

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)

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 101](#)]

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Orders of the day.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND

THE INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Richter moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 17 intituled *An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 17 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege under Article 26 of our Rules. Mr. Speaker, as authority for the point of privilege may I refer you to the source used by this Legislature when our own Rules are not explicit, namely *Parliamentary Practice* by May, 18th Edition, page 143, paragraph 2, and pages 331, last paragraph, and 332, first paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the practice of the Executive in holding press conferences to announce statements of policy which should properly be made in this House. Mr. Speaker, that there is a precedent that this House, by consent, hear short policy statements from the Members of the Executive Council on matters of public interest was demonstrated as recently as Friday of last week.

Since that time two press conferences have been held, one dealing with the ports of Squamish and Britannia and one dealing with the price board for petroleum products. Both these statements of policy are a violation of the privileges of Members elected by the people to conduct provincial business.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, Hon. Member. Before you proceed, I didn't get the page number of May.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Page 143, para 2, and page 331, last paragraph; 332, first paragraph.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, we are assembled for the purpose of conducting public business, and the practice of holding press conferences on important matters outside this House, rather than by making a statement to the duly elected representatives of the people in this chamber, is an infringement of our privileges as Members and is in contempt of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances of a far-ranging debate such as a throne speech is, I feel it is all the more regrettable that the Executive is adopting this practice. Our opening speech suggested that we were to be called here together more often. But what is the use, Mr. Speaker, if even when called together under our present practices, the Legislature is ignored by the Executive?

Mr. Speaker, as this matter involves careful consideration of the authorities cited, I am not asking for a decision or ruling by you at this time. But I believe that this violation of our privileges should be considered and I am asking that you give your attention to it and, at your convenience, give a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be glad to entertain your point of privilege. I do point out, however, one variation that I will have to take into account in the rulings that are made in May. In their House, happily they have statements by Ministers at the beginning of each session and they also have question periods, neither of which we have in this House. So it would be out of order for a Minister normally to be making statements in this House unless he had the floor. Therefore I will have to take that into account. I mention it to you because it is a matter that I will have to discuss.

I will reserve my decision, in any event, if you will send the material up that you have gathered.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Right. I could read, if you wish, Mr. Speaker, the quotation from May which I believe supports....

MR. SPEAKER: Well I've got a note of it and I think it is well in hand. Thank you.

The Hon. Member for Esquimalt.

MR. J.H. GORST (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honour today to welcome to the legislative chamber the grade 9 class from Dunsmuir Junior Secondary of the Sooke School District in the riding of Esquimalt accompanied by their teachers, John Bergbusch and Bob Meikle. I hope they find the afternoon's proceedings interesting and educational and informative.

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

[[Page 102](#)]

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, concerns motion No. 1 which we debated just prior to the adjournment last evening and the amendment to that motion.

At the time the amendment was proposed to this House, it was moved by the Hon. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) and seconded by myself. Just immediately after the mover of the motion spoke, I rose to my feet to support the amendment and I was told that an amendment to a main motion does not have to be seconded.

MR. SPEAKER: Procedural only. That's an exclusionary one.

MR. SMITH: I would like to continue if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I don't think your point of order is well taken because that point of order, if you had one, should be taken up at the time the matter is disposed of by the House. You are now having an inquest and I don't think, in this case, we can. But if you air any suggestions of authorities that will aid the Speaker, I would be most appreciative if you would give them to me at our leisure. We don't need to prolong the debate on it now.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, surely I can raise a point of order in the House and I can refer in the House to specific instances in prior parliaments. We have referred to this particular matter....

MR. SPEAKER: Points of order must be taken up at the time and only at the time. In the circumstances, you did not raise that as a point of order when you should have and now you want to raise it today, after you've done your research. I suggest that if you have any research that contradicts the position I took, by all means make it available to me and I will try to remedy anything that you think is wrong. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: I will concede to your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and I will be presenting to you the evidence that I would wish to quote on the floor of the House, were I permitted to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly. Thank you.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

(continued)

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

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before getting into the substantive remarks that I have vis-à-vis His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor's speech, let me first say how disappointed I am in the official Opposition and the role that they have played in this throne speech debate. I was looking forward to some sort of rapier attack on the Government's approach. I was hoping to hear what they stood for — what their philosophy is. Instead, I heard what I would consider superficial criticisms.

The Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) tells us about the mass confusion over the Mincome advertising. We're sorry to hear about that — seriously, we are. But the old people in my riding, Mr. Speaker, are not confused. They know what it is to live under the Sacred largesse. The Social Credit Government gave them nothing but words and we gave them food, shelter and clothing. They will remember that. They weren't confused on August 30, Mr. Speaker, they're not confused now nor will they be on some future date of a provincial election.

The Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) gave the crushing thrust of the official Opposition attack as the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot), as is his wont, gingerly took up the rear.

With the exception of a refreshing but all-too-cute speech from the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) — there's impatience out there on the flood plains of Chilliwack now that you have made your maiden speech — all-too-cute speech as I say. Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition offered in debate nothing but unresearched, groundless accusations based on gut reaction and not reasoned argument. What's wrong with the research assistant you have? Why don't you let Danny do it for you? What a pitiful little group, Mr. Speaker — the remnants of a vaudeville act. All you need is a few cream pies and a few seltzer bottles to complete the image.

What happened to the once vibrant...

MR. PHILLIPS: That's wishful thinking my friend.

MR. LAUK: What happened to the once vibrant, populist party that brought this province into the '50's? What happened to it? A sad little troupe of characters, an intellectual desert, devoid of imagination, understanding or sense of purpose. What is your philosophy? Why do you now exist? All there is left is vindictiveness and bitterness.

I am disappointed in your performance.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LAUK: Rise up. Rise up, Social Credit. Roll on, Social Credit. What's happened to the Bennett team? What's happened to the Bennett team over there? In utter disarray. Where is your leader? Does he still sulk in his tent? The Hon. Liberal leader (Mr. D.A. Anderson) said he was on the high seas. I hope

[[Page 103](#)]

not with three sheets to the wind, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter).

Why not to complete your ignominious decline and choose for your leader the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot). He's after the leadership, Mr. Speaker. And as was said recently in the past, he wants it so badly his tongue is not only hanging out, it's tearing at the roots. That's right, that's right, my friends. The Hon. Member for Columbia River, Mr. Speaker, can stand up now and say: "The heavy hand of state socialism. I'm going to protect you, you people of British Columbia. Back of the hand treatment, back of the hand treatment from the heavy hand. You see, there's a red cloud above me and I can't see anything. Where are my notes?" (Laughter).

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): City-slicker lawyer.

MR. LAUK: I'm just a country boy. (Laughter). Just a country boy, trying to do my best, Mr. Speaker. All this for only one dollar, Mr. Speaker, one dollar. Hurry, hurry, hurry.

Well, you know...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LAUK: I think that the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, were a little more to the point. Except that we on this side of the House are a little confused as to what your position is on various issues. It sounds as if you're doing some reading and some research. And I, as a rookie, appreciate it very much, because at least we have something to listen to. We have a contrast in philosophy, assuming that the fuzzy philosophy that you have can be defined. But we would like to know what position you would take if you were government.

The Member for Vancouver-Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) doesn't know the details of the port at Britannia, and he's not prepared to wait for any study. He says, "Whatever it is, I'm against it."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LAUK: He's against it anyway.

The Liberal leader (Mr. D.A. Anderson) gave us his usual "golly, gee-whiz" style of speech picked carefully from his grab-bag of old school tie critiques. You know why the Liberals will never govern B.C., Mr. Speaker?

Interjection by some Hon. Members.

MR. LAUK: You just wait my friend, you wait. You'll hear policy as soon as I wrap up my criticism of the Opposition.

