reform Commission report they suggest that these

should be regarded as rent increases. I think that is good.

I'm still concerned with the philosophy of the report. I think that perhaps we should look very carefully at whether we should go the Manitoba route of having a rentals-man or not. I personally feel that the self-help route is the best one — that we should have the rent review boards and that we should have landlords and tenants both represented on the boards. Where such boards are difficult to set up or not justified, then I think perhaps we should have a compromise between the two points of view and have a rentals-man of some sort representing the province in these areas.

It might be that in the urban areas we would have rent-review boards. In the rural areas where there is very little rental accommodation and a rent-review board would not be necessary, then we might have some kind of rentals department that would adjudicate any rental disputes. But I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, self-help be included in our dealings under the *Landlord and Tenant Act*.

While on the topic of self-help, I have noted in the last while, through our developments in the north country and the purchase of Can-Cel, that we have not yet gone into the area of workers' control and including workers in the management of the resource company. I would hope this would be considered in the future.

I would also hope that the community will be involved more in major decisions on growth in the north country and in the south as well. I will be talking about that in a moment, as it deals with my own riding and Tilbury Island.

I would hope that self-help might be encouraged in the schools as well, through student and staff committees planning the school programme, through staff committees adjudicating over the teaching capabilities of their peers, and things like that. I think rather than rules and regulations we should encourage self-help wherever possible.

I was a bit disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the education budget. I think the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) is trying very, very hard. I would like to congratulate the Minister for the programmes that I think she's about to bring in in the fall session. I have been working with her on some of these programmes and I am really pleased with the progress that is being made. I am a bit concerned about the Treasury Board's decision on the budget. However, I was pleased with the announcement of the Premier that the problems in each individual school district would be looked at separately. Hopefully, we'll be able to instil enough money into the budget between now and the fall — or maybe between now and next spring because I am not that optimistic that we can rewrite the schools Act in six months. But I am anticipating that we might be able to get by for a year until we are able to bring in a programme on education that will bring education out of the doldrums it's been in for the last 20 years.

Unfortunately many teachers — and we saw an example of this on Friday — are very, very frustrated that after 20 years of Social Credit ineptness in education the NDP has not been able to clear up the educational problems overnight in one-and-a-half years. I am a bit disappointed that we have not been able to do so as well, but I think this is very understandable.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Gone backwards.

MR. STEVES: The Hon. Member suggests that we have gone backwards. Actually what happens is that when a programme is brought in by one government, it is quite often a long time before the long-range effects of such a programme are felt. And we are feeling right now the long-range effect of 20 years of Social Credit. Hopefully, we'll be able to resolve this in the next 1½ years.

Mr. Speaker, many teachers are struggling in this province, and have been for a long time, to improve the methods of teaching, to develop innovative programmes, to bring in progressive programmes of teaching. And a number of the teachers in Surrey, I think, are examples of this trend. In fact, you might say that Surrey is one of the pacesetters in the province. So I can understand their frustration and why they were here on Friday. I hope they will look forward to the fall session and to next spring as much as I do for some major changes in the *Public Schools Act*.

I would like to throw out a few ideas that I have on how the school system may be rejuvenated and how our

moneys in next year's budget might be spent. I would hope that we could see further development of community schools in the province. I hope we can see schools with more opportunities for the teachers and the students to operate the

[[Page 271](#)]

educational programmes and have a little more control over their own education, i.e. what they teach and what they learn, in the case of students.

I hope, as I mentioned, to see teacher evaluation by peers, and a lot more local community input into the schools' programme. I would like to see this tied in very, very closely with communications. And perhaps sometime in the future — I don't expect it next year, or maybe even for a few years — but sometime in the future — tied in with the community cable communications network whereby ongoing education can be had throughout the community, not just at the school but through the media through the aide of cablevision — so it can be piped right into the homes for children of all ages whether they're 8 or 80.

I would hope to see in the schools more dependency on teacher aides. I would like to see parents working side by side with their own children in the classrooms. I tossed this out not only to the Minister but also to the teachers throughout British Columbia, because many of them have misgivings about bringing parents or outside people into the classrooms. I would like to say that I've tried it. I haven't had much success in convincing too many parents they should try it, because quite often they feel very nervous about going into a classroom with their own children — afraid they're going to show some of their own ignorance. But those who have tried it found it very rewarding and actually have learned along with the children. And the children have actually learned from the experience of the adults. So, I think it's a good system. I think this is one way of drastically reducing the class sizes in our schools. We presently have the highest class size of elementary schools in Canada. I think rather than going the route of having many, many more professional teachers, we should actually have teacher aides on a large scale. Although I think there is a need to reduce the class size per professional teacher as well.

I would look, Mr. Speaker, in the future for education to see a time when we will have fewer bureaucrats running the educational system, when it is more of a co-operative undertaking between the local schools and the provincial Department of Education. Where, instead of having school principals we might have administrators operating a community school, and that staff committees of teachers and students might be chaired by a staff chairperson on a rotating basis so everyone gets a chance to carry on the activities of operating the educational programme.

I would like to see us carrying on a dialogue in the coming year on some of these ideas. I would like the Minister to consider them, and I would like the general public, the teachers and the students to consider them.

Basically what I am suggesting is as much decentralization of the educational system as possible, and in the future not quite so much centralization through budget control as we have seen in the past 20 years.

I would like at this time to also congratulate the Minister of Finance (Hon Mr. Barrett). I am particularly pleased with his deft financial manoeuvres in purchasing Westcoast Transmission shares owned by El Paso, by using their own money from revenues we have received by upping the price of natural gas to the United States.

However, I am a little disappointed that the budget for the mineral and petroleum development in the province, in the mines budget, is only around \$581,000. I would like to see instead that it be around \$20 million. That instead of half-a-million dollars....

MR. FRASER: You won't have to wait long.

MR. STEVES: Well, I hope you're right. The Hon. Member says we won't have to wait long; I hope he's correct ... Instead it would be around \$20 million and that B.C. would get directly into the exploration for natural gas and oil.

In the deals to increase the profits that we sell our gas for in the United States, we've also increased the profits to the natural gas companies at the wellhead. I would like to suggest as well that instead of increasing the amount of profits they make, these companies at the wellhead should be public utilities, and that the government itself should get involved in oil and gas exploration.

We are faced with an energy crisis in this country; we produce about half of the oil and gasoline requirements that we need. We do have an excess of natural gas in British Columbia — in fact about three times as much as we need. But I think the benefits from natural gas should be ploughed into exploration on behalf of the province — or at least some of them — to find more oil reserves so that we can be self sufficient in oil development and oil production in this province.

I would like to see this province become energy sufficient. To do this, as well as further exploration for oil, I think we need to develop public transit on a mass basis, particularly in the metropolitan areas, to cut down on oil and gasoline consumption. I would also like to see us get involved in natural gas conversion to liquid natural gas for fleets of vehicles such as vehicles for B.C. Hydro, and so on — government vehicles, whatever they might be. We could have municipal fleets, school board fleets, all kinds of fleets converted to natural gas, and therefore take the pressures off of using gasoline as a fuel.

Presently there are a number of private companies considering converting their fleets to liquid natural

[[Page 272](#)]

gas — specifically, I believe, Hudson's Bay Company. And other department stores such as Eaton's and Simpson Sears are considering it. And I wondered why not the government, why not B.C. Hydro?

To build a gas liquification plant to carry this out would cost around \$250,000; I think it is not only an environmentally sound idea, because using liquid natural gas produces few pollutants but also natural gas is much more abundant. And once those natural gas reserves in the ground run out, which it is predicted they will do in about 25 to 30 years, we can still produce natural gas by solar means, such as growing algae on sewage, or conversion methods on salt water, and so on.

Natural-gas use also prolongs engine life by up to 100 per cent. I think we could find considerable savings in our future budgets if our vehicles were powered by natural gas. In fact, it is my understanding that it is not because of pollution that the companies in Vancouver are considering converting to natural gas; it is actually the saving on engine wear and replacement of vehicles that they're concerned about. Therefore, they're considering conversion to natural gas because it will save them money in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, B.C. Hydro has been authorized to spend \$500 million to increase its borrowing power for construction projects and transmission lines. I hope that some of this will go to develop energy alternatives such as geothermal power sites, which are abundant in B.C., and into investigating energy alternatives such as the natural gas and sewage that I've mentioned, wind power, wave power, and so on.

Also, I'd like to see us get involved in further studies such as the nuclear power symposium we had last fall and develop a major public programme to investigate energy alternatives, bringing in the experts — the inventors with their inventions — from around the world to advise us on how we may best find the alternatives to nuclear power and to more dams.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have to get away from more damn dams and, even worse, their nuclear power alternative. I would like to see us embark on further experimental programmes. We've already got one going in using Hat Creek coal for sewage treatment; I would like to see us go into a further experimental programme using Hat Creek coal for power generation after we've cleaned up the sewage. We might even be able to recover some of the minerals and wastes that are collected in the sewage by using Hat Creek coal, then recover it and burn the coal for fuel. So we solve the sewage treatment problem.

The Minister of Housing, when he was speaking, made a comment that I would like to quote at this particular

time. He said that rapid economic development can have serious social and environmental costs, and that a shortage of housing is one of these costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the social costs of rapid economic development are well looked after in this budget. I think the housing costs which are part of the social costs are very well looked after. I am very, very pleased with this budget in regard to human resources into social costs and housing costs.

However, the area that I mentioned at the beginning that I was a bit disappointed in is the area of environmental concern. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that this might be the budget in which we would go into recycling in a big way, and that we might be setting up a Crown recycling corporation that would be looking after the recycling of our renewable and non-renewable resources. I took forward to the day, and I hope it is in the near future, when this will be included in the budget.

I also had hoped that there would be a considerable budget allotment for some sort of separate environmental department – whether it's an independent environmental department or whether it's included with Agriculture, Conservation or even the Health department.

I also had hoped to see some reorganization of the Pollution Control Board by now into a role of combatting rather than regulating pollution. It took the sewage treatment committee, which the Hon. Member for Delta (Mr. Liden) and I were on, a year to get an answer from the Pollution Control Board — which recently was handed down last week — adhering to the instructions we had given them a year ago that we should have secondary sewage treatment from Annacis Island. What has happened, however, is that the extension of the deadline for sewage treatment has had to go on for another year, until 1977, due to the fact that the Greater Vancouver Regional District has been dragging its heels.

Also it means that for two years from the time the primary construction plant is built until the time we have secondary there will be basically just primary treatment in the Fraser River. Now, our committee will be watching very closely during the next year when the plant is gradually phased in and during those two years before we have secondary treatment to see if there is any chance of any deleterious effect on the salmon runs. The salmon go up to spawn every four years and two years, if there were deleterious effects, it could wipe out two salmon runs. I'm very disturbed with that aspect of the Pollution Control Board's judgment and will be watching that very, very carefully along with my fellow MLA from Delta.

Mr. Speaker, the second stage of sewage treatment I would like to see as well. I think the MLA for Delta will concur with me from our studies when we met with the experts last fall and last winter that we should be looking as well in the future to secondary treatment next at the Lulu Island plant, which is also the south arm of the Fraser, and at the Iona Island plant thirdly, which is the north arm of the Fraser,

[[Page 273](#)]

both of which are in my riding.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): Tertiary treatment.

MR. STEVES: The Hon. Member for Delta suggests we should look at tertiary treatment, and I think he is absolutely correct. This is why I think we should be going further with the development of the Hat Creek coal reserves and experimentation in those areas.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the growth that is indicated in this budget does not show a corresponding balancing in the budget for environmental concerns. We're witnessing a fantastic provincial growth, and in my own opinion not enough is being done to counterbalance this in environmental department, whether it is a composite department or not, as I suggested earlier, it is needed to keep a check on this growth of industrial development in the north and in the south. I think that such a department must be separate from the Ministry of Lands, Forests and Water Resources and from the Department of Industrial Development.

In my opinion, the environmental secretariat has already lost some of its credibility due to its close ties with the Lands, Forests and Water Resources Department. I think that is unfortunate.

The NDP policy has long been a policy for a full department of the environment, a full department of fisheries and a migratory salmon authority, with particular emphasis on the Fraser River.

Now, it may be that we can't have all three. But I think that our party policy is clear on the emphasis. These three can be combined, and in fact can possibly be combined with other departments. It is something I would like to see us take a very serious look at...(mike not on).

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, Hon. Member. Would you try the microphone beside you? We're having trouble with the wiring at the moment, and we do want to record the debate.

Interjection.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I'm afraid that the rest of your speech is going to have to be somehow taken as read so far as the printing of it is concerned. Unfortunately our *Hansard* system is based upon the recording system and if something goes wrong with the apparatus...I don't know what emergency equipment the staff have but we will see what they can do.

Each Member is supposed to speak in his place, but I think the Members of the House would agree that if there is a live microphone anyone would be prepared to allow the Hon. Member to speak from another microphone. Perhaps there is one on the other side. Would somebody find a live microphone? Yes, there is one over there.

Would the Members agree that the Member be allowed to speak from the other place?

Leave granted.

MR. STEVES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't expect that I would have to cross the floor to join the government benches. It must be a Social Credit plot.

I must say the view looks much different from this side of the House — it's sort of got me a little bit off guard here.

I was commenting on growth in the north and I'd like to say that I really can't be critical of those in the north country. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the story of development in the north is one of escalation.

The provincial government recently bought out Canadian Cellulose, and I think that was a good move on the part of the government, In fact, I applaud it wholeheartedly. However, to make it pay we have had to do other things as well. We have worked on getting better rail connections, better development of B.C. Rail throughout the north. It also requires more chips for more sawmills and so on.

All of this, again, is laudatory, but somewhere along the line we have to analyse just what is happening when we start one chain of events, because more rail lines bring more pressures to open up the north and more pressures for mines, such as the development of some of the major copper reserves in the north country. More mines bring on pressures for mine smelters such as in areas that we might find in Kitimat. Smelters require more power; power requires more dams.