You know why the Liberals will never govern in this province, Mr. Speaker? Because every time the defence before we even have a chance to talk about it. However cynical the federal government gets, however stupid their decision, however selfish their decision, or however it militates against interests of the people of British Columbia, and that's why you'll never govern this province.

I think the Opposition Members of all parties should watch very carefully, Mr. Speaker...

MRS. JORDAN: Who's going for the leader of the socialists?

MR. LAUK: ...how the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) conducts himself and his representation in his riding. Watch carefully.

He and his backbencher... (Laughter). He and his backbencher, Mr. Speaker, have done more for their constituencies. They have come quietly to Ministers, they've been on the phone and the Member for Oak Bay has conducted himself in a gentlemanly way. He has come to conferences and meetings, offered suggestions without playing politics, as we know some other people do. He does not sabotage the real beneficial programmes of the Government. He provides us with a contrasting philosophy as well, but watch him carefully.

And I hope that I don't live to regret those remarks. (Laughter). I hope I don't.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LAUK: He already has, and you know full well, the Hon. Liberal leader.

I want to talk about the role of the five month old New Democratic Party Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: That won't take long.

MR. LAUK: The Government has brought us back into Confederation. That's been said before, I know. But it was not just the symbol or renaming our highways. It was the evident fact in this country that in British Columbia for the first time in many years there is a new cooperation — although with disagreements and some misunderstanding between the federal and provincial government.

We have recently had announced — and a large part of this effort of negotiation was on the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) — that the government will now share with us the cost of land banking in Vancouver and Victoria and, we hope, throughout the province, to bring about the stabilization of land speculation in some way and to assist us in our NDP efforts to bring about better public housing. The land banks — that's what I'm talking about — 75 per cent federal cost. This was largely due to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs who went there and negotiated that deal. There's cost-sharing.

[[Page 104](#)]

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) has negotiated cost-sharing agreements. We led the way, Mr. Speaker. We increased the old age security to a \$200 a month minimum income and now other provinces are following us. The federal government is supporting us, and I hope that this government will continue to lead in this social reform.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should in the House look to the future of cost-sharing arrangements. I can see cooperation on mass urban transit, on industrial development in this province. And it will succeed because there is no longer an empty chair for British Columbia in Ottawa.

Discussions, as I say, are and will be continuing. It is almost a re-negotiation of Confederation by all the provinces with the federal authorities. Because after the first 100 years we are now looking to the future. We're now thinking of the new problems of the urban man. And this re-negotiation of Confederation, I know, will give us renewed confidence in our future and a unity that we've never had before.

There was, Mr. Speaker, the historical meeting between the cabinet in British Columbia with Governor Dan Evans of Washington. A long overdue meeting, Mr. Speaker. A recognition that we are both partners in terms of our coast line. Those people in Washington were anxious to know what we looked like. They wanted to know who we are, and they're finding out. Our Premier brought us great distinction as British Columbians, Mr. Speaker, and he was greeted well by the people of Washington.

And just to show you what one meeting can do — we had an oil spill up the coast line, up Island here, and in

a split second the governor of Washington responded with whatever aid we needed without any question. Because he knows us now and he trusts us now, Mr. Speaker. Meetings with the Yukon leaders, with Alaska, have brought about a recognition that we are responsible neighbours, that we have a responsibility to the environment and to our coast line. And don't think for a moment that the Premier is not aware of our responsibility as a Pacific trading partner. These discussions and meetings and exchanges will continue.

There has been some remarks made about human rights. Some of the Members of the Opposition have stated that you cannot legislate morality or attitudes and I agree. Just as you do not eliminate murder, arson and rape by making them against the law.

But, you see, a human rights bill is a statement of society. It says that we in society oppose racial hatred and discrimination. We oppose discrimination on whatever grounds, based on race, creed, colour, political affiliation and so on. And I hope that the Human Rights Act as it develops and evolves in this province will include in it a statement under the department of human rights for the protection of our

[[Page 105](#)]

immigrants.

In my riding, Mr. Speaker, there are people from every ethnic origin and national origin. Let's not forget where we all come from. Let's not forget who made this country great. Let's not forget who fulfilled the national dream. My grandfather, Mr. Speaker, along with many other Polish, Chinese, German, Scots, drove spikes for old 374 prior to its chugging into Port Moody. And in those days the fulfillment of our national dream, our national unity, and passed down in my family was the old saying "Lord Strathcona drove the last spike but a million more were driven by Mike."

Let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, that these immigrants are still arriving in our country with hopes and dreams of a new life. And remember that they are Canada's children too. They deserve more, I think, than what they are getting now. They have the problems of settling in a new country and often they cannot speak our language. They need assistance, not only from the federal government but the provincial government. I would ask that this be taken into consideration in the future, and that we assist these people in assimilating and adapting to their new culture.

I want to say also that this government in the past five months has clearly demonstrated that it responds to people. The people of the North Shore have asked about the ferry terminal. The Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) answered. The people of the province asked about automobile insurance and that's going to be answered. Then don't tell me about competition in automobile insurance. They knew on August 30, the people of British Columbia, what competition there was in that industry. None. And you will find that the oil and gas review board revealed to the people of British Columbia what little competition there is in that industry.

There are dealers, the small businessmen which the NDP represent, Mr. Speaker, in my riding who have a great many complaints to make about the oil monopoly in this province. They are unequal wholesale prices. A large complex can get below what the average dealer gets as the wholesale price.

Talk to the retailer about promotions that eat away into his profits. Talk to him about the competition in the oil industry and you will get your answer. They will want something more than an oil review board eventually I can assure you. And I can see the day when this province soon gets into the field of wholesaling their own oil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal was said by the Opposition with respect to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. They said there was nothing in there to indicate what this Government was going to do in the future. I will read just one sentence. It's poetry, Mr. Speaker and you know poetry doesn't have to be long, it doesn't get paid by the word. It's poetry for those that have eyes to see and ears to hear with, and I quote: "The administrative and legislative programmes will be carefully designed and will be based on the clear necessity to plan our future, so that we may live in harmony with our environment and at peace with our fellow men, and to depart from the acquisitive North American values that have seen profligacy and waste on all sides."

Do you know there was in the 19th century a man by the name of Herbert Spencer who, to his misfortune, read a book by Charles Darwin. Charles Darwin at the time was saying that the reason the human race has survived so well was because it was the fittest species, or one of the fittest species. And that those species in our animal kingdom that do not do well and are not fit will not survive, but will perish.

Well, poor old Herbert Spencer thought that meant survival of the fittest among us, the human race. But history told us that it is not survival between human beings that Darwin was talking about. It is survival between species. The fittest species survives. And how has the human race survived? It has survived because it was able to help each other. Because most people, most of the time, recognize that we are our brother's keeper.

You know, we are told that we need more growth, we need to make things to sell, and sell and sell. The First Member from Point Grey said that we need 10 per cent a year. This is a fantastic challenge that is facing the new Government, 10 per cent growth a year. Maximum growth, Mr. Speaker, leads and will lead in the 1970's to disaster, to the destruction of our society.

I say to the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) that he has no vision, he has no vision of the future. He's betraying our future, because what about the next 20 or 30 years?

Profit through capitalism is a failure. It has given us perhaps 30 brands of toothpaste and 50 brands of automobiles. But it has also given us hollow empty lives. Where is the happiness in that, Mr. Speaker. What has happened to our goals as a society?

The loss of non-renewable resources is making it impractical to continue this vast 10 per cent a year growth pattern of which the First Member from Point Grey talks. These non-renewable resources won't go away if we leave them in the ground and negotiate a better deal — if we plan our economy, if we make sure there are jobs for British Columbians. We must protect ourselves. It is only when we are fair to ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that we can be fair to others.