So we find exponential growth escalation in the north country. I'm not saying that this is wrong; I'm not saying that this is right. Personally I am very pleased that the government has been involved in developing the north. However, I think we should recognize that there may be a price to pay for this development in environmental and social dislocations, and there has to be an ongoing and serious dialogue with the people of the north in determining what scale the development of the north will be.

The same, Mr. Speaker, also applies to people in the south, and in this regard I would like to comment on what is happening in my own riding. Basically the matter in question is in north Delta, while my riding is Richmond, but the effects of development in Delta will bring about major and long-lasting problems in my riding. In particular, I am referring to the development of Tilbury Island as an industrial site.

The Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Lauk) has recently been involved in purchasing 726 acres of land on Tilbury Island. This land is prime farmland, although in this particular regard I am not so much concerned with

[[Page 274](#)]

the fact that it is farmland that is being purchased. What I am concerned with is the escalation — the actual exponential growth — that could take place in the surrounding communities such as I have outlined could take place in the north. It is this escalation that I think we have to start a dialogue on.

Obviously taking 726 acres of farmland out of farm production is not too well in keeping with Bill 42, and I think it becomes very difficult to defend when I was one of the ones who was very outspoken in bringing in Bill 42 last year. But where it really comes in conflict with Bill 42 is not just this 726 acres on Tilbury Island, but how it affects the farmland in my riding as well.

What it means, Mr. Speaker, is that if we develop this area, which is good farmland, across the river in Richmond, then in my riding, where we have probably about 1,000 acres of very poor peat-bog land that was mined out years ago and is sitting vacant, some of it the city garbage dump, it is quite logical that this land will be developed as well. In fact, in my opinion, any harbour development should go on very poor quality land.

It is also logical that the Tilbury Island development could expand into the Burns Bog area; where that area has been mined out and certainly where Vancouver has their present garbage dump it is quite possible that sometime in the future that will be developed industrially as well.

So what we have is escalation of industrial development in the estuary of the Fraser. Now, some people in the opposition might think that it's fine to hear a backbench MLA criticize the government on this, but I would remind them that really all the government is doing is following a long-standing Social Credit plan.

This was a plan, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to which I ran my election campaign in Richmond a year-and-a-half ago. I exposed this plan to the electorate, we debated it thoroughly, and I was elected with 49 per cent of the vote. I think this speaks for the reasons that I am levelling on this today, and the feeling as to how my constituents take this particular proposal.

In Richmond today we have about 4,000 acres of agricultural land which is in secondary reserve with the possibility of it going into industry, as outlined by the GVRD. It is the same kind of land that is being used on Tilbury Island for industrial development. If we are to take 700 acres or so from agricultural secondary reserve in Delta, then why not the 4,000 acres in Richmond? Here we have our first escalation.

Secondly, the hundreds and hundreds of acres in the bog areas that were mined out in Richmond logically should be developed. It is no good for farmland and it is available. So we end up with shipping on both sides of the river, which is exactly what the Fraser River Harbour Commission has been saying all along, and which is exactly what the Social Credit government said in 1967 when they designed the plan in the first place.

Further escalation comes about when we find that in order to get from one side of the river at Tilbury Island to the bog area on my side of the river it would require a bridge or a tunnel, and then, of course, a freeway across Richmond's agricultural land to connect to a new bridge, probably connecting with Boundary Road in Burnaby.

Again, this was in the Social Credit plan from 1967. I discussed this some time ago with the chief planning engineer and found that it was so, that these plans have been on the books all the time. In fact, in 1967, at the time when the Social Credit government developed Roberts Bank, Mr. Loffmark and Mr. Williston said that they expected that the Fraser Valley would be one great industrial area all the way from Point Roberts to Hope. I am very much concerned that we must take precautions to be sure that the development of Tilbury Island is not the first stage in that development.

Mr. Speaker, to have you understand my problem I would like to outline what I am really faced with in my

particular riding. We have, in Richmond, an island riding completely surrounded with water, and completely surrounded with sewage, as I have mentioned. There are three sewer plants going in; all three are primary except for Annacis, which will be secondary by 1977, as we have decreed.

We have on the north arm of the river the North Fraser Harbour Commission using it for small, industrial development and for log booming. The river has been destroyed by pollution from rotting log debris, rotting bark. As the tide goes up and down the log booms are rubbed together, the bark falls and the water is polluted from the poisons.

We even have the regional district offering us another garbage dump for the Vancouver city on the Sturgeon Bank or Iona Island, whichever we would like to give them.

We have the possibility of a ferry terminal development in Richmond as well, which is another added growth to the community. If it is at Iona Island it won't be that bad, but it would be pretty bad if it went to the Steveston area and required another highway.

So I think you can understand my concern when I very, very seriously question the development of the south channel of the Fraser for a deep-sea port. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are basically following the report of the Fraser River Harbour Commission, as developed by Norm Pearson, who is now with the Lands, Forests and Water Resources department. This report called for trifurcation of the Fraser, which means the Fraser should be narrowed down, that they should dike it in and narrow its

[[Page 275](#)]

channel so that the water would become deeper and self-flushing. This would make it a hazard for the young fingerlings being shot out directly into the ocean, and, of course, would be a detriment to the fishing industry. Furthermore, the river would be lined with shipping berths, each berth requiring about 40 acres of back-up land for industrial development and warehousing.

Basically, the Fraser River Harbour Commission report and the Social Credit government programme of the '60s is one of massive industrial development of the Fraser, and a declaration that the Fraser should be an industrial river.

I think that we can have growth, but I think that it can be a steady-state type of growth whereby for every growth pressure we put on an area we must bring in some kind of balance both for positive social and environmental action.

I would like to suggest with regard to Tilbury Island that everyone in B.C. does not necessarily need their own harbour. We don't need B.C. harbours, we don't need federal harbours, we don't need a Fraser River Harbours Commission harbour, we don't need a North Fraser harbour, a Nanaimo harbour, a Squamish harbour, and so on. I think we do need some kind of a coastal zoning authority, such as they have in the State of Delaware, where these harbours can be combined and we don't spread them all over the province. I think we do need an environmental department of some sort to assure that these developments don't become a fait accompli and that you don't see on TV one night that all of a sudden you are getting a harbour development next door.

I would like to suggest that the Tilbury Island proposal be scaled down drastically. Secondly, we should take measures to prevent expansion onto marginal lands so that we don't see the harbour development expanding back onto the Burns Bog and to the Vancouver dump. Thirdly, I think we should, if possible, move the proposal from prime farmland to marginal land such as the bog areas in my own riding — which have been burned out and mined out — as an alternative.

I would like also to ask the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) to take a very close look at this proposal. I find the Minister of Highways a very enlightened Minister.

I'm very concerned. He made a statement the other day — it's had favourable editorial comment in *The*

Province this morning — that he's concerned about development along highways. I would like to suggest that if we were to get more bridges and more highways through my community, it would be just one more highway cutting up the agricultural land, going right across the middle of Richmond, which would increase the pressures to rezone that land for industrial development and for housing development.

After all, if we do bring in this massive industrial development along the banks of the Fraser, where are the people going to live that need housing as well? If you cut up the farmland with more highways, you can't blame them for wanting to get their lands rezoned.

I would like to suggest to the Minister, if the Tilbury Island proposal does go ahead, that he consider some way of getting a public transit system to Delta and, of course, to tie in with Richmond, rather than more bridges and more highways which will cut up the farmland.

MR. FRASER: They're going to hang them in the sky with a sky hook.

MR. STEVES: I would like also, while I'm on highways, to comment on the Minister's enlightened programme to restrict development along the highways. I think it's an exemplary programme that should assure that we no longer export urban sprawl wherever the highways are built. The press is not often in agreement with us. In fact, we've had a lot of headlines lately that are biased and misleading, but I think the editorial in *The Province* this morning called "Stemming the Urban Lava Flow" is a good one and *The Province* should be commended for siding in with our position that we should have some type of highway zoning to prevent development and urban sprawl along the highways.

I hope that if we do bring in such legislation, or if the Minister does bring in such legislation — which I hope he will — *The Province* will be just as strong as they were in that editorial in defending the legislation when it is attacked by Social Credit and some of the developers throughout the province, who like to see free and unbridled development wherever they get the opportunity to build it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my discussion of the budget with some comments as to how the budget affects my own riding.

Things in my riding aren't all as bad as it perhaps might sound because of my concerns with the Tilbury Island development. For example, the federal government is embarking upon a programme right now that I'm very pleased with. I hope to hear an announcement imminently on the development of a fisherman's wharf and boat harbour in my community. This is something that I've been involved in personally for about five years. I'm head of the committee which five years ago met with the federal fisheries department requesting a government wharf — or actually a government fish boat harbour — in the Steveston Harbour.

I'm not entirely happy with the solution they're offering to us, as they will probably be cutting one of our islands — Steveston Island — in half in order to build a harbour. Each benefit you get...even good things have their price. What is happening is that they

[[Page 276](#)]

want to use half of this particular island — which is a rather beautiful island in the middle of the river — for a sand-hauling operation, and that seems to be the price they're asking us to pay in order to get our fish boat harbour.

However, I hope that we might be able to find some kind of a compromise on this and that the fishermen will be able to get their harbour, which is long overdue.

In my area the only government docking facility is very small and is always overloaded. The fishermen are forced to tie up with the private canneries, and as they tie up with the canneries, then they have to sell their fish to them. They are forced to sell their fish to these companies for lack of space to tie up in an independent fish boat harbour.

So I am happy that I co-authored the original submission on this — actually my wife wrote most of it — and I'm happy that I co-authored it and met with the federal authorities and this will be coming to fruition in the near future.

I'm also happy with the treatments that the Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Radford) is giving to my riding and to the riding, I believe, of the Hon. Members for Vancouver South for development of recreational facilities along the north arm of the Fraser.

In particular, we have about five sandbars along the north arm of the Fraser in my riding which are excellent fishing bars for Dolly Varden trout — the only variety of edible fish that can survive the pollution. The Minister of Recreation and Conservation has been looking at these very carefully and I'm hopeful that he will be able to adopt some kind of programme in the future to protect these fishing bars. I understand from the Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) that she has been requesting that they also include road ends on the Vancouver side.

I hope too that the Lands, Forests and Water Resources and the Recreation and Conservation departments will gradually eliminate log booming in the north arm of the Fraser by restricting future log leases and bringing in legislation, as recommended by the committee on forestry and fisheries, to require dry-land log storage throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, directly to the budget and the assistance it gives to my riding: the assistance to the Richmond people — the \$2 per capita municipal increase — will bring in about \$100,000-plus to my citizens. The one-third welfare reduction will bring in about \$200,000-plus. The cost last year was \$800,000, so it will be at least \$200,000 that we'll gain from that. The \$30 renters' and \$40 homeowners' grants will bring in about \$800,000 to \$1 million to my constituents.

The dike tax removal, which I'm very, very pleased with, will reduce our tax load by between \$1.6 million and \$2 million over the next four years — or roughly \$500,000 to \$600,000 a year. So the total saving in my riding, through the budget, this year will be between \$1.5 and \$2 million to my constituents.

Add to this the community and recreation funds. Last year we received one-third-of-a-million dollars, and I hope this year we might receive similar funds, towards building an indoor pool, which we've been trying to get for years; it would be our first indoor pool. It's going to cost \$800,000 or \$900,000 and hopefully we'll be able to get money from the community recreation fund — again something we've been waiting for for a long time.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, what this budget means to the homeowner as far as human development is concerned, humanist type of budget that it is, is about \$ 100 per home in my riding in reduced taxes. More likely, however, this will not come back to them in the form of reduced taxes from the municipality but will probably allow for a reallocation of funds so the municipality can buy much-needed parkland, build much-needed recreation facilities, can build the indoor pool I've mentioned, carry on their sewer programme and, hopefully, secondary sewage treatment as well.

If you add in the indirect increases, the indirect assistance such as in housing — and I mentioned before Richmond is a key area for housing — such as in health, human resources, the Mincome programme, the reduction of sales tax on books, which I think is an excellent thing that is long overdue — because basically educational books have been taxed — and on second-hand clothing, this will bring other added benefits to my riding of \$4 million or \$5 million.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a good budget as it concerns the people of the province. I think it's very much of a humanist budget. I'm a bit worried that we might be setting some irreversible trends toward exponential growth, but I think that we can look at this in the future. I would like to support this budget.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I wasn't quite sure I was going to make it today. But I would suggest to the government that I, along with some of them, listened with great interest to the former speaker, the Member for Richmond (Mr. Steves). All I would say is that if you're going to sort out his policies, don't bother; you aren't going to have the time.

I would also mention to that Member that, while I do listen with interest, I suggest that he should do considerably more research in what he is recommending. His policy on agriculture, as he mentioned earlier, is very detrimental to many farmers who wish, in fact, to farm on leased land, and some of the farmers in his area that he included want to continue in that practice.

[[Page 277](#)]

Also in his proposal for recycling, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that his actions in the North Okanagan and the government grant from this government is instrumental in putting out of business — or nearly putting out of business, it's in its death throes now — a small independent family corporation. So I would suggest that he do a little more research before he advocates these programmes.

I would, on behalf of the official opposition, like to welcome the new Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) and to congratulate him on his landslide victory and to wish him success and happiness in his political career — although it may not be very long.

MR. CHABOT: Enjoy it while you're here.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to take my place in this budget debate representing the people of the North Okanagan. I would like to start by assuring the rest of the people in British Columbia, in the province, that the people of the North Okanagan do not wish to secede from this beautiful province. They do not wish to leave their homes and their lands and their lives and their families. But they do wish to secede from this government.

They wish to secede because of this government's pogo-stick Premier and its pogo-stick policies. They jump from here to there to everywhere, and every time their pogo stick lands it's in the pockets of the taxpayers of this province.

They wish, Mr. Speaker, to secede from the ridicules of the Premier and the constant battering that they and the rest of the people in British Columbia are receiving from super-centralized controls, poorly drafted and confusing legislation, financial mismanagement and unprecedented waste. They wish to secede from the increasing arrogance and the deaf ears of the Premier and his political tinkering with legislation and with the stock market.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, they have asked me to suggest to you that the people in British Columbia are frightened of their government and concerned for the first time in many, many years about the security of their jobs and the security of their small investments. They are deeply concerned about their loss of freedoms through the headlong rush of this government to invade and increasingly control every aspect of their personal lives.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to leave this province and they don't want to leave their homes and their families. They ask why should they because of these Johnny-come-lately policies this government is introducing.

We in the opposition and the people I have the honour to represent, in examining this government's budget, feel it should be exercising fiscal responsibility. This is not in the budget. The government itself should be setting a leading example in this province for controlling inflation and assisting people in how to handle inflation, which it is not. In fact, this government is not only ignoring inflation, it is fanning the flames of inflation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MRS. JORDAN: It is a Nero-fiddling-while-Rome-burns attitude.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad to say, but for the first time the civil service of British Columbia, who should in themselves be able to accomplish the objectives of their work and their training without political interference, are now for the first time feeling pressures of political interference in their everyday jobs. That, Mr. Speaker, is a first for British Columbia and it is not a proud first. The rumour market in the civil service is strong and it says: "Toe the

NDP line or be eased out or shuffled sideways."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you yourself are aware of the growing concern and unrest growing in this province. I would only cite for your edification the front page of *The Province* last Friday. This is what it said:

"City's housing hike tops all." That's in Vancouver. "Teachers to march on capital." "Strachan backs off charge against insurance companies." "Victoria steps in on schools." The only bright spot in that paper, Mr. Speaker, was a suggestion that one of the Ministers of this cabinet was getting stuffed.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't isolated....

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

MRS. JORDAN: I hope he enjoyed his visit. It really isn't a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker, and it isn't an isolated day when we see headlines in British Columbia like this, proving beyond a shadow of a doubt the concern and unrest this government has generated.

The day before, February 14, Valentine's Day, we saw a headline: "\$100 million in projects stalled by government." Mr. Speaker, those projects....

HON. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services): Stop reading the big and start reading the small.

MRS. JORDAN: It's a shutdown, Madam Minister, of projects reaching every hamlet in this province, from Cranbrook to Fort St. John, from Vernon, my own constituency, to Chilliwack. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to that Minister, she should have been around to hear the workers' hearts quiver on that

[[Page 278](#)]

Valentine's Day.

Mr. Speaker, the next day, on Saturday, what do the headlines of this paper say? *The Vancouver Sun*, a different one; and a sad day for British Columbia. "Private forest firms 'second to government.'" Mr. Speaker, this is a policy that has been practised by this government for a year but it's the first time that any Member of this government has brought it out publicly. I would like to read exactly what this government has in mind for private companies in British Columbia:

"If private enterprise wants to continue in the forest industry in B.C. it must be prepared to take second place to the government...."

"Skelly, chairman of the Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries, said 'the provincial government is determined...'"

— what he didn't say and what we know is that it is determined at all costs —

"...to see public enterprise succeed in the forest products field in B.C."

"This means, he said, the government will use the most sophisticated technology available and will hire the best available staff whether they come from Canada or abroad."

Or are NDP supporters.

"I also believe that the government is under no obligation to provide our resources on an equality of access basis to public and private industry.

"Publicly-owned firms should have access on a priority basis. If rail cars are to be required by Can-Cel, the province..."

— and the taxpayers —

"...should provide them. If chips or timber are required by Kootenay Forest Products, then the government should allocate them.

"If new technology or marketing information becomes available through the efforts of government-sponsored research, that technology and that information should be made available exclusively to publicly-owned industries."

And so on, Mr. Speaker.

That open statement and the practice of this government for a year, Mr. Speaker, means that private industry, while expected to pay taxes in this province to create employment and to be competitive in this province, is not going to have the opportunity. The NDP government will subsidize with the taxpayers' dollars and place in a preferred position their own corporations, not on a businesslike basis, Mr. Speaker, but on an ideological basis. The Minister of Finance has to prove he is right no matter what the cost to the long-term economy of British Columbia and no matter what the cost to individual companies and jobs.

What that headline implies, Mr. Speaker, is that this NDP policy will squeeze to death independent forest operations, whether it's large or where, in fact, it does go from truck loggers to small shake mills, fallers and plywood plants. That will include those in the north Okanagan.

Then, I predict, when this has happened, the government will blame them for poor management and failing to meet their commitments. They will blame them for mismanagement. The ultimate result of this all over the province, this "squeeze them" policy, will be bigger and bigger subsidized government. It will mean the loss of thousands of jobs, the loss of hundreds of independent small businesses and small business operations. These thousands of workers and these large numbers of business people will have no choice but to move away, go on welfare or become civil servants.

Who is he going to jump on next, Mr. Speaker? That's the concern of the people in this province.

I'd like to speak for a moment or two on the matter of consumer affairs as it relates to this budget. If the responsibilities of the Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young) include, in fact, helping to educate the consumer and to protect the consumer of British Columbia from the pitfalls of the marketplace, improper business practices and big business, then surely the consumer and we can expect the Minister of Consumer Services to protect the consumer from big government and big government's improper business practices.

ICBC, or Autoplan, surely must be one of the most classic examples of big government involved in questionable business practices. I would ask, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister: was the NDP and, in turn, this government, guilty of misleading advertising when it inferred in its election campaign that the B.C. government has \$25 auto insurance? Why can't you? Where is the Minister's voice in this consumer concern?

What about the overcharging? Whether it's deceptive and misleading, we would like to know where the Minister of Consumer Services' voice is in this matter and what is her opinion? How is she protecting the consumer in British Columbia from this type of misleading advertising? What about the overcharging of premiums to lay people by ICBC with no guarantee of refunds and no interest on the overdue repayments?

Not once have we heard this Minister raise her voice and insist that the blatant ICBC gouging of the public be compensated for by, in these two instances, accurate refunds and an effort on the part of ICBC to find out who has overpaid and by the payment of interest on this money. There could be, and it appears evident there are, several million dollars in the hands of ICBC from the overpayment of premiums.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, not once in the whole fiasco of ICBC overcharging, irregularity of rates, political

[[Page 279](#)]

gerrymandering or monopoly of controls have we heard the Minister of Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young) in the Province of British Columbia speak out on behalf of the public of British Columbia.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Not one word. Not one!

MRS. JORDAN: The effect created by Bill 71, which the Minister incidentally voted for, produced not one word from this Minister on behalf of the consumer about the 100 to 300 to 400 per cent tax increases on farm leases in British Columbia and on small businesses that were inflicted by her government. It is a tax which is to be passed directly on to the consumer in British Columbia on essential commodities such as food, housing, clothing — areas which are vital to all the people but hitting harder those who can least afford to pay — families, fixed income people, the older, single women who have raised children or are raising children on very low wages.

You know, Mr. Speaker, people scoffed when the Premier announced that he would remove the 5 per cent tax on used clothing, but I suggest that this is going to be far more significant and that if this government stays in office very long, the line-ups at ICBC will be nothing compared to the line-ups at the used-clothing markets of British Columbia.

We would like to know why the Minister's voice.... I'm sorry to see the Minister is leaving the House. I would think she would be quite interested in knowing what the public is concerned about, especially as her vote is coming up. We would like to know why, when the Minister was flailing the private sector for double-ticketing in the grocery stores and in other sectors — and it is a matter that we agree with — she said nothing when the government enterprises were double-ticketing.

The NDP Member for Kamloops (Mr. G.H. Anderson) said on Friday that Kamloops was the home of the ripoff artist. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that Kamloops is a major centre for British Columbia government offices. He also said people need to know what business to avoid. The major business to avoid in British Columbia at this time is the B.C. government. No private business, no private industry would ever be allowed to jockey the public the way this pogo-stick Premier and his cabinet have.

Mr. Speaker, this government has indicated that we will go into more and more businesses in the private sector in British Columbia, and we suggest to the Minister of Consumer Services that she is going to have to become concerned about the prices and the products and the practices of these businesses. They are already in the alfalfa-cubing business, and she should be concerning herself about the actual cost of production of alfalfa cubes, bus fares, chickens — and there well might be a very good story in the chicken business with this government — and the price of milk.

With the Member for Alberni's (Mr. Skelly's) statement last week that there will be special positions for government businesses in British Columbia, surely the Minister will have to interest herself in the consumer price of lumber and other domestic forestry products, and the business practices of these mills and government outlets.

The government will soon be in the housing field. Surely she has a responsibility to investigate the business practices of the B.C. government Housing Corporation, the terms of their leases, and perhaps the commissions that are paid to government real estate agents.

Mr. Speaker, the people of British Columbia don't want to see the efforts and abilities of the Minister's department stop at government doors. In fact, they insist that government doors be opened to this Minister so that she can carry out her responsibilities to the consumer as designed. I would say to her — who has just entered — Madam, in this budget, through you, Mr. Speaker, you want \$80,184 alone for your office. Incidentally, this Ministerial expense is more than the Minister of Recreation and Conservation's (Hon. Mr. Radford's) office, more than the Minister of Agriculture's (Hon. Mr. Stupich's) office, more than the Attorney-General's (Hon. Mr. Macdonald's) office, the Labour department, Mines and Petroleum Resources department, Municipal Affairs, Provincial Secretary or Public Works. Surely for this type of Ministerial expense the public has the right to expect that any actions of yourself and your department will pass through the doors of government, as well as in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move now for a few minutes to the area of Recreation and Conservation and it is the first time I've had an opportunity to speak eyeball to eyeball with the Minister (Hon. Mr. Radford). I would like to say that I, personally, find him a very delightful person and that I believe that he is proving to be one of the better

Ministers of this government — although that is not necessarily a high recommendation for Ministerial ability — and to wish him well in his work.

However, I was surprised to see him take political swipes at the former administration — we had expected better of him. Also when he is fully aware, and I know he is, that he has inherited one of the finest parks departments and one of the more outstanding park systems in the world, and while he glowed under new park acquisitions, and glowered over the previous redistribution of park boundaries, he did forget to mention that under his administration, the NDP administration, there had been also a number of park redistributions, and there were, in fact, deletions from the parks jurisdiction. I

[[Page 280](#)]

understand this; the practical facts of life must apply.

But what I do concern myself with is that the Minister has allowed special park-use permits to leave his jurisdiction and they are now in the jurisdictions of the special lands service. Mr. Speaker, these special parks permits frequently apply over operations which have a massive effect, in fact a major effect, on the adjoining parks. I suggest to the Minister that this is wrong. This is no way to be handling your administration. Special use permits and special permits for activities basically connected with parks should be under the parks jurisdiction.

He also didn't explain, Mr. Speaker, that a major portion of the new park acreage was on line by the former administration, nor that some of his new parks will likely have to have redistribution of boundaries following public hearings.

Nor did he explain why, in one-and-a-half years, his government has not declared any new ecological reserves when, in fact, there are 19 more on tap from the former administration.

Another principle of Recreation and Conservation that is causing serious concern is regarding the new licences and angling fees. While raising the fees particularly to non-residents is, I'm sure, quite justified and acceptable, one must seriously question the government's attitude of charging little children under 16 \$5 to go fishing unless as it says in the regulations, they are "accompanied by a person who is in possession of an appropriate, valid angler's licence." You know, with the coffers of this province swelling, this amounts to another tax on the people of B.C. and it is a tax on the kids. There are thousands of youngsters in this province who enjoy fishing in every hamlet and waterhole that they can find.

HON. J. RADFORD (Minister of Recreation and Conservation): There is no charge under 16.

MRS. JORDAN: Then you had better reword your regulations, Mr. Minister, because as the regulations read now unless these children are accompanied by an adult carrying a licence they can't go fishing on their own. A five-year-old has to spend \$5 to wet a line. This government is not only digging into the pockets of the poor, the pensioners and the workers, it is socking it to the kids. Surely with all the money virtually streaming into the coffers of this province, kids under 16 should be able to fish free.

Mr. Speaker, when one examines the budget and compares it with the Minister's words it is also disappointing to see that he, like the rest of the NDP, tends to forget facts. He talks in glowing terms of the great infusion of money in his recreation and conservation programme. I would remind him that what he didn't say was that the previous administration put aside \$20 million for accelerated park development, and \$25 million for greenbelt acquisition, making a total of \$45 million set aside for park acquisition and accelerated park development.

The previous administration had spent \$8 million out of the \$25 million and the NDP have spent zero, zilch, nothing, out of that fund since then, according to their figures.

Up until March, Mr. Speaker, only \$11 million has been spent from the Accelerated Park Development Fund and these \$11 million represent moneys almost entirely committed by the former administration. So in 1972-1973, \$11 million had been spent in accelerated park development, with another \$8 million from the Green Belt Protection

Fund Act. This budget, Mr. Speaker, with its \$5 million for parks development projects is \$6 million short of funds already allocated for this purpose. So the Minister's glowing report and budget just don't gibe. In fact, his budget doesn't allow for an accelerated park development programme. It could almost be described as a budget considering the de-acceleration of the park development programme.

A matter of serious concern regarding this Minister is what the real role of the Minister is in recreation and conservation and in the overall budgeting policies and decisions of this government. Certainly, as I mentioned, he has tried to be a good Minister; but the budget, which is the real gauge of the direction in which the government is going, would suggest that the government has him only for a high degree of administration and public relations.

When we combine the points in the budget with the role, or lack of role, that the Minister has been allowed to play in the decision-making in relation to land use in this province, we find that he's been cut off at the pass, Mr. Speaker — cut off at the pass. The fact is that the real power in this government for any form of land use, including recreation and wildlife, ties not with the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, where it should, but with the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams).