Automation some day will either make us all unemployed, producing material wealth and services, or working perhaps one day a month. And the Hon. Member from Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) give us his concept of what a job is. Well, he is wrong. A job isn't a gift from some big daddy up in the sky who is going to give us a job and we should kiss the hem of his garment. That's not the concept of work. We must change our concept of work, Mr. Speaker.

You talk of some, I say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey who talks of some little challenge — a silly little challenge, called 10 per cent growth. Let's manufacture anything, an electric toothpick, as long as he can get that 10 per cent growth. What does it mean?

Well, I'm talking about a larger challenge, Mr. Speaker, and it is called survival.

Profit through capitalist expansion, as I say, in the face of diminish growth potential and loss of nonrenewable resources can lead only to our complete destruction as a society. And it is about time we in this Chamber opened our eyes and saw that fact.

We have an environment that we have to protect, because it leads to the basic fact that we must face in this part of the century. The quality of life. Not just the quality of our material wealth but the quality of our lives. Nowhere is this more evident, Mr. Speaker, than in the riding of Vancouver Centre where all the major problems of the 1970's are coming to roost and demonstrating themselves most clearly.

The overcrowding high density situation is critical. It is critical from many points of view. I can give examples of the problems that arise. In the west end there is the development concept of the past. I am glad to see that in Vancouver, perhaps, there is a new approach that will be taken by the city fathers, with the new government there now. But I will tell you that MLA's from Vancouver will be watching them very carefully.

Why is it that we cannot learn that sometimes leaving something alone will add to the quality of our lives? I

support most clearly the arguments that have been raised for not ripping down Christ Church Cathedral. That is in my riding. And if you went down there to Georgia and Burrard and looked around you could see tower after tower blocking out the sun, taking away our view, putting people in close proximity with one another for the greater part of their lives, and yet they want another tower.

I can see perhaps some reversal in that attitude of build, wreck down, rebuild, to something more planned, more humanistic. With this overcrowding I can see that there will be a new participation in all levels of government with transit.

Because what has become of our cities, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the automobile? We have built highways, we've built parking lots. I ask any one in this chamber to join me in trying to get home in my riding at 4:30 or 5 o'clock at night. It is a city for automobiles, not for people. And we are now moving towards a new goal to reclaim our city for people and that's where mass transit comes in — a staged

[[Page 106](#)]

development of mass transit. And I can see soon, cooperation of the three levels of government to bring about the staged development of mass transit so that we can eliminate the need of the automobile in the hard core of the city.

I am not talking about 50 years from now, I'm talking about five or 10 years. You will see this coming. The automobile will no longer take such a major importance in our economy. It is one-third of the average man's budget in the United States and probably more.

But the saddest part of what's happening to the city is the loss of community, the loss of human society. It leads to the very real social problems in my constituency and in other urban areas.

One of them is heroin addiction. There are 15,000 addicts in the City of Vancouver. They are our children. And I don't think that I could put it any better than what I read in this morning's *Vancouver Province*. You know the *Province* is improving; the *Province* is becoming a paper. Yes, read it again, read it again. It's not a political organ like the *Vancouver Sun*. It's not controlled by the Liberal machine I hope. But it seems that Lance-Corporal Malone was on a holiday because here's a nice.... "nice," that's not the word for it. Here's a considerate editorial.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): God will get you for that (Laughter).

MR. LAUK: No, he's on the high seas. (Laughter). I'll quote from this editorial. Excuse the levity on a very serious issue — an issue that my friend from Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) has stated should rise above party lines, and I'm sure it will.

"In ancient Greek mythology the height of futility was represented by a character named Sisyphus. After offending both Jupiter and Pluto he was condemned to push a heavy stone to the top of a hill. On reaching it, it would always roll back again, making his punishment eternal.

"In modern society the height of futility is represented by our efforts to reduce the traffic in illicit narcotics. The harder the police and the judges try to discourage the trade the worse it becomes. It is evident every week that we not only don't have the answer but that our substitute for an answer is making the problem worse. Our present day Sisyphus has offended logic and common sense to the point where we can't even roll the "stone" to the top of the hill.

"Surely the time has arrived when Canadian legislators must search for a better solution than that of endlessly rounding up and jailing addicts and pushers whose places are taken almost immediately by other addicts and other pushers.

"Last week a man was sentenced in Vancouver to life imprisonment for trafficking in heroin. The judge called him, 'a determined and unrepentant peddler against whom society must be protected.'

"The life sentence,' the judge added, 'should be a clear deterrent to others who become involved in the distribution of heroin.'

"This sentence was according to our drug laws that for years have kept the police and the judges busy trying to stamp out

the drug traffic.

But is a life sentence a deterrent? The trafficker involved had already spent 13 of the last 14 years in jail on drug offences. Prison, obviously, had not deterred him and it is fair to ask whether his life sentence will discourage others in the same trade.

"Recently in County Court and the B.C. Supreme Court two other life sentences were imposed on men involved in drugs. This certainly will take them out of circulation. But does anyone believe it will deter others?"

"This approach won't curb addiction. The trade is now flourishing more locally than it has ever done."

That's not an unusual example, Mr. Speaker. I've practised law for seven years. I defended mostly heroin addicts and I know the sad story from first-hand knowledge. I've walked away from emergency wards seeing children die from overdoses. I've walked away from prison cells where they've hanged themselves and I know the story first-hand. Our approach is just like the approach of the myth of Sisyphus.

When do we say that these people are no longer a part of us? You know, I imagine that in some day gone past there was a large circle and all of the people were in this circle. And perhaps a majority decided that there were some in that circle that should be out of it, and the circle got smaller and smaller until one day there was one man left. And all of those who were cut out from the main stream of society were looking at that one man. And then there was a large circle again.

When do we turn our backs on our children and say that they are dead? When do we cast that handful of dust in their coffin and say that they're not reclaimable?

The Narcotic Addiction Foundation in Vancouver, out of 15,000 addicts, treated less than 500 a year. Large sums of money from this province and from the federal government and from other agencies go to support that organization. That is not a treatment centre, it's an experiment centre. It is a sop on the public conscience, a fraud on the public. I would be very displeased indeed if I saw any estimate in the forthcoming budget, Mr. Speaker, going to that foundation.

I could say the same about the Alcoholism Foundation — they treat no one — we are not approaching this problem, we are hiding from it,

[[Page 107](#)]

we are looking upon alcoholism and drug addiction as a disease when it is a symptom of a disease.

The disease is here in this room, it's in society at large. We are the disease. We cannot say, "Ah ha, you've got leprosy", and cut them off from society. We are the lepers and we must cure it. The approach that should be taken is one of treatment, one of understanding. Why do we put these people in jail? Why do we turn our backs on them and throw away the key and say, "You are dead, my child I do not recognize your existence"? That does not recognize the Judeo-Christian ethic that I am my brother's keeper.

I can give you an example. In November of last year an aircraft was lost in the Northwest Territories. The authorities looked and searched for this aircraft. And after a certain period of time, almost out of Swiftian mythology, we heard the leaders say that we are calling off the search, that it was likely that these people were dead, that we spent enough money on them already.

But there were a few people in Canada that said: "No, that's not the value of this society, that's not a statement of our value. The value is the sacredness of human life. The value is trying to search out for our lost ones." And the search was continued. By chance a survivor was found.

Let us not ask questions about why that pilot lost his plane and maybe how foolish he was. Let's look at David Kootook, 14, who came from a gentle, primitive background, who did not need to be told but knew and understood that he was his brother's keeper.

That's our philosophy, Mr. Speaker, so that we may live in harmony with our environment and at peace with our fellow man. And to depart from the acquisitive North American values that have seen profligacy and waste on all sides. I say Herbert Spencer is wrong. He was wrong. And I say to all of you in this chamber, "Join with us. Help us break down the cultural and economic barriers to the good life for everyone. Help us to create a new order of social justice".