Mr. Speaker, it was the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources who said at Prince George that the government would, in fact, cut down its park development. While the Minister of Recreation and Conservation said in his speech, "We are involved in the major resource decisions of this province" — and we really hope he is and wish he was — the facts are that there was no weight from his voice. In fact, his voice wasn't even heard from when the wildlife management reserve was lifted at Roberts Bank. It wasn't his voice that had the reserve put on again, as he knows; it was the Member for North Okanagan with the help of the media and the people in the area.

Another example in the Interior of the province, Mr. Speaker, relates to my own constituency, the

[[Page 281](#)]

North Okanagan, in regard to Cosens Bay. It's approximately 2,000 acres of one of the provincial Parks Branch's top priority park acquisitions. It's top priority because of its unique tundra and extensive natural life aspects in both flora and wildlife. Another plus for this is that it's one of the few unique dry-belt examples in the province, and it also borders on a magnificent lake.

It was designed to be, and it must be, totally a senior-government purchase and responsibility. But the point here, Mr. Speaker, is that it's not the Minister of Recreation and Conservation that we are dealing with; it is the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

In fact, it's really no longer a discussion between the people and the Minister. It has been months and months of nothing behind the closed doors of that Minister's office — as to what he is doing and what in fact is the future of the park itself. We in the North Okanagan are deeply concerned about this closed-shop attitude towards the acquisition of this land, particularly in light of the fact that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources has said that the people in the area will have to pay a large part of the capital acquisition costs, a point that is not realistic and a point that I dispute and stand firmly on.

The people of the North Okanagan should not, and as far as I'm concerned will not, have to pay for what is in fact a provincial and senior-level government acquisition. But again, Mr. Speaker, we would like to be dealing with the Minister of Recreation and Conservation.

I must ask again, as another example, citing the northern part of the province, when it was the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources who announced the development plans for the north in terms of sawmills and other industrial programmes, there was not a word from the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, and no word from him ensuring that the wildlife studies that have been requested will be carried out.

Those are three examples around the province, Mr. Speaker, which support public concern and our concern that a fine Minister has been cut off at the pass, and that in fact he's not being allowed to do his job, and that it is the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources that is the tsar of the lands, and he puts recreation and conservation

secondary. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province and this opposition want a Minister with weight — with weight — in the decision-making of multi-land use, and recreational decisions in this province.

MR. FRASER: If Bob says "jump" you say: "How high?"

MRS. JORDAN: I had intended to speak a little on community recreation, Mr. Speaker, as another example where the Minister isn't giving the facts, but we have a new speaker in the House today. I don't want to be too long — as long as the Member for Richmond (Mr. Steves). But I would like to bring to the government's attention, in relating to the budget, a matter of interest to the North Okanagan. I would refer to ICBC and its permanent home.

I realize the other Members of this House were not cognizant of the fact that was made on Friday, but I felt sure at the time that the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) had either proofread my speech or he'd been given a leak from the sources that I've been investigating.

There's no question, if ICBC can ever emerge from its maze of difficulties, that it is logical and reasonable and in fact desirable to place the home base of this corporation in the North Okanagan. An analysis of ICBC in terms of location reveals that it need not necessarily be centered in the metropolitan area.

Its major dependency on the Vancouver area is the computer, and my understanding is that the computer cable that is already into the Okanagan could be expanded with an extension to the Vernon area. Or, in fact, the laying of a new computer cable would be feasible and far less costly to undertake than what the accelerated costs would be in the overall picture if ICBC were to remain in Vancouver.

HON. MR. LEA (Minister of Highways): You want it in Vernon.

MRS. JORDAN: Yes, Mr. Minister, and I'll tell you why, and you'd better listen. There's really no reason why this company should be linked to the major business centre in British Columbia in Vancouver. It's an independent corporation, and certainly there's no need to discuss business with other auto insurance company head offices, because there are not any other auto insurance head offices in British Columbia.

Transportation to and from Vancouver and Vernon is rapid and frequent and would accommodate the necessity of any major business conferences with ease. A move like this would not be a first in British Columbia, and it certainly would not be a first in the world. I would suggest, as an example, that in the late 1950s IBM was encouraged by government to move into Rochester, Minnesota.

Rochester at that time had a population of 25,000 people, mostly medical and therefore very transient, and it had a service area of 4,000. The community itself was a one-industry town and, as I mentioned, mostly medical, and its location was 80 miles of nothing between Rochester and Minneapolis and St. Paul. If anyone knows the area, they'll know that Minneapolis and St. Paul are 2,000 miles from

[[Page 282](#)]

anywhere.

This was a highly successful programme which diversified the life of these people and gave them a much more stable economy. This is a unique opportunity in the north Okanagan for a variety programme such as this, where the community and the area itself can offer a variety in lifestyles from agricultural and recreational pursuits to cultural activities and living accommodation. It's a clean industry, Mr. Speaker, and it would provide many job opportunities for young people in the valley who wish to remain in the valley, and its programming would dovetail well with the northern campuses of the Okanagan Regional College.

I would take exception to what the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) said in advertising cheap land in the Okanagan to say that, as far as this Member's concerned, if anybody buys land in the Okanagan, particularly the north Okanagan, they're going to pay a fair price for it and our people are going to benefit from it. But there's no need to consider land because, as the Minister knows, ICBC already owns land in Vernon. They paid \$140,000 for it

and they're doing nothing with it.

I would suggest that that would make an excellent home for ICBC. But I am pleased to have the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) join with me and I'm sure we can unite together and truly encourage...

Interjections.

MRS. JORDAN: ...the government — not to put in a chicken factory in the Vernon area; you can have that in Shuswap — but to really, seriously home ICBC on the land it owns in a community where it is highly suitable.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter in the North Okanagan I would like to bring up, which is in keeping with the policies of this government, and that is the matter of an agricultural college for the province. While there is a growing agricultural training centre in the Peace River, it of necessity reflects a specialized type of approach to agriculture.

There is a vital need in British Columbia at this time for a basic educational centre for overall agricultural training in the broadest, practical sense. The North Okanagan is a very obvious centre because it is in itself the centre of some of the most vast, intensive production areas in the province. It is the centre of the most diversified production of nearly any province in Canada.

Our production ranges from vegetables to grapes to soft fruits to hard fruits, dairy, cattle and, again, highly intensive multi-production operations. There is an increasing incidence of younger people in their 20s and 30s going into agriculture in our area. I suggest this not to de-emphasize the university degree programme but that this type of programme can fill a gap which is very obviously here. It can offer practical training whether in terms of management of packing houses or production facilities — and we lack these managers in British Columbia — whether it's in terms of highly specialized agricultural management in itself or horticulture. There is a unique opportunity in this area because of its location and central point to undertake this.

This centre is 80 miles to the furthest reaches of some of the most successful cattle ranches and it is all within 80 miles to the most successful soft fruit ranches. Vernon itself has facilities now which could be utilized to start this type of a college programme. Perhaps even more importantly we have in our schools and on the staff of the regional college, now at this time, highly interested and qualified people in agricultural management, horticulture and development. There are also people who are qualified in multi-land use, and recreation and wildlife conservation, which should incorporate and be incorporated in any agricultural training programme.

Mr. Speaker, this government has taken over the regional colleges and the vocational schools, and it has the power and the authority now to undertake this programme in this area. If it did undertake this, it would be in keeping with what the government professes to be a very strong agricultural policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while there are many other concerns of the people that I have the honour to represent, I will bring them up under estimates. But I would say that the people of North Okanagan, along with personal constituency concerns, share the provincial view that this budget does not reflect reality in terms of the economics of the day. It does, when you examine it, pocket windfall profits from inflation, and it takes away from those who need it most.

On examination it toys, in itself, with consumers, limited-income people and the recreational aspects of life, just to mention a few. While the government talks about dividends to people, in reality what dividends there are they take away again through hidden taxes and government-fanned inflation.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no budget this size could be all bad. There are many areas that we will be prepared to support. But one must admit that where the budget does move in needed directions it frequently spoils that effect and the effect of those allotments through its adherence to dogma and through what is very questionable fiscal management.

What concerns me and what concerns even any homemaker in British Columbia is that the budget does not

account for vast sums of money that will come in through underestimated revenues. This, plus the NDP track record for emotional and political decisions and wastage and the use of special warrants, is a rather serious concern in the public mind.

The policy statements, Mr. Speaker, made in the

[[Page 283](#)]

last few days alone by this government, only serve to heighten the confusion and the suspicion that surrounds this government and this budget. While, as I said, Mr. Speaker, there are certain aspects of this government that are worthy of support, and that we will support, it would be impossible for any seriously responsible legislator to vote for the real meaning of this government as it is reflected in this budget as a whole.

It's a jumpy budget; the actions of the Premier and Minister of Finance point it out so clearly. British Columbia's greatest need at this time is not a pogo-stick Premier, but a leader of a party in power which is, to say the least, alert and responsible.

At this time more than ever, Mr. Speaker, British Columbia needs a leader who is sensitive to the economic complexities of this province, a leader who can budget in line with real people needs and concerns and revenues and a leader who not only understands the meaning of fair play between people...

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General): We have that now.

MRS. JORDAN: ...government and business — fair play, Mr. Attorney-General — a leader who understands fair play between government, the individual and business.

Interjections.

MRS. JORDAN: Not only a leader who understands it but a leader who is strong enough and capable enough to practise it.

Interjections.

MRS. JORDAN: That's what the people of this province want, Mr. Speaker, in policy statements and in this budget. It is then, Mr. Speaker, when this fair play is returned to British Columbia — and it's only then — that the people who are the backbone of this province and the backbone of our life in both economic and cultural terms.... Only then will they not wish to secede from this land and from their homes and from this government.

It is when we have responsible leadership that there will be no longer the political fear and investment uncertainty in our province. Mr. Speaker, we don't find that in the government and I suggest, for all the analysis of the budget, that is what is needed and is lacking.

HON. MR. RADFORD: A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The former speaker, the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan), made a statement regarding angling licences which was totally untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I point out to the Hon. Member that the only correction you can make is not in rebuttal to another Member's speech, but where you are misquoted on some point. If you were misquoted, that is a different matter.

HON. MR. RADFORD: Well, I think, yes, I was misquoted, Mr. Speaker, on the point that she raised about the residents of B.C. that are under 16 years of age being charged \$1 for a fishing licence.

Interjections.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Hon. Member bear in mind that what I've just said is that if you were misquoted in some statement in a speech in the House which was just made, then you are entitled immediately afterwards to correct that misstatement or explain it to the House. But that doesn't fall into the category of her statement, and therefore you would be out of order to proceed.

MRS. JORDAN: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, please!

MRS. JORDAN: Just for clarification, because you suggested that he was concerned about a statement that I made....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm not interested in continuing the debate on the question because there's no point of privilege in this matter, unless it bears upon a statement that's been made by the Hon. Minister in the House, and there's no such statement.

I wish to recognize the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Capilano.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me at this stage because I was in a bit of a quandary. The little unofficial list of the speakers that came around said that a Mr. J.G. Gibson was to address the House at this point this afternoon which, of course I guess, would be that former distinguished MLA — my father. His voice could have been heard here if he'd known it was his turn.

MR. SPEAKER: We'd all know.

MR. GIBSON: It is a very great honour for me today to be sworn in as a Member of this House and to have the opportunity of making my first remarks in this budget debate. It's an honour, first of all, because of my feeling about the place of elected

[[Page 284](#)]

politicians in our society.

I have in the past been involved in the political process with a chance to see the operations of government inside and outside. While it has been good training, it's not the same as being elected.

I have formed a very high regard for the men and women who have to take the ultimate responsibility for the decisions they make in the legislative votes they cast and then be accountable for those actions to the public. I concluded that no matter how good your ideas may be and no matter with what energy you pursue them, you have to follow the elective route to do the best for the people. Whenever that's not the case, the public interest is in jeopardy because it's only the elected politicians whom the public can control directly. It's essential they be the ones with the real authority.

On that concept of responsible government our parliamentary system has been developed. It is on that basis I am very proud to enter this House today.

I am honoured by the fact that I have come into this assembly as representative for the riding of North Vancouver–Capilano. Every Hon. Member must have warm feelings about his or her riding; I certainly do about mine.

It's the central one of the three ridings on the north shore of Burrard Inlet, reaching from the Capilano River on the west to Lonsdale on the east, from the inlet to Grouse Mountain. It's a beautiful area, ideal for an urban community: residential uplands, sufficient flatlands for an industrial and commercial employment base.

Geographically, it's part of the greater Vancouver marketplace. Many of the employment, cultural and daily responsibilities of my constituents relate directly to the other side of Burrard Inlet. It's astride the routes to the

northern coastline and central interior of the province. From these factors flow the transportation concerns I'll be discussing later.

In human terms, which is the most important thing, it's the place of residence of over 40,000 British Columbians of all walks of life. Some who are uninformed refer to the North Shore fat cats when talking about our needs for governmental services and recognition. But nothing could be more misleading in reference to the kind of people who live in North Vancouver–Capilano. We have the whole range, from young to old, from moderately well-off to moderately poorly-off, that you would find in most areas of British Columbia.

As so many people in British Columbia, the people in North Vancouver–Capilano are working for a living and for this province. They are earning their way; they're not resting on their past or on their laurels. Blue collar, white collar, all kinds of jobs. North Vancouver is populated by the kind of people who make British Columbia run and whose efforts contribute so mightily to the taxes raised and disbursed by this Legislature.

In political terms, North Vancouver–Capilano has been Liberal for the past dozen years and remains so today. The landslide results of the last election were enough to maintain that particular tradition. And that's the third reason why I am particularly honoured today, because I am following in the footsteps of men I very much admire who have represented this area for my party in the past.