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the interests of the decorum of the House I'll resist the temptation to mimic the bitterness of the Second Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk). The Member says, Mr. Speaker, that he is disappointed in the Opposition — that he wanted to know where we stood, where the Opposition stood. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I can adequately express my disillusionment with the Government of British Columbia over that incredible document that we continue to call the "Speech from the Throne."

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, in this province with the whole of British Columbia waiting for this shiny new socialist Government to indicate where it intends to go, where it intends to take us. Mr. Speaker, this Government was in the position to win the confidence of British Columbians, but they blew it because they gave us a meaningless document — a document that leaves the people of this province in doubt and in uncertainty that is prevalent in all of our homes. And it continues to build. This Government had the chance to dispel that uncertainty but it chose to ignore that chance.

The only things that this Government has indicated clearly are negatives — stop the growth, switch off the development of the most vibrant province in Canada. You must, Mr. Speaker, get your heads out of the sand and accept the fact that British Columbia is going to grow. It is going to continue to attract people from all over the world, and particularly from other parts of Canada. We must accept that and then we must manage our economy and our directions of growth so that we can continue to enjoy the level of life to which we have become accustomed and so that we can protect and maintain a high level of environmental quality.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson), the mover of the document in question, talked about pork barrel the other day. Well, for once, Mr. Speaker, a Member of this new socialist Government is on solid ground. For this Government, in only five months, has honed the practice of pork-barrel politics to a fine art. Consider the Cass-Beggs affair. Consider the proliferation of the superflak — the executive assistants, "friends" of the party — being repaid and placed in positions of extreme influence regardless of their qualifications, or the lack of them — positions that are created mainly, it appears, to isolate the cabinet from the people. And, if you can believe the television reports, to isolate the cabinet from their own backbenchers.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, the exercise by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) in ordering buses without benefit of public tender. His excuse — "I don't intend to horse around with public tenders," he said. "I don't want to delay the delivery of those buses so we won't horse around with public tenders." There has to be a clue somewhere in that statement to this Government's philosophy.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. McCLELLAND: Sure he's smiling. While we're on that subject, Mr. Speaker, the mover of the throne speech also said that openness is the style of the NDP. Well, I wonder if the backbenchers still believe that, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they don't.

[[Page 108](#)]

MR. McCLELLAND: Or are they finding out like the rest of us — many other sections of our society — that the Executive Council of this province is not interested in consultation, is not interested in other points of view but its own. The Executive of this province is interested only in power — for that is the socialist way.

My colleague, Mr. Speaker, made reference briefly yesterday to a particular problem in his constituency and one that overlaps into my constituency as well. It's a simple problem but it outlines perhaps the method in which this Government operates. It has to do with a group of only 38 farmers who are broiler hatching-egg producers. I suppose the city-slicker lawyers have never even heard of a broiler hatching egg producer. They just happen to be caught in a squeeze between two marketing boards. Their position is critical and they asked the Minister of Agriculture for help. All they wanted was some help to get the two boards together so they could discuss their problems. The Minister of Agriculture, in his magnanimity, said, "Settle the problems yourself. I'm not interested."

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Did I say I was not interested?

MR. McCLELLAND: No, I don't think you said you're not interested, Mr. Minister. I amend that. You said, "Settle the problems yourself. Go away. Don't bother me."

Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency have a number of questions that they would like to have answered. They expected the answers in the Speech from the Throne — if not the answers, at least an indication of direction. They didn't get either. Mr. Speaker, my phone rings constantly. My mail load is up every week. And they aren't getting the answers. The people in my constituency and every other constituency in British Columbia can only assume that they didn't get the answers because the Government doesn't know the answers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Send it to committee.

MR. McCLELLAND: The Government doesn't know where it is going, Mr. Speaker, and doesn't even know where it is now.

Just listen to the speeches from the Government side and it becomes pretty obvious that this Government is confused — that it still thinks it is in Opposition. It has no idea, Mr. Speaker, about how to get on with the business of providing positive, aggressive and open government.

Speaking of being confused, Mr. Speaker, the House leader of the Conservative Party seems a little bit lost as well. I see he has left the House at the moment but he spends most of his time on his feet attacking the Opposition. I'd like to tell him that the Government is over there, not over here.

Mr. Speaker, let's hope that the Government does find its way out of its confusion very soon and starts to answer the questions that the people of British Columbia are asking — questions like, in my own specific constituency, "What are you doing about flood damage payment for the people who were inundated with water in many parts of the Fraser Valley?" I realize that the Government has agreed to participate to some extent with the Municipality of Surrey in costs, Mr. Speaker. But what about the hundreds of individual families who have nowhere to go for help?

Why didn't the Government set up local claims offices in the flooded areas and invite those people who suffered damage to their homes and property to come in and file for compensation? The total damage in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, from the Christmas flooding to private individuals — from flooded basements, loss of furnaces and hot water tanks and rugs and furniture and so on and other damages — will never be assessed. But all indications are that the amount is tremendous — in the millions of dollars. Normal insurance policies don't cover such losses and there has been no answer from the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, Recreation and so on and on and on.

I'd like to offer the Government the idea of local claims offices and suggest it isn't too late, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker. Why don't you do it right now? People there would love you for it.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): He doesn't know what love means.

MR. McCLELLAND: The people of my constituency also want to know what this new Government is going to do about future flood control, about which I'll speak in more detail in a moment or two.

Where is the mention in the throne speech about increased aid to municipalities? Didn't see it there. Most important, Mr. Speaker, where is the statement of direction of the socialist Government — the statement that the people of this province fully expected and fully deserve to have. I wonder where are the explanations to British Columbia's farmers — the proud, independent businessmen who have given so much to build this province. "The backbone of the nation," that unfortunate man in the gallery said the other day and he is right. Farmers whose future hopes have been shattered by the callous attitudes of the socialist Government.

First, Mr. Speaker, this Government destroyed the confidence of the corporate and investment community and now it has irrevocably impaired the confidence of the entire agriculture community,

[[Page 109](#)]

many of whom considered this new Government friends. As the old saying goes, with friends like these who needs enemies? Where are the explanations, Mr. Speaker?

Because of this Government's precipitous action with regard to farmland, with no reference to any long-term planning — in fact to any logical planning principles at all — this Government has locked the door on the future of all of British Columbia's agriculture industry. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this Government has declined to consult with the very people who are most affected by the actions.

Why is the Government so afraid to talk to the farmers? Why can't the Government at least extend the farmers the simple courtesy of listening? You told the B.C. Federation of Agriculture that you would consult both with its executive and with members who were interested before you did anything to affect the farm industry. Again, Mr. Speaker, the Minister chose to ignore that pledge. If the Minister had bothered to talk to the farmers, Mr. Speaker, they would have told you that you don't have to force them to stay on the land. Does the Government really believe, Mr. Speaker, that it can keep a viable agriculture industry going by force? If that is what this Government believes, it is completely out of touch with the real reasons why a farmer chooses to till the soil.

The point is that you are not going to keep 'em down on the farm by telling them that you're going to freeze their land. Just because you freeze the use of the land isn't any guarantee that you will have anyone on that land maintaining that use.

The whole of Langley city is frozen today; the whole of Langley city.

If I may digress just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that I contacted our planning officer in Langley city today and today alone we froze or refused permission for a development for an egg cracking plant in our industrial area, another industrial plant by Spiralock Industries in our industrial area, a major apartment development, a senior citizens' complex, Mr. Speaker, and a personal care home for senior citizens. They've been effectively stopped because of the land freeze initiated by this Government. On land that never ever will be farmland again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking!

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, since this Government obviously doesn't know why a farmer chooses to farm in the first place, why his roots are firmly entrenched in the land, then I'd like to try to tell the Government — and it's so simple, I wonder why you don't know: The farmer farms the land because he wants to. Not as the Hon. leader of the Liberal Party said yesterday, because he sees his land appreciating in value, but because he wants to farm. He chose farming as a career, the same as an electrician, a carpenter or a cook or a plumber — even a politician — chose his career.

Be that as it may, what's wrong with the expectation that your land will appreciate in value? Historically, society has used land and private homes as a basic form of security. In one way I suppose that virtually all of us, Mr. Speaker, are speculators. Even the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources and Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Williams) and so on, even that Minister has no hesitation to turning a speculative profit if the opportunity arises.

So, Mr. Speaker, as long as the farmer is a farmer by choice, he's going to continue to work his land and provide the produce to feed our nation. At the same time however, that farmer has every right to expect the same opportunity for fair compensation that you and I enjoy in our careers.

Mr. Speaker, the whole philosophical approach to this farmland preservation by this Government is unacceptable. Instead of freezing the entire inventory of farmland in British Columbia, without first developing any logical land use policy or set guidelines, instead of a hasty and ill-conceived freeze of the assets of thousands of British Columbia farmers, we should be directing all of our efforts, Mr. Speaker, toward helping the farmer achieve that fair return.

Whether it's by implementing the drainage programme so vitally needed in many parts of my constituency, or by vigorously seeking out new markets for British Columbia grown products, then it's in this manner that we will ultimately protect our agricultural industry.

I mentioned the drainage programmes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to tell the House what benefits could accrue in increased production and increased employment just by supplying adequate drainage and flood control in one tiny corner of British Columbia. This corner is where governments have been fiddling around since 1881 with drainage plans.

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Since 1952.

MR. McCLELLAND: Since 1881, Mr. Speaker.

We're talking about the most productive vegetable-producing lands in western Canada. The rich farmlands of the Serpentine-Nicomekl Valley. And I'd like to stress again, Mr. Speaker, that the other side of the House is the Government now and I expect you to do something. I don't care what happened before, Mr. Speaker. Let's get on with it. All right? Fair enough. With proper drainage this area has the potential, Mr. Speaker, of supplying all the western Canada markets with fresh vegetables throughout the growing

[[Page 110](#)]

season. This area has everything, Mr. Speaker — unique soil, moderate climate, long growing season — everything but drainage. And the problem gets progressively worse, of course, as the urban development on the uplands results in more and more runoff water flowing into the under-drained farmland. Consequently, more flooding and more crop losses.

The real shame is that as flooding becomes more prevalent the growing season gets shorter and shorter. The flow of products is interrupted more and more. And the area loses its credibility as a reliable source of supply. So the buyer goes elsewhere and the end result is not only a shortage of fresh B.C. grown vegetables, Mr. Speaker, but a higher price for the housewife in Vancouver.

The Government must implement an adequate drainage programme in that area right away. You do it and you'll keep these farmers on the land. You won't have to force them with legislation, because they'll be happy to farm their land, because they'll be able to enjoy the fruits of their labour. And that's all they ask, Mr. Speaker, of this Government.

And the Government has to stop insisting on local cost-sharing. The local municipalities cannot afford it. They haven't got the money. And the province can't afford to let the situation get any worse.

Because the Cloverdale area, Mr. Speaker, is the only area in western Canada, west of Winnipeg, that's suitable for the production of some of these kinds of vegetables — lettuce, celery and cauliflower and such. It is the "salad bowl" of Canada, and this Government has a duty to protect it.

Drain the land and it will provide western Canada with fresh vegetables practically year-round. Don't drain the land and we'll get our vegetables from the United States. We'll have, of course, an immediate increase in foreign

exchange requirements, and then further dependence on the U.S. for food supplies and a dependence that means higher food prices. That's what we're committed to stop.

Mr. Speaker, the total estimated value of the food crop in that Nicomekl-Serpentine flood plain area in 1972 was just over \$3 million. Do you know that the losses for 1972 were over \$1.5 million? That's 50 per cent of the total value of that crop production lost because the area isn't adequately drained.

The farmers in that area, Mr. Speaker, expected some hope in the throne speech. They want a permanent solution; they want it now.

Give these farmers a flood control and drainage programme and you'll double production in that area and you'll allow those farmers to make a decent living and they'll stay on the land. A decent living. That's how you keep them down on the farm, Mr. Speaker, not with threats and freezes.

A member of one of this province's finest pioneer farm families was in our office the other day, Mr. Tom Berry. He's a Vancouver Island dairy farmer and comes from my constituency originally. He told the whole sad story when he said the other day, "You can legislate the farmer off the land but you cannot legislate him back on."

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech was an astonishing document in that it did not indicate the real socialist philosophy. And because of that it didn't indicate the real reason for this farmland freeze. Is the Government afraid to tell us what it really has in mind, to tell us what it's seeking, and that it is seeking an end to private ownership of land in British Columbia? If that's what this Government believes, tell us. There's not much doubt that the freeze is a smokescreen for total control of private lands in this province.

The Hon. Member for Comox (Ms. Sanford) is quoted as saying, "We have to take a second look at private ownership. I'd like to see," she says, "all private property eliminated." I'll bet that's not such good news for the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources and (Minister of) Recreation and Conservation.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McCLELLAND: Wildlife. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to invite this House to look carefully at the order-in-council No. 153-73. Do you know that 90 per cent of the land in the Municipality of Langley is now frozen under the very general terms of that order? I've said already that most of the land in Langley City — a vibrant and bustling little city with a good programme of zoning control — is under the confines of that order-in-council.

You know what else that order says, Mr. Speaker? It says, "No person shall issue or cause to issue a building permit authorizing the construction of a new building on farmland."

"No building," "no person." Does that order mean what it says? That you may never build a new home, a new barn, a new garage? That's what it says. You can't construct a new building on your own property. That's what that order says.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McCLELLAND: There's the order, Mr. Speaker.

This new socialist Government isn't interested in preservation, Mr. Speaker, it's interested in state control of private lands.

And I suppose that's all right, because the Merriam Webster Dictionary defines "socialism" as "a theory of social organization based on government ownership or control of the means of production and the distribution and exchange of goods." That's what the dictionary says a socialist is; why doesn't this Government tell us what a socialist is? Why hide what you believe in, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of more comments about the farmland freeze. I agree wholeheartedly that we must provide greenbelts and that we must preserve agriculture as an industry. I believe it with all of my heart. And I agree that we must never again allow urban development on logically and sensibly defined flood plain. But we have to be realistic about our farmland needs. This issue is often distorted beyond all sense, and it is being distorted beyond all sense. We forget, for instance, that technological advances have allowed us to produce more food on much less land. Each year the number of acres in farm production decreases, yet the production shows considerable increases, outstripping in fact the actual population increases. This preoccupation, Mr. Speaker, with artificial attempts to preserve farmland tends to hide the real problem which, simply stated, is to ensure that we don't cover the entire lower mainland from Vancouver to Hope with black-top and houses. We could only do that through positive planning, Mr. Speaker, not freezes and threats.

Mr. Speaker, the mover of that weak Speech from the Throne spoke proudly in the House the other day about all the things the Government has done in only five months in office. Well for once I agree with the Member for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson). The Government has been busy, all right. In just five months, Mr. Speaker, the socialist Government has caused millions of dollars to be lost in the stock market, frightened the investment community, made being a friend of the party a condition for employment and for winning government contracts, even managed to alienate its own backbenchers. And this Government, Mr. Speaker, has broken the spirit of the farmers of British Columbia. That's not bad for just five months. I can hardly wait for the rest. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): Well, Mr. Speaker, we've heard some interesting debate this afternoon. A number of ideas. I cannot say that I agree with all of them, but they were interesting.

The second Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk) certainly attacked the Liberal Party, had his shoe lace out, said that the Liberals were against everything. He referred to the announcement by the Premier that there would be a cancellation of the port announced for Squamish and that there would be a building in Britannia instead. And I don't think the Second Member for Vancouver Centre should have been attacking the Government. He should have been attacking the Premier for the very style of government that the Premier and his cabinet colleagues found so objectionable when they sat on the Opposition seats.