The first of these referred to was my father, Gordon Gibson, who represented Lillooet in this Legislature during the 1950s and the North Shore in the 1960s. He was and is one of the most fabulous men British Columbia has produced. His political career spans some of the most turbulent moments in B.C. history. His name became synonymous with the fight for integrity in government.

I remember well in our home on the Capilano River the long days and longer nights that went into the struggle against government power and big business reflected in the forest management licences: the Sommer's case, which will never be forgotten by any Minister in any British Columbia government. Those days were my introduction into politics and they were memorable,

The Premier the other day in his kind remarks mentioned my Dad's sense of humour. There wasn't a *Hansard* in the House in those days but you'll recall the controversy over the Peace River dam, the Bennett Dam, how much it was going to cost and whether we should be spending that kind of money on this enormous project. The then Minister of Lands and Forests stood up in the House one day to advise the House that a way had been found to take 50 feet off the top of the dam and save the people of the province \$50 million. My Dad stood up and said, "Why don't you take 50 feet off the bottom and save them a billion." (Laughter.) I hope he will revisit this Legislature shortly.

The second representative I follow and admire is Ray Perrault, for many years a representative of the North Shore and Liberal leader in this House. Ray gained a special reputation for energy and service to the ordinary British Columbian, a reputation he continued and enhanced first of all in the House of Commons and now in the Senate of Canada working for British Columbia.

The third is Dave Brousson, a representative for Capilano through three elections from 1968 to 1973. Dave acquired a name not only as a diligent constituency worker but as a fighter on the provincial scale for causes like the preservation of the Skagit Valley. Predecessors of this calibre give any new Member for North Vancouver–Capilano strong examples and high ideals to follow.

Another visitor to this House today, the Hon. Arthur Laing, a former Member of this House, another former Liberal leader, is a man with whom I

[[Page 285](#)]

worked for many years. He was Mr. Liberal in British Columbia; the complete man of honour and integrity.

Because of having worked with these men, I am particularly proud to enter and be in this Legislature as a

Liberal. I say this not to downgrade the political faith of any other Hon. Member of this House but to say I am proud of my own.

In these days it's too easy just to be against rather for something; but you can't build anything on that basis. As a Liberal I believe in the primacy of the individual. I believe that "in all human affairs there are abuses to reform, new horizons to discover and new forces to develop." Those were the words of Laurier half a century ago and they are no less true in British Columbia in 1974.

So I have special pleasure in taking my place as a Liberal with a leader and a group of men whose individual attainment and joint contribution to the work of this House is something I much admire and will work to support.

I have a couple of other tributes to pay at this stage. The first is to the other candidates in the recent by-election. They were all the finest their parties could put up and it was tough competition. They had 15 all-candidates' meetings so we saw a lot of each other. Some of them have been and will remain in public service.

I refer, first of all, to Mayor Ron Andrews of the district of North Vancouver, a strong candidate for the Social Credit Party. He's currently in hospital in Victoria recovering from an operation; I wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

Peter Hyndman, active in the affairs of the Conservative Party; a strong and fine candidate for them.

For the NDP Diane Baigent was a good candidate and a fine person. I think we all came very much to admire her over the period of the campaign, with her complete sincerity and generous instinct. If this government, Mr. Speaker, is maintaining a list of defeated NDP candidates — I don't know — but if they are maintaining a list of candidates who don't have any public appointments yet, Mrs. Baigent deserves a place at the top of that list. I'm glad to see she was put on the Capilano College board a couple of days ago.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): She was on it.

MR. GIBSON: Yes, she was reappointed; that's right.

Finally, at this point in my remarks I want to pay a tribute to my wife and family and to my supporters, many of whom are here today. They worked with extraordinary effort and devotion in a very tough battle. I am grateful to them; and perhaps I might be speaking for most Hon. Members of this House if I became more general and acknowledged the vital contribution all campaign workers make to the democratic system we live in.

I want to give a pledge to all Capilano citizens, whether they voted for me or against me or whether they voted at all. I will diligently represent their interests to the best of my ability. I will very shortly be opening a full-time office in the riding as promised during the campaign. And I commend the government on the measures of financial assistance introduced to help with such expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this is the budget debate but I won't attempt in any detail to rake over ground so many Hon. Members have already covered very well. Rather, I would like to make one or two general comments on it and then go into detail on a few selected points.

The budget as presented for this fiscal year is one that will be agreeable to a great many people — certainly it must have been agreeable to the Premier and Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) when he met himself in the corridor to discuss it — and which has such a considerable excess of funds to disperse without the necessity of raising taxes.

It's clearly not so agreeable to the people involved in education that their share of the budget dropped dramatically, that the needs and hopes they had had for a major increase in attention were denied even in this year of tremendous abundance. For the moment we're left with a hope — and only that; no details — that supplementary funds will be forthcoming upon proof of need. That's a difficult way, to run a schoolboard and not a good way to present a budget. The whole thing should be out on the table for the Legislature to examine. The amount of the extra

funds and the criteria must be there for the school boards to plan.

The situation presumably reflects a government uncertain of its policy and trying to keep its options open in this area. Even that simple admission might help the situation. It would help our understanding.

The budget is also not so agreeable to the municipalities of British Columbia, in terms of either cash or philosophy. The increase in the per capita grant didn't even keep up with inflation; the other measures proposed provide for insufficient help.

But on the philosophical side the situation is, I believe, even worse than just dealing in terms of cash. What seems to be happening is that a government which talks about the virtues of decentralization in fact acts in highly centralizing ways. Who pays the piper calls the tune is an old slogan and it's a true one in province-city relationships.

The municipalities are constitutionally powerless against the government to start with. To supplement this with financial starvation will continue to erode local responsibility. That isn't what the government wants, I gather from its statements. So perhaps it's just looking for a way out.

[[Page 286](#)]

I've got a suggestion for them. The government has been very active in setting up task forces to look into areas with problems, and maybe this is just such an area. I would suggest to the Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) that it might be very useful to their responsibility and certainly useful to the public dialogue if they would set up a task force to inquire into the possibilities for increasing the financial independence of local governments, including the regional districts.

Such a task force should usefully and quickly look into measures in force in other parts of Canada and compare what's happening in British Columbia. Public information is a first step in all such complex questions.

Then they should examine the various proposals, including the numerous submissions of the Union of B.C. Municipalities over the years, as to how tax revenues might be more usefully shared with the local governments. It's a truism that local expenditure needs are growing far faster than the local tax base. B.C. could show real leadership in tackling this problem.

This budget raised once again the question of the expenditures of governments as opposed to those of individuals in our society. Already governments at all levels in Canada spend something like 40 per cent of our Gross National Product. The federal level spends about 14 out of that 40, so that leaves 26 per cent that we can talk about in this House, at the provincial local level.

The effect of this most recent budget is to notch that percentage up a little higher yet. Exact figures for B.C. are difficult to obtain in the absence of a general economic report, but it is clear that if our Gross Provincial Product is up by 16 per cent, and the budgetary revenues are up by 25 per cent, then the share of government has eaten into private expenditure by another percentage point or so, which is a significant loss in an already losing battle.

To assist the Legislature and the public to analyse such questions more usefully, I would suggest to the Premier and Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) that it would be a great service to the cause of open government, which this government supports, if he would produce a detailed provincial economic report to be tabled before the budget. As any householder knows, you can't make even the best criticism of even the family budget without all the important figures, and we don't have all of them here at the provincial level. This is not only bad reporting and bad business; it's also alarming. It's just a question of public accountability, and it is necessary.

In specific terms I'd like to talk about the single most important long-term problem facing our province, and that's the problem of growth. Growth stands out as the issue, apart from the world economy, which is not under our control. Problems of growth could seriously change our way of life in British Columbia in adverse ways if we don't get a handle on it now.

The House will be familiar with the basic numbers. When you're talking about compounded growth year after year and you want to know how long it will be until a particular thing that's growing doubles, you apply what's called the "rule of 70." You divide the growth rate into 70 and that gives the number of years to double.

Well, B.C. is growing at 3.5 per cent a year. That means we double every 20 years. That isn't long; that means that, starting now, within the lifetime of the British Columbian of average age we'll double twice. Four people will be standing where there's one right now. For the long haul that should give every one of us a lot of food for thought, and for the short haul it gives us immediate practical problems for society and the government to address.

Current growth numbers are roughly 65,000 to 70,000 new British Columbians every year. Something like half those people settle in the lower mainland — around 30,000 in the greater Vancouver regional district alone — that's a net figure: it takes into account births and deaths as well as new arrivals.

Mr. Speaker, if we didn't have this kind of growth, there would be no housing crisis, and there'd be no transportation crisis. We wouldn't have a municipal finance crisis, we wouldn't have an environmental and parkland crisis. Life would be easy. The government could just sit around and listen to the trees grow and slice a few more branches off the forest industry when they wanted entertainment, as one of their backbenchers did over the weekend. But the growth is there and it's fundamental to the future of our province, and it's essential that the government should show that it understands the problem as a whole, rather than looking at its isolated symptoms, because the symptoms of growth are like a balloon — you poke it in somewhere and it'll pop out somewhere else or else it will explode.

I'll be speaking later about a third crossing for the Burrard Inlet. If you deny such a crossing and dam up the growth on the North Shore to keep the commuter traffic off Vancouver streets, where does the growth go? It backs up into Vancouver, and then Vancouver dams up the growth and says, "Not too many more highrises," and where does it go? It goes into Richmond, Delta and Surrey, and the Vancouver streets become increasingly congested with commuter traffic that could be solved by a third crossing. That's just one small aspect.

Growth starts to cause a pinch in accommodation and prices go up, and this affects the poor, particularly pensioners. So the government put in a Mincome scheme with no residency requirement to help retired people pay the higher rentals and taxes. Retired people from all over Canada like the look of

[[Page 287](#)]

that, and come to B.C., which is a pretty nice place to retire anyway. So a policy developed to deal with a symptom of growth ends up causing even more growth.

Looking at it another way, housing prices go up because of growth and it starts to exceed the means of the average family, so ways are found to channel more money into the mortgage market on better terms. Better grants are provided to purchasers and renters. More money is chasing the same amount of accommodation and so prices go up again, still ahead of the subsidy.

The point is that growth has to be considered as an overall phenomenon, and it has to be done quickly. It's becoming increasingly difficult to buy time and to put some of the hard questions off.

Let's suppose, for example, that the government does proceed with the development of the University Endowment Lands right now, which I think would be a tragedy. What would be achieved? We might put 30,000 or even 60,000 in that space. If you remember those growth figures, that's only a one- or two-year breathing space — just bought one or two years time and the endowment lands are gone forever. That to me isn't planning. That's irresponsibility. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that there will be caution and reconsideration in that area.

A very encouraging thing happened last week. A local level of government has been able to see the dimensions of the problem and — to the credit of the Greater Vancouver Regional District — they held a day-long seminar to begin to tackle some of these problems of growth. I had the opportunity to be there, and I gather that the papers produced for that conference will receive distribution to Members of this House. I much commend them to

your attention; they're worthwhile.

The basic considerations on growth are pretty simple. We don't have to worry about unlimited growth. It'll never happen. You see the projections that the whole globe will be a quivering mass of protoplasm 500 years from now — that won't happen. Growth will always limit itself, but the problem is the self-limitation process. It is sometimes so unpleasant that it would be better to do it in other ways. Many urban communities on the continent have stopped growing just because they've become so unlikable — costly and crowded and crime-ridden — that nobody wants to live there any more. That's what I call the natural limit to growth. But there's a point well before that when the growth should be checked, and we might be only one or two doublings away from that point in the greater Vancouver area. That to me does constitute a genuine crisis.

It's a particular local problem. It isn't a national problem and probably not even a world problem by the latest figures. Changing values and technology appear to have dropped the birth rate to much lower levels than in the past. In Canada, our own birth rate is skimming along just above the replacement level. It fell dramatically from 28 per 1,000 twenty years ago to 15 per 1,000 now, which is a social revolution. Most of our national increase is in immigration, and even with that our growth as a country is only 1 per cent per year, which doubles in 70 years.

In British Columbia and in the Greater Vancouver Regional District it's very, very different. We are now about one million people in the GVRD. At current trends we will be 1.5 million people in 12 years — 1986 — and by the year 2000, depending on which estimate you take, somewhere between 1.7 million and 2.1 million.

All kinds of people think that's too rapid. So the question is what to do about it. We're part of a nation and there's no way we can put up a gate at Rogers Pass.

In addition to that, most people feel that some growth maintains a healthy dynamism in a community. But how can we slow it down? Part of this is up to the federal government. About 40 per cent of the GVRD growth, according to their figures, comes from foreign immigration — people coming to Vancouver from outside of Canada. That's a tremendous percentage of local growth.

The federal government has called for a review of its immigration policy. With Canada as a whole growing so slowly, we have to appreciate that there are going to be many voices across this country for increased immigration. With the special problems of British Columbia, this House and our government should consider whether we shouldn't have a strong submission to the federal government about the impact of growth on our province. I believe the government should take this under advisement as a priority item.

Beyond that there are some things we can do on our own as a province, both as to the attractiveness of people moving to British Columbia and, probably more effectively, where in British Columbia they decide to settle. Outside the lower mainland the problems are much less critical. I think there should be a minimum of regulatory measures, though there will have to be some, but the main route will be the zoning and the influence of housing supply and price within the greater Vancouver area, plus the location of major employers — particularly government-owned, like the ICBC, which should be outside the growth area as much as possible.

In general, the provincial government must do a great deal to make it attractive for both persons and jobs to locate outside the lower mainland area. For example, a great deal of our growth has been and will come from the migration of retired people into British Columbia from other parts of Canada. So there is no problem of job location here. Indeed, this gives rise to jobs for other people. Retired people

[[Page 288](#)]

might respond well to tangible kinds of encouragement to live on Vancouver Island, for example, with its many climatic and other advantages.

The provisions of cultural amenities away from urban centres are critical to this development. The GVRD (Greater Vancouver Regional District) seminar was told that from our current million the trend line growth to 1.5 million in 12 years could be reduced by 100,000 with moderate controls and by 150,000 with what they call strong

controls. The general sentiment among the aldermen and municipal representatives present was that there had to be at least a moderate reduction. A lot of this is up to the provincial government and it's a priority.

Given the continuation of some growth, the next problem is living with it. In particular, how should this be shared among the lower mainland municipalities? We have to understand that this will be a controversial question because you only have to notice that the growth rate over the past five years has ranged from a low of 4 per cent in Vancouver to 122 per cent in Delta. Not all the municipalities have the same ability to accept growth, but even those that do may have very different levels of willingness. There are going to have to be negotiations here. Regional equity is going to have to ensure that the burden and opportunity of growth will be better distributed.

Regional planning for transportation, industry and housing requires that kind of agreement. With that kind of agreement, citizens' worry about growth should be much lessened once it is planned, once it is obvious government is working with it.

What has to be done is the allocation of growth through the allocation of new housing development opportunities between the municipalities. I think it is a fundamental principle that each municipality must have a voice in this process. The regional district and the province also have a part to play. It will be a complex negotiation, I would hope conducted in the light of the fullest public hearings.

As a second principle, I would suggest that no municipality should be asked to pay an unfairly high price for growth. While most of the land in my own constituency is developed, the east side of the District of North Vancouver contains a very sizeable area of developable land. It may be that this should be developed more quickly in the future.

But again, another principle: I do not believe North Vancouver taxpayers should be asked to accept artificially low prices to do this. If there is any subsidy required for this kind of development it should be a general charge on the public purse of the province as a whole.

It is clear that municipal fears about the cost of growth is one of the main reasons for some of our problems and, in particular, the cost of serviced land.

The imposition of high development charges on the developer certainly doesn't hurt them; they just pass it onto the consumer, thereby raising the cost of the housing.

Something that must always be remembered in looking at the cost of housing is that the price of this year's new housing affects not just those dwellings; it affects the price at which all used dwellings change hands as well. It affects the rental market. The cost of housing is therefore driven up for everyone.

To me, the process that is going on now is just absolute madness. Almost nobody benefits. The average homeowner may be happy to see the value of their house increasing, but it doesn't do them any good because they either have to live in it or buy or rent a new one if they want to sell. Their taxes go up steadily in the meantime.

The people who are really being squeezed are the ones who on the average can't afford it: the people who rent and the people wishing to enter the housing market.

The long-run answer is not to rely only on putting more funds in the hands of people for housing purposes because, unless the supply is increased, that obviously just increases the demand and raises the price still higher for everyone in this province.

The answer is to increase supply in the short run and to control growth in the longer run. We are very fortunate in British Columbia and in the lower mainland. We still have enough time and enough land for both of these things if we start right now.

In this context, we have to hear a lot more from the Minister of Housing (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) as to how he is going to proceed. Some of his announcements so far are very worrisome to me. He has expressed an intention to

arrange for the building of a lot of units. But even so, at least 85 per cent of the 37,000 or 40,000 units to be built next year we are going to be built privately. The crunch is, what is being done to make sure that that private development continues in an orderly way. That's the crunch: public housing can't solve the problem by itself.

We will await the answers with hopefulness, but I ask the Minister to realize the answer mostly doesn't lie with direct government action. Rather, it lies with making it possible for the municipalities and the private building sector to do their job, to try to vastly increase the competition in the housing field so as to hold that price line.

The 32 per cent increase in housing prices from last year is just completely unacceptable. In the meantime, prices are literally going up every day.

The planned-unit development concept the Minister mentioned offers great hope. Inter-municipal co-operation offers great hope. So-called in-filling offers hope. But let the government set the conditions and the financial possibility of these things

[[Page 289](#)]

happening and they will happen. Put the money into encouraging those things; don't try and do everything yourselves.

In the meantime, if the government is determined to build some housing directly, I submit that the leasing route is the wrong way to go now, however attractive it might be in terms of dogma.

If the idea of leasing is that private individuals should not own land, then I disagree with that. If the idea of leasing is that it is a way to prevent a windfall profit to the purchaser of lower-cost lands, there are other ways of doing that through restrictive covenants on the title. There may be arguments for leasing in the long run in theory, but these are outweighed for the moment by the practical problems and the feeling in our society about the importance of land ownership as the one main investment chance of the ordinary person.

Growth impinges heavily on the question of transportation in the lower mainland area. I won't get into that general subject at this time except to reiterate to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) what so many others have said to him before: the regional district must have a central role in the planning of transportation facilities no matter who is to actually operate them. This planning must be done in the light of public scrutiny and information.

In 1974 it's just not good enough that the public's money is being used to pay for the development of all kinds of information that then will not be made available to the public in advance of the decision-making so that their voice can be heard. Once governments have made their plans, consultation tends to be a sham; it has to be guaranteed in advance; I hope the Minister will make this one of his guiding stars as he enters into this tricky area.

There are ways of letting the public into transportation discussions without giving the speculators a profit from that knowledge. I have no doubt some of these methods have been drawn to the Minister's attention. They should be used.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a specific transportation problem related to my own riding: the rising demand for persons and goods to get across Burrard Inlet to and from the North Shore. I want to set a particular context for this discussion because the issue has too often been clouded as being one of commuter traffic. The major solution to commuter traffic is transit. Let's agree with that quickly. In the short run it's buses and more buses, and further along it will be rapid transit.

Transportation was the major local issue in the just-finished by-election. That is so because the people of North Vancouver have a very good perspective on just what the transportation problem is all about. They have lots of time to sit in the traffic and think about it, Mr. Speaker. Some call the First Narrows Bridge the longest parking lot in the world.

It's a regional problem. The North Shore transportation has great implications not only for local purposes but for the City of Vancouver, for the Sunshine Coast, for the Whistler–Pemberton Valley recreation area and the Interior of our province.

Let's look at the factors governing demand for crossing capacity.

First, there is the local population. This population is growing. Estimates range from something like 140,000 now to 200,000 in 1985 — 11 years away. That forecast may even be low if there are pressures for the North Shore to accept a higher rate of growth than it has in the past. I ask how we could make that contribution to ease the general growth problem unless adequate transportation is available?

So point 1 is the growing demand that local population growth causes. This may be reduced to the extent more people obtain work on the North Shore, more people in each car, better transit facilities.

Secondly, the question of the area population. The worst tie-ups now on the Lions Gate Bridge occur on the weekends when ordinary citizens from all over the lower mainland are out sightseeing or travelling to the recreational areas, which mostly requires crossing the inlet, or shopping, visiting friends or whatever it is. That population is growing too. With it is a traffic demand that isn't much relieved by transit.

Then there is the regular through traffic; the passenger and commercial traffic bound to some destination either north or south of the downtown business area. Fifty per cent of the people crossing the First Narrows Bridge aren't bound for the downtown area at all and transit won't solve that problem.

Then there is the component of all the people bound up through the Sunshine Coast. That traffic is probably growing 15 per cent a year. The Interior traffic; once the route through Pemberton is paved, it could cut off 100 miles of the current route through the Fraser Canyon. It would be an attractive circle route to tourists.

This kind of thing I think is going to change all the traffic planning for the third crossing. I say that the government should make no decisions until it has traffic forecasts for this portion of the demands and has made those forecasts available for public study.

Then there's the additional factor of the crossing traffic demand for the carriage of commercial industrial goods, as more industry grows on the North Shore.

Mr. Speaker, these points add up to a major rise in demand for Burrard Inlet crossing capacity, and a demand that is not related to commuter traffic. No third crossing decision should be made until that's

[[Page 290](#)]

added to the debate. In particular, I very much deplore and am sad at the action of the budget cancelling the Burrard Inlet crossing fund, diverting it into transit purposes.

In large part this is an irrelevant sleight-of-hand because funds are going to be needed for both purposes. But it also represents a prejudgment on the part of the government about the form the third crossing should take — that is, no provision for vehicles. I believe they are going to back off that judgment for strictly regional needs even if they are not prepared to do it for the hard-working, tax-paying citizens of the North Shore.

Let's look at the economics of it. Just about everybody seems to be agreed that commuter requirements are going to make a rapid transit third crossing necessary sometime in the next decade or 15 years, or 20 years, or 25 — eventually, that's the point. But it would be madness to build a rapid transit crossing without vehicle provision too — because of the simple economics.

The point is that when you sink any kind of a caisson down in your tunnel section, it doesn't vary your price very much if you sink down a wide section with some traffic lanes in it or a narrow section with just room for rapid transit. The cost is not going to vary too much. So if you built a transit tunnel, that will cost you \$71 million,

according to the recent figures; and if you add six lanes of traffic, that costs you another \$52 million to get across the inlet.

In other words, for another 70 per cent you get vehicle facilities as well for all that through traffic, even if all the commuters ride the rapid transit. That would have to connect with the proposed Thurlow tunnel in Vancouver, perhaps one that would carry only through traffic, thereby removing thousands of vehicles every day off the Vancouver streets plus the regular North Shore approaches.

This removal of vehicles from the Vancouver streets by this plan often isn't appreciated. It would amount to 70,000 vehicles a day; that would make a great contribution to Vancouver. And if it was just through traffic, it should be paid for by the province; and that's the kind of package we should look at.

On the financial side, building a transit crossing only would be a heavier burden to the transit rider and to the province. The original scheme hopefully would still have a chance at federal financing to be paid out of tolls. That means that the vehicle traffic would be almost completely paying the cost of the rapid transit crossing out of tolls. That has to be considered the big plus, and the way we should be going in the allocation of transportation costs.

Mr. Speaker, I make these points today not in the expectation of changing the government's mind at once, but in the hope that they will continue to reassess the situation, to get new information and to take these arguments into account.

The regional travel patterns have changed the question entirely. There's no doubt that a third crossing will be built eventually. Let's have the most useful one we can get, properly planned, financed by federal government, federal money and the motorist rather than the transit rider. That should be the approach we should take.

There is one local transportation question on which I believe and hope we can get much more rapid agreement, and that's the idea of a ferryboat system across the inlet. What we have here is short-term help that can buy us time for the long-term planning. It would also give immediate assistance to the North Shore commuter.

Studies of the previous ferry service, 1968 to 1971, have established pretty conclusively that this is something that would be used by the North Shore commuter. This is particularly the case when arrangements are made for the coordination of the ferry service with public transportation routes on the North Shore — with proper bus routing and, most importantly, with the provision of a transfer from the bus system across the ferry link. This is something we can get going right away and expand to continually take up the commuter load until the long-term solution of a cross-inlet, rapid transit link can be built.

Mr. Speaker, "the possibility of immediate" does mean right now. Most of the needed work has been done. Hydro knows what would be necessary in terms of altered bus routes, and the ferries are available. Capacity exists for 1,500 passengers an hour — peak load. All that needs to be done is negotiation of terms and the fixing of the fare, which on past experience would certainly be acceptable to the rider, and how it would tie in with the Hydro transfer privilege and what would be the arrangements with the ferry owners.

It could be operating in a matter of weeks, and it could provide the cheapest crossing facility of any kind. The travel time would be under 12 minutes. It's a pleasant way to travel.

For the longer term Hydro might want to build its own ferries and get a start on that quickly. Schedules might be expanded from the initial peak-hour operation. Tourist traffic might be picked up in the summer. The possibilities are tremendous; we can start out right now. That capacity of 1,500 passengers per hour would take a lot of cars and buses off the First Narrows this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shipboard romances.

MR. GIBSON: Shipboard romances. It's a great opportunity and it buys time — even if the addition of further ferries is needed, probably at the cost of three-quarters of a million to \$1 million each, if the Golden Gate ferry service is any guide. These ones

provide a 1,200-per-hour capacity each. So let's get started this spring, Mr. Speaker.

I'll deal with another local matter briefly. It has implications for provincial policy generally because it's the question of the Indian cutoff lands on Capilano Reserve No. 5 in the Capilano riding.

Many Members will know the history of the cutoff lands generally. It's one of the most iniquitous in the history of our dealings with the Indian people. At the time of Confederation certain B.C. lands were set aside for Indian reserves. Unlike most of Canada, these weren't covered by treaty but rather were unilateral government allocations.

In 1912 the then B.C. government decided that some Indians had too much land. They were able to convince the federal government to establish a joint commission. The agreement establishing that commission, and many subsequent undertakings to the Indians, provided that the lands should be taken or cut off only with the Indian consent. Many hearings were held and in due course, pursuant to new federal and provincial legislation, lands were cut off without Indian consent.

In the Capilano reserve this amounted to 132 acres. The land was transferred to the province; most of this land is still held by the province. Certain of it must obviously be retained in its present use: the rights-of-way for the Lions Gate Bridge and the British Columbia Railway, the sewage plant and the park provisions for West Vancouver. Fair arrangements can be made for this. The balance should be returned to the Indians post-haste.

The federal government has long since agreed that this is proper. The Indian band has had one meeting with the government and received no satisfaction and little sympathy. Requests for a further meeting have been ignored.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of treatment which had led in the past to the feeling of bitterness of the Indian people. It's precisely the kind of attitude towards a grievance of small groups that in the end leads to the downfall of governments. I'll return to this subject on future occasions.

As a final topic, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have reference to the ownership of British Columbia land by foreigners. I notice that one or two speakers have mentioned the matter in this debate; I hope what this means is that this is an idea whose time has come. This is a fight I've been engaged in on the federal and provincial scene for several years. When we talk about foreign control of our economy, it's critical we should understand that land is not only the most basic of all our resources, it's also the simplest case by far to deal with.

When a foreigner brings investment and causes the construction of works and the creation of employment, he may or may not be putting a net benefit into the Canadian economy. The simple purchase of land, however, confers no such benefit and should be denied to foreigners.