MR. CHABOT: Where is he? His chair is empty.

MR. McGEER: Well, that's traditional too, as the Member for Columbia River well knows. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, probably the Second Member for Vancouver Centre had not read the environmental report, which was the subject of the news conference, before the House had been given any copies or any notification. It is the conclusion of that report, and why I want to make the point particularly, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Vancouver Centre and to all of the new Members of the House. I'm pleased to see so many of them here, and Mr. Speaker, they've just been excellent listeners which means that these new Members are going to learn very fast about the ways of the House. What that report said was this: "rather the main concern is that the scenic, aesthetic and recreational attributes of Howe Sound, and the life style associated with it will be impaired by further industrial development."

Now it's on this basis that the leader of the Liberal Party said that other alternatives should be considered. It's because that particular report was misinterpreted to the press and to the public at the time of his news conference that we object so strenuously to be the old style of government, which is being practised by the new Premier. The Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) who will be speaking in the House in a few days will have a great deal to say about where we should go in dealing with the shipment of coal from British Columbia ports.

I want to just draw the attention of the House to one aspect of the general problem, and that is, the Premier of the province is following exactly in the footsteps of the former Premier. As the Liberal leader said yesterday, the old Premier is hiding in the clothes of the Member for Coquitlam, because we have the same conflicts of interest that so plagued the previous administration. We have one man being the Premier and Minister of Finance. He was all

against that when he was the Leader of the Opposition, and all his supporters over there on the Opposition side were all against it too. Now it's fine. He condemned the corridor press conference, but now he's the leading exponent of it. He condemned the ignoring of the Legislature and the backbenchers, but now he's practising it in exactly that way.

I put the motion forward as a member of the Public Accounts Committee and as a Member of the House, that we should invite to this chamber, through our committee system, the heads of the Crown corporations in British Columbia, so that they could lay before us their plans and their financial requirements. That motion was refused by the then government. But, Mr. Speaker, it was supported by the Premier and those who now sit in the Treasury benches.

The reason for that suggestion is an obvious one.

[[Page 112](#)]

The Crown corporations have hidden behind the skirts of the Premier for many years, and it's clear that this tradition is being carried on. When the former Leader of the Opposition, who was so against pollution, now is advocating a third port to ship coal within 30 miles, 40 miles, in an area which environmental reports describe as one of prime recreational value, and which if the Premier of the province were not completely committed because of his conflict of interest position to the welfare of the Crown corporations, the idea would never be seriously entertained.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, when you refer to conflict of interest, I think it should be made clear whether you're preferring some kind of charge of a personal character, or whether you're merely referring to the fact that he holds two offices of government.

MR. McGEER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, two offices! May I make it clear that there are three or four offices. There's President of the Executive Council, there's the Minister of Finance, there's the Presidency of the PGE, there's the control of the pension plans. All these things represent incompatible objectives. We used to talk about how the Premier should have press conferences with the Minister of Finance, to talk to each other and try and resolve some of these things. But it never really happened.

What we're having is the same old style, and I say to those in the backbench, that it's going to lead to the same old difficulties, and it must be you who take a leading role in seeing that these conflicts of interest are broken down. When you sit with us on the Public Accounts Committee, set forward a policy by which these heads of Crown corporations will appear before you and us. You can demand that, because you'll have a majority on that Public Accounts Committee. In this way you can be certain that these conflicts of interest will begin to disappear. You'll be the ones that will be successful in implementing the policies that your Leader used to espouse. You can be his conscience, and you can keep him out of trouble, which if he carries on in this way is bound to increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Second Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk) repeated that ringing phrase from the throne speech about how we were going to get away from these "acquisitive North American values." I think there is a great deal of merit in that philosophy. I don't think it can extend to prolonging the misery of the unemployed. Getting them jobs is surely not incompatible with a quality of life. There isn't much quality to life when you don't have a job. If we've got more people looking for work than there are jobs, obviously you have to have growth to take care of that problem. While I think that philosophy has a wonderful note to it, I noted yesterday that the Minister of Highways was violating that philosophy. He used to give wonderful speeches in the House, Mr. Speaker, about the evils of the acquisitiveness of certain cabinet Members. Who would have thought that the present Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) would don the clothes of the former Minister of Highways, Mr. Gaglardi? Who would have thought that the socialist pilgrims would want to go first class in a new executive jet?

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): Oh, come on.

MR. McGEER: Well, you've pedaled along for so many years, but after all the executive jet has been brought back twice. A report has gone in that it should be purchased. Well, I think the Minister of Highways is going to go into a tailspin if we go for that expensive first-class jet. You can go ahead and say that that has nothing to do with acquisitive North American values, but I can tell you there is no greater symbol of North American

acquisitiveness than the executive jet. All the successful people get them.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. McGEER: Certainly, certainly.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: But he was never ashamed of capitalism or the acquisitiveness. I just think that for the Minister of Highways to be the leader in this, it just makes one's mind boggle to wonder what is going to come next.

Certainly, from our point of view, we don't think a case has been made for that kind of extravagance and we hope that the Minister of Highways will retract and not try and follow in the footsteps of the former office holder.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Columbia River Treaty. Many Members who sit in this House, of course, were unfamiliar with the raging debates that were carried on in the early 1960's, when one of the largest projects that had ever taken place in the province was under consideration. It is now commonly recognized that the Columbia River Treaty was one of Canada's greatest negotiating disasters. It is a classic example of a resource rip-off. It involves energy. At a time when the United States is approaching Canada regarding a continental energy policy, we should be reminding everyone in this country that this is a prime example of what an energy policy should not be. Canada is supplying the resource. Canada is committing its territory to the development of that resource. Canada is suffering the ecological damage and Canada is selling the resource

[[Page 113](#)]

to the United States for a fraction of its true value.

As far as I can tell from the answers given to questions I have asked on the order paper — and the Premier asked some too when he was Opposition leader — we are going to be short over \$360 million to reach the point of former Premier Bennett's promise in the critical 1963 election. Members who were present at that time will recall the promise was that the three treaty dams could be built, that Mica could have half its machining installed for what the Americans contribute.

It's too long for me to go into details as to how we arrive at the \$360 million shortfall. At present time the taxpayers of British Columbia are supporting that project with generous infusions of money. Some of it is on our electric light bills. More of it comes by direct legislative vote. Over \$20 million from the Department of Lands and Forests has been committed for clearing behind the Libby Dam. I will be happy to go over the calculation with any Member as to how we arrive at this enormous \$360 million figure, which is the subsidy that we are supplying to the United States.

This is going to come entirely out of the pockets of the people of British Columbia. Before the last election I called for a re-negotiation of the Columbia River Treaty. I support what the Premier has done so far in seeking that re-negotiation. I am disappointed that he did not get farther with Prime Minister Trudeau in the December meeting. But the offer I made in October to help out however I can still stands. The Premier has yet to take me up on that offer.

I want now to make some suggestions as to the route British Columbia can go to achieve a renegotiation. I want to remind the Members that the stakes here are very, very high. We have a tremendous amount to gain. We've got nothing to lose.

The first is to take advantage of the agreement signed between the British Columbia government and the Government of Canada in 1963. Section 7 of that agreement said, "Canada shall, at the request of British Columbia, present any claim deemed reasonable by Canada arising under the treaty which British Columbia wishes made against the United States of America." The agreement also states in section 5 that "Canada shall, if requested by British Columbia, endeavour to obtain the agreement of the United States with respect to the operation of any dams,

the modification of land required, the diversion of water or any problem which Canada and British Columbia agree is in the public interest." The key phrase is "in the public interest." To rectify a situation which has seen the British Columbia people shortchanged by over \$360 million, stuck with 150,000 acres of our most beautiful land perpetually flooded — the Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) knows of the devastation done in his territory, unnecessarily — and suffering enormous ecological damage, is surely in the public interest.