Why should this be? This isn't out of any dislike for foreigners — particularly not Americans, who are the largest purchasers by far. Nor is the fact that some other countries, including the U.S., impose no such restrictions at all relevant. Our problems are different in scale. If every Canadian bought one acre of prime U.S. land, we would own under 0.5 per cent of the United States. But if every American bought one acre of prime Canadian land they would own over 10 per cent of our good land. Difference of scale.

If the foreign purchase of land adds nothing to Canada, it does take away things; it does have negative effects. The first of these is the driving up of the level in the price of Canadian land. If more money is bidding for the same supply, that's the natural effect. In some areas this had had dramatic and disastrous effects.

We are literally being bid out of our own patrimony, particularly in terms of vacation lands. We simply can't afford to pay in many cases the prices that foreigners can afford. Our economy isn't that wealthy. One of the advantages of being a Canadian is access to relatively close, low-cost recreational land. And we are allowing ourselves to be priced out of that market.

The second negative effect is that windfall profits on land are vexing enough even when they're in the hands of Canadians. But in the hands of foreigners it's to me completely intolerable. The value of land is created by its natural advantages, plus the activities of people around it. Almost all of those people are Canadians. Increase in the value of any Canadian land should be kept in Canada.

So what should be the programme? Step one should be the registration of the beneficial national ownership of every piece of British Columbia land with no hiding behind trusts or corporate names.

The shocking thing is that we don't know how much of our land is foreign-owned. We have reason to believe, from registration in the Maritime provinces and the continuing examples that one hears, that it is extensive. So step 2 should be the passage of legislation declaring that land transfer henceforth will be a one-way street, and that any sale, whether by a Canadian or the Crown or a foreigner, would be allowed only to a Canadian or a landed immigrant. Thus we would gradually repatriate our land in the long term, and in the short term prices on much of our land would soften, although I doubt whether there would be any actual decline. The province may have to get together with the federal government on this because the constitutional situation is unclear, but we must act quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I've said my piece for today. I'm honoured and delighted to be here. We live in a very

[[Page 292](#)]

great province. We have great opportunities for human progress and social reform and happiness for all our citizens. I'm proud to have the opportunity to help to work for these things. In British Columbia we should be positive, because we have so much to be positive about. I believe we have to keep it that way through a reliance in the individual, in private initiative, and in encouragement of the finest instincts of humankind.

I thank the House for its generous reception of me today.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): I would like at this time to congratulate the new Member for North Vancouver–Capilano for his very fine speech. Certainly I think that he covered a variety of topics that are extremely important, and he did an excellent job of presenting them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very anxious to get in a few words during this budget debate and, of course, I'm very proud to be representing the constituency of Omineca. Omineca encompasses one of the most beautiful areas of this Province of British Columbia. Although I have only resided there about eight years, I think that of all the homes I've had it is indeed the one that I intend to spend the rest of my days at, because it is home to me and the people there are very friendly and I really do love living in Omineca.

I'm very encouraged, Mr. Speaker, over our New Democratic government's first budget. After all, when you spend half-a-billion dollars more than the previous one, it couldn't help but be impressive. Our Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), who brought in this great budget, has used much thought in the spending and I commend him on his foresight. In fact, he will be the Premier of this province for a very long time if he continues to bring in budgets like this one.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): Send him a box of McIntosh reds.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): I'll agree that two years is a very long time.

MR. KELLY: I'm extremely impressed with the budget for the Housing department. I may not receive very much of the benefit of this in my riding, but who knows? (Laughter.) We might receive some of the benefit, and although we are a sparsely populated riding we are in the throes of great expansion. We find that there has been a tremendous turnover in the labour force up there because there is not available accommodation for the people who want to go up there and work in that part of the country.

MR. McGEER: We'll try and send the Premier up there.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

MR. KELLY: Anyway, it is my belief that if we were to build good, well-planned trailer parks in the centre in my riding we could, in fact, encourage a lot of people to come and live there permanently. In the north the mobile home is a way of life, and with more strict regulations on the construction of these trailers so that they are being better made, they will stand up to harsher winters, and a trailer home is actually a desirable thing to live in. I intend one day myself to live in a trailer home. I'm not talking about single-width, of course. When it comes to the hard weather conditions and the time you have to build a home up in that country, the trailer home is the only thing to have. I expect that in the very near future we will have large communities in the area strictly in trailer homes. That will be the way to live.

I have been in some of these large trailer parks, especially in the United States, and, my goodness, you couldn't find anything finer as far as community planning is concerned. If they have the forethought put into them they can have recreation halls and everything else built right into these parks.

If there is any housing that is going to be programmed by the municipalities in my riding I would urge that our Minister (Hon. Mr. Nicolson) give all assistance possible to those people to get into the housing business, because we are short of homes, and the cost of building a home up north is extremely high.

I don't know whether that Minister would be able to supply funding for domestic water services. Go to the Cariboo — you don't even have to go to Omineca — go to the Cariboo and there are many hundreds of homes that don't have a domestic water supply or any form of running water. As I have mentioned at previous times, there are children who grow into adults who have never known running water in their homes. I have some of those same types of homes in very small communities near where I live, and I would like to urge the Housing branch to assist these people in putting in community water wells and supplying these homes with domestic water.

As it is, the local garage in my hometown is the supplier of water. If you go down for a tank of gas you pick up a barrel or two of water, and if it is 30 or 40 degrees below zero you can imagine what the conditions are. The tanks are half frozen solid by the time they get home and then they have to have a trailer or something to manhandle this barrel of water off them and into their homes. In fact, in many instances people even today melt snow for domestic water consumption up near where I live.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Do they charge for the water?

MR. KELLY: No, they'll give it to them.

[[Page 293](#)]

We have a real expansion programme outlined for northwestern B.C. This also includes part of my riding, and I can assure you that the people are very pleased with what our government is planning for them.

Burns Lake is one of the areas, and it is just bustling with what is going to happen in the new stage 4 of our development programme for north-central British Columbia. It is a real shot-in-the-arm for them because for many years they have been depressed, business-wise. They did have a sawmilling industry there and it folded up on the creation of Bulkley Valley, and that was a fiasco which was endorsed by the previous administration. They took all the business out of Burns Lake and for many years now they have had no financial base whatsoever. So this has been a real boon to them, and they are only too anxious to get going on this project, because it has been a long time,

When we get into this expansion programme I'm very anxious that the Ministers involved — and the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) especially — will allow the local people to have the input into these industries, because we have a history up in central British Columbia of badly built factories, sawmills and what-have-you, poorly constructed for the north country, poorly constructed for the materials that they were going to sawmill. Indeed, if they are going to do any construction in that country they should depend on a lot of input from the local people.

They know what the score is, and there would be none of these fiascos where tens of millions of dollars are lost to companies. And who owns the companies? The people with shares in them.

These companies go in there with all the good intentions, only to wind up bankrupt a few years later with, as I said, tens of millions of dollars short. Not only that, when that happens what happens to the royalties expected to be returned to the province? They, too, are short because they haven't harvested the materials that should have been harvested while they were either broken down or shut down because of bankruptcy.

I've heard there's a possibility of some towns being built up north. They probably won't be very big. They might have to be mobile towns, towns that could be moved around. This is where the mobile home comes in again. Certainly if there are communities to be built in the north, I think the people who live up there should really be the ones to say where these homes should be built.

MR. PHILLIPS: There's a lot of Non-Status Indians up there.

MR. KELLY: Well, they have to live somewhere too, Mr. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do they share in the resources up there?

MR. KELLY: I'm very pleased, of course, with the budget speech about the reforestation programme. This year we have a budget of almost \$13 million for reforestation. Well, I'd like to read you a paragraph out of the 1971 budget the former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) passed in the 1971 session:

"British Columbia is presently planting 25 million trees at a cost of \$3.5 million as a part of a five-year programme to plant 75 million trees by 1975 with a budget of \$10 million. This goal, of course, only takes care of the current needs."

And so on.

He said they expected to go to \$10 million in a five-year programme. Here we are only three years later and we have a \$13 million programme. Truly, even that isn't adequate but at least we're going in the right direction. We will have an abundant forest tree planning programme in the very near future.

MR. CHABOT: Socialist extravagance.

MR. PHILLIPS: You sure cut them down with your state capitalism.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite alarmed at what's happening concerning the Nechako Reservoir. There has been some cleanup done on this reservoir by the Bond Brother operation in Vanderhoof, and they sawmill what there is in commercial wood that they salvage out of that lake. They only pay salvage rates, of course, but it has been a very excellent operation.

Considering that there was approximately 85,000 acres of drowned timber showing above the surface of the water and the rate they're harvesting at, which is probably 1,000 acres a year, you can see the length of time that is going to be involved in trying to harvest this drowned timber. I'm extremely alarmed about this because some day we're going to have to clean this lake up and it's got to be in the very near future.

In 1972 the former administration went into a programme of attempting to clear a portion of this lake up. At the rate that that little episode cost, it would cost literally tens of millions to clear up the drowned forest in the Nechako Reservoir.

Well, I object to the people of this province having to pay these large sums to clear up this mess. It certainly wasn't the previous administration that was responsible for it; it was, I believe, the former alliance of the Liberals and Conservatives. I suppose in their desperation to get some business into this province they allowed this whole fiasco to take place. It is the mess of the century as far as I'm concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: They're both sitting together over there.

MR. KELLY: This was done in the name of progress. The progress has been that the company which owns it now makes, and has made, millions of dollars in profit. They paid a nominal sum to the government of the day and a later payment of \$250,000 for the privilege of drowning a very large portion of this province. If a large corporation such as that one, making so much money, couldn't in all reasoning see themselves clear to put a little bit of that profit back into cleaning that reservoir up, well then, I don't think they're really much of a company.

MR. CHABOT: Kick them out, kick them out.

MR. KELLY: I think they should be obliged to put a nominal portion of their profits back in to clean up that reservoir. If they don't, the taxpayers of this province are going to have to pay for it. I think, in fact, that legislation should be designed to make them clean it up. I think this legislation should force them to clean up that reservoir. After all, they've had the free water out of it all the years they've been there and until the year 2000. With the profits they'll get out of that in the end, it just isn't right morally that they should continue without making some effort to clean up this reservoir.

If they don't clean it up, and if it isn't possible to pass this kind of legislation, then I would suggest that this reservoir should be drained, at least partly. The drowned timber surrounding this reservoir is showing through just on the edges. At least you could go out far enough to remove these trees. It would be a lot less expensive than it is at the present with the way they're dropping this tackle down each tree to shear it off at the bottom. It's making it very expensive. This is the way I feel about it. The sooner we get after them and remind them of their responsibilities the better off they'll be in the eyes of the people of this province and in everybody else's eyes.

It's certainly unsafe to navigate a boat through there. About four years ago, five people were drowned in that reservoir. Nobody said it was a tree but I don't think anybody would disagree that it wasn't one of these drowned trees that sunk that boat. Five people perished; a terrible expense, when you think of it, just in human lives.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to speak once more about wildlife in my riding.

MR. PHILLIPS: Wolves?

MR. KELLY: I have spoken about it before and, as the Hon. Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) said, we might be wearing these issues a little thin but how do you get any response if you don't bring it up in this House?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's right. Keep at them!

MR. KELLY: You know I was truly under the illusion that when our government came into power we were really going to see some real top management as far as wildlife was concerned.

MR. PHILLIPS: However!

MR. GARDOM: But!

MR. KELLY: No, I don't use those words.

Well, this hasn't happened as far as I'm concerned. We've had improvements and lots of them, but they don't relate to the things I consider important in my riding.

I think that we have to institute a programme right now to prevent the further slaughtering of our diminishing herds of moose and deer, at least in Omineca. If we don't, we're going to have to institute a programme that will take years to bring these herds of animals back to where they should be.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Jack must go.

MR. KELLY: There's a news item here in *The Vancouver Sun* of December 12, 1973, and the headline is,

"Big Game Bag Up in B.C."

MR. PHILLIPS: Even the animals are deserting the ship!

MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, it says that the hunters bag an average of 21 per cent more game and generally things were much better. But you know, Mr. Speaker, the way they got these figures was a little bit of a twist as far as I was concerned.

In 1973, there was a 24-hour check station open at Cache Creek, and this is where they got their figures from. But in 1972 and 1971 that check station was only open 16 hours a day. There were eight hours a day when there was no count of any animals coming through there. I can assure you that many hunters go through the Cache Creek check station heading for Vancouver and other points in the middle of the night.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fly-by-nights.

MR. KELLY: Well, many of them have to get to their jobs in Vancouver and other places, and this is what's going on.

I say that the figure the game branch is using as being an excellent year in fact has no relationship at all to what is actually happening. The fact was that

[[Page 295](#)]

there were several hundreds or thousands more hunters, and naturally the pressure was on. Anyway, there hasn't been any change in wildlife in my area and they shortened the season.

As far as the antlerless animals were concerned, I don't think my Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Radford) has listened to anybody. I've had representation from every wildlife organization in my area; from the big game guides, (how do you like it) from conservation officers, from farmers, ranchers, from Indians — poor old Indians. He won't listen to them.

You know, the Indians' lives depend on this. Many of them live in the built-up areas and work just the same as anybody else in the community and don't depend on game. But you know that I have several hundreds of Indians in my area that eat moose meat year-round, because they live in such remote areas of this province.

MR. PHILLIPS: Now they're starving.

MR. KELLY: Well, some of them are pretty upset because of the number of animals available, because there aren't those animals available.

MR. PHILLIPS: Maybe they've all moved to Alberta.

MR. KELLY: The Indian doesn't have a meat market down around the corner or up the lane, or any place else. He usually has to get out and, if he lives in a remote area, he has to walk out to hunt his game. He cuts it up and drags it back to his home. He has no freezer. There is no power. Not only does he not own a freezer; there's no power. So in most of these cases, these people living in these remote areas must have meat, fresh meat.