Secondly, British Columbia can demand that the Canadian government initiate a study to be carried out under Article 15 of the Columbia River Treaty itself. Article 15 states that, "the permanent engineering board" — under the treaty there is a permanent engineering board — "shall investigate and report with respect to any other matter coming within the scope of the treaty at the request of either Canada or the United States of America." The results of such a study could then be used as a basis for re-opening the treaty.

Thirdly, British Columbia can ask the federal government to refer its problems directly to the International Joint Commission. Again there is provision under the Columbia River Treaty. Article 16 of the treaty states: "Differences arising under the treaty which Canada and the United States of America cannot resolve may be referred by either to the International Joint Commission."

Mr. Speaker, I think what has incensed so many Members of this House who were here at the time and so many of the people of British Columbia who visited this area of Columbia River development and have seen what has happened, is that neither the Columbia River Treaty itself nor the agreement which was signed between the Province of B.C. and the federal government was referred to the Members of this House. No committees of our Legislature sat and heard any evidence. Liberal and NDP Members who were then in Opposition were suspicious of the long-range consequences of this treaty. Again and again we stood up in this House objecting to what was being done. Never was there anything done to bring the case to British Columbia and try and justify what was being done to the people of this province. Instead, an agreement was rammed through at the federal level. A snap election was called at the provincial level, and now we've got this disaster on our doorstep which we have to try and rectify. And, Mr. Speaker, the British Columbia Government must know exactly what to ask for in a treaty renegotiation. Because, unfortunately, a contract was signed. The former Government demanded a lump sum payment for the sale of power for 30 years and for providing flood control for all time. Now, that's in the contract and it obviously isn't going to be good enough to go cap in hand asking for more money because inflation has left us with this unbelievable shortfall of \$360 million.

What we've got to ask for is something completely different. We must ask for compensation for ecological damage and compensation for peaking power.

What the United States paid for in that lump-sum payment were two completely different things: they paid for flood control and they paid for firm power. No mention at all was made of peaking power, and

[[Page 114](#)]

yet it's very evident that the United States is benefiting to an enormous degree from this peaking power. They're using all of our Canadian storage — or will be in the future — for that purpose.

Flood control in the United States involves loss of Canadian land, the value of production of that land — both in taxes and goods — and the environmental damage that's a consequence of a poorly-cleared reservoir.

These reservoirs are not going to be valuable for prime recreational purposes. The height of them varies tremendously according to the demands of the United States. We have to empty them every spring, flood our land to protect their territory — with no compensation.

The ecologically damaged area behind the treaty dams is equal to 15 Skagit Valleys.

Francis Bartholomew, who was scorned by the old Government but whose statements I and others have often quoted in this House, has turned out to be consistently right in the statements he's made about the Columbia River Treaty. In 1961, in public hearings in Revelstoke, he drew everyone's attention to a United States report that

calculated the Americans would save \$120 million a year by the kind of storage that Canada provides under the treaty. Those savings were not for firm power, for which we receive payment. Those savings were in peaking power, which the United States is getting scot-free.

What we must rest on, Mr. Speaker, is the theory of the Columbia River Treaty which said that benefits should be shared equally between Canada and the United States. Now when the details of that sharing finally get worked out it turns out that some are more equal than others, by an enormous amount.

The case that has to be taken to the Americans is two-fold. First, Canada has suffered enormous losses because of inflation and can no longer allow the Americans to have these peaking power benefits for nothing. The inflation which has cost us so much has merely added to the already tremendous benefits in power that have gone to the Americans.

Secondly, the ecological factors — and these weren't valued terribly highly by either country a decade ago — are now extremely important. We can't afford to wait another 50 years to pay some attention to them. That's when the treaty expires.

The Premier did say he would be submitting a formal brief to the federal government to re-open the treaty, especially in the area of funding. We have no way of knowing what will be in that brief. We hope, however, that British Columbia's case will be better prepared than it ever has been in the past. And that may mean the hiring of outside consultants such as Francis Bartholomew, no matter how difficult B.C. Hydro engineers might find such a suggestion.

The Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) knows what I mean. But I would recommend to him, Mr. Speaker, that he study the record. Because some people have been consistently wrong and Francis Bartholomew has been consistently right.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: I understand that. But it's a question of preparing a case. And I'm sure the Premier must have been very disappointed by the Prime Minister's statement that he did not think that B.C. has grounds to complain about the deal it got from the United States.

The former Premier made an extraordinarily foolish negotiating move. It won him an election. But it's left us with an unparalleled mess on our doorstep. I have no hesitation in saying that the federal government was equally foolish in agreeing to it and permitting it to be the basis of a treaty. The guilt is clearly federal as well as provincial.

Now, there are even more important reasons for complaint about the treaty than the financial blunders. I'll name them again: ecological damage and the ignoring of peaking power benefits.

The Prime Minister has said he would name officials to a liaison committee if British Columbia named officials to one. That's a positive note. We should work on that basis.

One thing is clear. No further discussion should take place between Canada and the United States on any aspect of continental energy until the Columbia River Treaty is re-negotiated. There is more to this than just the suggestion that we should try and learn from the mistakes of the past. It will be a test of whether goodwill on the part of the United States extends to correcting an arrangement which is patently unfair to Canada. Never again should we sign any long-term energy contracts which do not provide adequate escape clauses. The lesson on the Skagit and the lesson on the Columbia River Treaty are just too obvious.

Circumstances change. Factors such as ecological preservation can alter enormously the values to be placed on a resource. So can shifting financial circumstances.

So we can hold out, with the support of the federal government. The United States is approaching us about a continental energy policy on gas. They'll be approaching us about other things. What we must insist upon is that the

Columbia River Treaty be placed right at the top of the list. Because in the case of the Columbia, it's not just the taxpayers of British Columbia who've lost out. The whole country's been hurt. The beneficial effects our energy has conferred upon the United States has made it more difficult for us to penetrate those resource markets south of the border that we already have.

Right here in British Columbia there's idle

[[Page 115](#)]

capacity at the Kitimat smelter. There's idle capacity in Quebec as well. The greatest export market for the number one power intensive industry in Canada, namely the aluminum industry, is the United States. What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to pay a tariff on every pound of aluminum that crosses the border.

The Canadian manufacturers have to absorb the total cost of that tariff, because they must sell the product at the same price in the U.S. as does the U.S. producer.

After the Columbia River Treaty was signed, there was an enormous expansion — as many Members predicted — in the State of Washington and Oregon in the aluminum industry. Because that treaty made available huge blocks of cheap power. The consequences were a lowered market for our aluminum, a difficulty in competing price-wise with those industries that were already established, idle capacity in Canada, unemployment in British Columbia and lower taxes to the federal government and to the provincial government.

So the effect is on jobs as well as taxes. We've lost out and lost out heavily. The time to prepare a case is now. Unlike many people who are pessimistic about something being done, I say that our case in politics and economics is extremely strong. I say that we should push that case with the national government and with the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the second Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) who stated today on an extremely fine speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. McGEER: She had some wonderful ideas on industrial development. She reads well. She reads well. She has picked up a well-known book — *Politics in Paradise*.

AN HON. MEMBER: By a well-known writer.

MR. McGEER: Which I know others in this House have read as well.

MR. LAUK: I've got it.

MR. McGEER: I'll autograph copies.

HON. MR. WILLIAMS: What's the price now?

MR. McGEER: \$7.95. You can buy it on the ferries. They tell me it's selling a bit too. At least better than another book that's also for sale. I don't set the price; I feel badly about that.

But the Member, Mr. Speaker, stands out from a good many who have reviewed that book. She grasped its real intent. It wasn't to describe the scandals and short comings of a previous administration. That sort of thing was just there to entice people to read the book.