The average white hunter can go up into that country; he'll buzz out of town here and 10 or 15 hours later he's 600 or 700 miles away. He can maybe, by driving up some back road, be fortunate enough to drop a moose, or maybe even two. In a few hours he's got it loaded on and he might be on his way back into Vancouver.

But the case of the average native is that he's footbound. He doesn't have a car to jump into or a motorcycle. He's got to walk around. Especially if he's close to his reserve or his home in the hinterland, he just doesn't have the opportunity to walk those three, five or eight miles into the bush to obtain a moose. It's too far on foot.

I think that the Minister has really got to listen to the Indians. He's got to have to take them into his

confidence.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: More money spent on the hunter.

MR. KELLY: He's got to listen to these people and I think that he's got to adjust the game Act to accommodate Indians.

The fact is that right today there are Indians that have been prosecuted for killing game, and I would say that these people actually really need this meat. There is no question whatsoever that these people do need fresh meat. In fact how do you think, for example, that Fort Ware, we'll say Fort Ware.... I phoned there a week ago to talk to them about one issue or another.

I tried to get a plane in there, and there hasn't been a plane in there for the last week because of weather conditions. But for heaven's sake, there hasn't been a plane in there for a month before that, I found out yesterday. Those people get their food in in the middle of the summer by barge, by river-boats, and that's it. From then on they depend on the meat right in the area where they're living for the rest of the year. Because they're able to get lots of fresh meat those people are reasonably healthy, and so are their children.

Interjection.

MR. KELLY: No, they live right there and they're handy to this meat because the white man's pressure hasn't driven all the game out of the country. They can go right to the river and fish right in front of their reserve, and catch lots of fish because, of course, it hasn't been fished out like everywhere else that the white man seems to impose himself.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any wolves up there?

MR. KELLY: You know, on many of the existing reserves there is not sufficient land to accommodate the amount of game that is required by the Indians that live on these reserves. After all, an Indian can hunt on a reserve any time of the year. But in these postage-stamp-sized reserves, of course, the game that there is is either hunted out or driven off.

Then in many instances the roads have been built in close to these reserves, and with more transportation by the white hunter coming in with his four-wheel drive and what have you, that even makes it a little sparser.

I'm of the opinion that the Minister of Recreation and Conservation has to allow a certain portion of land around these reserves to be a filtering strip, we'll say, where white hunters can't go in, so that the game will filter through and go into these reserves. We've been encouraging the Indians to live on the reserves. We want them to stay there. Apparently we have no place else for them in society. So I think that because of this we have to make these kinds of conditions available to them.

I've asked the Minister of that game department to

[[Page 296](#)]

close the antlerless season for a trial period in Game Management Area 22. I did this at the urging of the Nechako Valley Conservation Association, and this association has a record second to none for conservation in this province.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Would he do it? No sir!

MR. KELLY: You know, I was even impressed by the guides. I thought the guides would all be down on me because, of course, it looked like I might be cutting into their business. But there was a guide on Quesnel radio the other day, apparently on a lengthy programme in the morning, and he was an advocate of the antlerless season — at least for a trial period. As I said before, conservation officers support me on this.

Apparently there's a programme on the TV where a small pack train.... I don't know how many people there

were, but they were able to film part of this thing. They took a 350-mile ride by horseback through the Cariboo somewhere and they apparently were going through good game country. They went 350 miles and they saw three deer. Nothing's wrong, but they saw three deer.

MR. PHILLIPS: They didn't put their glasses on.

MR. KELLY: We don't have any predator control. We used to have. The man that's still the predator man in Prince George told me personally that he was credited with killing 10,000 wolves. Sounds like he's from Texas, but this is the kind of bait that he put out. It was done from the air and these were cyanide baits, and they killed 10,000 wolves; that was his estimate — conservatively.

MR. PHILLIPS: What year was that?

MR. KELLY: Well, it was only stopped about four or five years ago, I think.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver–Little Mountain): The Conservatives.

MR. PHILLIPS: And now he has 40,000 more.

MR. KELLY: They haven't had any control since that I know of. The only time they'll send the predator man out now is when you complain personally, and in most cases they'll tell you that "Well, we think you're being a little irrational," or "there's just something wrong with your eyesight," or something to that effect.

In fact, a man in the Peace River was told that he was the predator, and the agricultural committee heard that this spring. I'm not saying that out of the top of my hat; there were several people that heard that remark. So how can you possibly deal with a game branch that is acting in that method? I want good game management. I think the Minister of Recreation and Conservation wants good game management, but he must listen to the people in the areas that are concerned.

It is with these words that I urge our government to consider the following:

That an all-party committee be struck, from this Legislature, to look into fish and game and its management in British Columbia.

That in the interim, appointees be selected from the game clubs in our province to work along with the Wildlife Branch to help manage our wildlife.

I also urge that on the recommendations of the agricultural committee — and I know there'll be resistance to this, but as far as I'm concerned it's the only way out — that predator control in agricultural areas should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. That was one of the recommendations of the agricultural committee.

Interjections.

MR. KELLY: I listened to the Minister speak on the leg-hold trap in his throne speech debate, and I was terribly disappointed, terribly disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. KELLY: No. 1, I know that he doesn't know anything about the leg-hold trap.

MR. CHABOT: He knows it now. (Laughter.)

MR. KELLY: To suggest that a trap set wrongly is painful to an animal to me is ludicrous. Any animal that is caught in any trap and is not killed within seconds is, indeed, in utter agony. A trap that isn't properly set will not catch any animal because it was probably not located in a proper location for conventional trapping in the first place, and it couldn't possibly catch an animal.

The money that was donated for research work on humane traps, as far as I was concerned, was a farce: just a pittance of what should have been committed into research on trapping. I think the amount of money that was contributed to help retired trappers design a successful humane trap is also beyond comprehension. That's fine; there are a lot of these fellows who have traps almost completed or almost designed and only need perfecting. Well then, of course, we should have stepped in a long time before this to assist these people.

For example, at a recent taxpayers' meeting in Terrace I find that the Humane Trappers Association is trying to get the trappers to use experimental traps that have been designed by these people who are

[[Page 297](#)]

trying to get a humane trap perfected. Why, for heaven's sake, are they obliged to do this? The government of British Columbia should be doing this. Are we trying to do away with the leg-hold trap or aren't we?

The fact that the federal-provincial committee on leg-hold traps doesn't include one trapper tells me that we can expect years of study, red tape and talk, as you referred to in your speech, and it is just going to be another stall job that nobody's really going to answer. I'll be an old man before I see the leg-hold trap banned.

MR. PHILLIPS: You've got a lot of years left yet, Doug.

MR. KELLY: British Columbia should lead Canada out of this age of cruelty to our fur-bearing animals, and the time is now.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): You've got too many city Members.

MR. KELLY: Our Minister (Hon. Mr. Radford) should hire the B.C. Research Council or some other agency to construct a humane trap now. This agency could take advantage of all the present humane-trap technology that has been gathered today and come up with an answer to our present problems. The time to get started is now.

Even a mouse trap is a humane trap, and you can buy the thing for 10 or 20 cents, and it has probably been designed by some housewife in her spare time. (Laughter.) Well, it could have been.

Why should we be so bogged down in this space age when it comes to constructing a humane trap. It could be done now, and I am anxious that this Minister will really take the bull by the horns and get on with the job.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Cocke moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Presenting petitions.

MR. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition. It is a petition of the City of Vancouver praying for the passage of an Act intituled *An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter*.

Mr. Speaker, I move the rules be suspended and the petition of the City of Vancouver be received.

Motion approved.

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition. It is a petition of the British Columbia School Trustees Association praying for the passing of an Act intituled *An Act to Amend the British Columbia School Trustees' Association Incorporation Act*.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and the petition of the British Columbia School Trustees Association be received.

Motion approved.

Motions and adjourned debates on motions.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Motion 9 standing in my name on the order paper (see appendix).

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for South Okanagan (Mr. Bennett) that the motion of the Hon. Premier be amended by adding, after the word "necessary" in the last line, the following words: "but that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House forthwith for the purpose of providing the special committee, before its review, prior benefit of a discussion by Members of the Legislative Assembly on assessment procedures."

MR. SPEAKER: There is no provision for that that I can think of in the rules. There certainly is for moving an amendment, but to dissolve the House into a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of discussing a motion when....

MR. McCLELLAND: No, Mr. Speaker, not to discuss the motion but to discuss the problems of assessment so that the House can then report to the committee so that the committee will have a better knowledge of the subject for which it has been called.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll accept the motion because it is one that the House can deal with in its own way, whatever way it chooses. I find it a little puzzling.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, if I could just speak briefly to the amendment. I don't want to keep the House either, but many of the Members, in fact I would say virtually every Member in this House, has been receiving information from the Members' constituents about special problems which have relation to assessment procedures since the passage of Bill 71. I suggest that all of these Members should be given the opportunity to pass on to the committee through a Committee of the Whole House that kind of information. The committee can't operate successfully without that kind of information. And for that reason I move that amendment.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am confused by the official opposition's position. I

[[Page 298](#)]

understood before the House met, on numerous radio broadcasts, and as recently as last Saturday night, the Leader of the Opposition was espousing this House committee could do the very thing that it is set out to do. Now the Member wants this House, which is against the whole purpose of the all-party committee....

Each individual Member can come before the committee. When we are trying to go about the thing through a committee as wanted by the House, then we find that you don't want the committee to have it but the whole House, well, I don't understand.

The committee must report to the House by the end of the session. Surely to goodness at that time everything that hasn't been held in the committee is available to the Members. But the opposition has changed its mind again, Mr. Speaker.

We reject the amendment. We're going to the all-party committee.

Amendment negatived.

Motion approved.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald presents the reports of the Special Committee on Selection appointed on January 31, 1974 (see appendix).

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to add to that the list of names that have been agreed upon, as far as I can make out, by all parties in the House for the personnel of the special committee which we have just approved. That will be the standing committees and the special committee; the list of names. I beg leave to present that report.

Leave granted.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I presented the report, but now I move that it be adopted so that those names will be the personnel of those committees.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

ERRATUM

Page 203, column 1, line 44 should read
my constituency. For example, in the Fort Babine

Page 203, column 1, line 51 should read:
between Kitimat and Kitamaat village. I would make an appeal here today

Page 203, column 1, line 58 should read:
from that Indian village. Kitamaat village is one of the

[[Page 299](#)]

APPENDIX

The following motion is referred to on page 297:

That a Special Committee be appointed to review assessment procedures in British Columbia with particular emphasis on making recommendations to the House before the end of this Session respecting new assessment legislation, and, in order to assist its deliberations this Committee shall examine existing legislation that bears upon the assessment function at the Provincial and municipal levels:

That the Special Committee appointed under Standing Order 68 be instructed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of members to compose the Special Committee appointed by this resolution:

And that the Special Committee appointed by this resolution be empowered to send for persons, papers, and records, and to hear representations from such organizations and individuals as may, in their discretion, appear necessary.

The following report is referred to on page 298:

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Special Committee appointed January 31 to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House for the present Session begs to report and recommend that the personnel of the Select Standing Committees of the House for the present Session, and for the Special Committee on Assessments, be

as follows:

STANDING ORDERS AND PRIVATE BILLS — Messrs. *G.H. Anderson, Cummings, Dent, Gabelmann, Lewis, Steves*, the Hon. *Ernest Hall*, the Hon. *A.B. Macdonald*, Messrs. *Smith, Morrison*, and *Gardom*.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS — Messrs. *Cummings, Liden, Gorst, Nunweiler, Rolston, Skelly*, Mrs. *Webster*, the Hon. *Gary Lauk*, the Hon. *Phyllis Young*, Messrs. *Fraser, Bennett, Morrison, McGeer*, and *Curtis*.

AGRICULTURE — Messrs. *G. H. Anderson, Cummings, D'Arcy, Kelly, Lewis, Liden*, the Hon. *David Stupich*, Mr. *Phillips*, Mrs. *Jordan*, Messrs. *Williams* and *Curtis*.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING — Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *D'Arcy, Liden, Nunweiler, Rolston*, Ms. *Sanford*, the Hon. *J.G. Lorimer*, the Hon. *L. Nicolson*, Messrs. *Phillips, Fraser, Williams*, and *Curtis*.

LABOUR AND JUSTICE — Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *G. H. Anderson, Barnes, D'Arcy, Dent, Gabelmann*, the Hon. *W.S. King*, the Hon. *A.B. Macdonald*, Messrs. *Smith, Richter*, and *D.A. Anderson*.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND HUMAN RESOURCES — Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *Barnes, Calder, Gabelmann, Rolston*, Mrs. *Webster*, the Hon. *D.G. Cocke*, the Hon. *Eileen*

[[Page 300](#)]

APPENDIX

Daily, the Hon. *Norman Levi*, Messrs. *McClelland, Schroeder*, Mrs. *Jordan*, Messrs. *Gibson* and *Wallace*.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS — Messrs. *Calder, Gorst, Kelly, Lockstead, Skelly, Steves*, the Hon. *W.L. Hartley*, the Hon. *Graham Lea*, the Hon. *R.M. Strachan*, Messrs. *McClelland, Schroeder, Gibson*, and *Wallace*.

ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES — Messrs. *Calder, Gorst, Liden, Lockstead, Skelly, Steves*, the Hon. *L. Nimsick*, the Hon. *J. Radford*, the Hon. *R.A. Williams*, Messrs. *Smith, Chabot, D.A. Anderson*, and *Wallace*.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENTS — Mr. *G.H. Anderson*, Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *Liden, Nunweiler*, the Hon. *G. Lauk*, the Hon. *J. Lorimer*, Messrs. *Steves, Fraser, McClelland, L.A. Williams*, and *Curtis*.

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