MR. LAUK: A typical Liberal trick.

MR. McGEER: The purpose was to lay out a completely new industrial strategy for the province and for that matter the country.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put a few things on the record about the previous administration that I felt a lot of influential people should not have accepted in British Columbia for so many years. That was only done — and those things were only accepted as you know, in order to keep the hordes from power. But you are into power now and despite what the second Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) said today, the performance of the economy is the key to retaining power once you get in. Anybody who doesn't realize that lesson will find out after he's been kicked out of office.

The former Social Credit administration did have an industrial strategy.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: I believe they are.

MR. LAUK: You're not listening.

MR. McGEER: It involved a harvesting of natural resources. It worked while the roads were being built. It continued to work while the pulp mills were being built. It was supported artificially while the dams were being built but when all that building was done, nothing more had been accomplished than increasing the supply of natural resources to semi-saturated world markets.

Everyone who looked carefully at the situation predicted that the tailing off of construction would lead to high unemployment in the province. Why? There was nowhere to turn for new jobs. The years when a new industrial strategy should have been worked out were entirely wasted. Now we have 80,000 unemployed. In the next years 80,000 to 100,000 more people will be looking for jobs. You have to find at least 150,000 jobs over the next 2 years in order to make a dent in that problem.

Mr. Speaker, what it amounts to is an industrial expansion the like of which this province has never seen before. Unemployment is going to continue to plague British Columbia until we have that new industrial strategy. And if the second Member for Vancouver South, Mr. Speaker....

AN HON. MEMBER: Centre.

MR. McGEER: Centre, not South. We want her in the cabinet. She is the only one who has had any

[[Page 116](#)]

bright ideas on that side.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Let backbenchers in power.

MR. McGEER: If you want to stay in office, you're going to have to have this new industrial strategy. Unemployment is going to continue to plague B.C. until we have it. There is only one that will work. Only one that has succeeded for any advanced nation in the world. It's a strategy that could bring to this province a million new jobs for British Columbia here and around the world in the next 15 years. I may sound extravagant but I want to give everyone here one example.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$7.95. I'll buy your book.

MR. McGEER: He's read it. Read it again.

AN HON. MEMBER: He didn't understand it. It's the other Member who understood it.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, last month to my laboratory an electron microscope was delivered. It cost \$46,000. I was aghast but that's what you have to have in order to do modern work in cell biology. Instruments about the size of two of these legislative desks. The value of it — most of the value of that \$46,000 is tied up in a few plastic wafers about the size of an ash tray. Inside them are printed electronic circuits which can control to a fantastic

degree the electron beam which is the heart of the microscope.

The genius and design for all of this came from Eindhoven in the Netherlands. Members may recall, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian troops helped to liberate the Netherlands at the end of the Second World War. It's a country about the size of Vancouver Island. The land is just as flat as the Fraser Valley. They are without natural resources and at that time they were without industry. The corporation that produced that electron microscope produces dictating equipment that the acquisitive Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Barnes) probably has in his office — which we have in the legislative buildings — and thousands of other products; Mr. Speaker, the important point is that 300,000 people are employed by that one corporation around the world. The spin off in service industries — and, Mr. Speaker, that would include lawyers I presume — and suppliers would amount to maybe 1,500,000 people.

That is substantially larger than the total work force in the Province of British Columbia. Holland happens to have the densest population in the world, about 17 million people I believe. The average unemployment runs about 1 to 3 per cent consistently less than half that of Canada. So that clearly natural resources are not essential to jobs at all and the industrial strategy that produced that remarkable growth can be found in selected industries in Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the United States. Spain indeed.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): Most of them are socialist governments.

MR. LAUK: Most of them are socialists.

MR. McGEER: I mention these particular countries because between 1964 and 1969 all of them had substantially less unemployment than did Canada and did British Columbia. Now maybe they had socialist governments, it depends what your definition of socialism is. But I would guarantee that those governments could not operate by the kinds of philosophy that we have heard espoused by the Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk) and which appeared in the throne speech.

In a recent study by the Science Council of Canada — and the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), and I'm sorry he's not here, quoted from that. He had the conclusions muddled up. But what is revealed in that report should shock Canadians. Of 110 of the most significant technological innovations that can be described in the world today, not one was first reduced to practice in Canada.

Of all the OECD nations, Canada was conspicuously last in every single growth industry that has been part of the world picture since the time of the Second World War. This includes electronic components, plastics, computers, pharmaceuticals, scientific instruments, man-made fibres. There is only one area where we have shown performance and that's in steel and nonferrous metals. The reason for that is because we've got the minerals, not because we have the philosophy or the industrial strategy.

What have we done to maintain the standard of living that will permit MLA's to get the stipends they enjoy and others to have the incomes that they also enjoy. It is because our natural resources have been harvested at a greater rate than our economy is growing.

The economy is growing at about 4.5 per cent a year but natural resources are growing at 6.5 per cent a year because the rest of the productive sector is shrinking. We have become more and more dependent in natural resources during the last 10 years than ever before.

It is happening at an accelerating rate. The performance of other nations is so much spectacularly beyond our own that we have fallen back more and more and these are not industries of high employment.

The capital investment for a new job in the forest industry is about \$50,000. In a whole series of

technological industries done in the Boston area, mentioned in this study, the capital investment for a new worker

was not \$50,000, it was \$1,500.

Our standard of living now is about 40 per cent behind the United States. If you believe World Bank figures, we are also behind Sweden and Switzerland. A consequence of this bad industrial strategy is being felt all across Canada. Mr. Speaker, we are going to suffer from this in British Columbia more than will the other parts of Canada because we have lived high on the resource hog in this province.

What I say is that the only route for success will be to produce and produce competitively in the modern growth industries. Every public statement so far by the cabinet members has been against not only that strategy but any industrial strategy. The only member who has given a start at all has been the Second Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster), that's why I say take her in the cabinet. Bring some common sense to those Treasury benches.

She said, "sponsorship of a Science City." That's right. It is a start. A second one — might as well get the whole programme out — is to offer industrial incentives of the correct kind to get the proper new industries established.

The third is to encourage sales representatives abroad for our manufactured British Columbia goods. Not to fire them as the Attorney General did as his first act in getting into office. We canned our only entry into a market which is as large as the Canadian and which has a purchasing power at least one and a half times as great. We eliminated that as part of our industrial moves. At a time when there are a 1,000 new civil servants, we canned two who give us an entry, into that important market.

A fourth is encourage technical buying by the Government itself. There is a wonderful example right here in British Columbia — an industry called Glenayre Electronics. They received encouragement by the B.C. Railway for getting a new and very modern device attached to railroad cars for tracking them, which if it works would be adopted, I am sure, all through North America.

Now this is the way that a government agency can encourage not only a British Columbia company but can encourage an idea that has tremendous potential for growth.

AN HON. MEMBER: We shouldn't have to buy American jets.

MR. McGEER: Someone suggested, Mr. Speaker, that buying American jets instead has been the purchasing policy of the socialists. But perhaps there's time — we may get into modern things in our own B.C. railway rather than get into a tailspin supporting American aircraft companies. A fifth, Mr. Speaker, is to hire consultants to help with this industrial strategy. Go beyond the B.C. Civil Service. Go beyond the economic consultants you normally find in the province. If they had the industrial strategy you'd have it by now. Hire Pierre Bourgeault. At least he studied the problem and has written a brilliant report. Talk to top management in these successful industries — whether they are in Eindhoven or anywhere else in the world, Mr. Speaker, this is my plea to the Premier and the cabinet — but particularly to those who make up the bulk of the Government side, sitting in the backbenches. I have learned over the years, the Premiers and cabinet Ministers often turn a deaf ear to Opposition members. But the real power, if it is ever exercised, Mr. Speaker, lies in the Government backbenches.

They have the power to discipline a cabinet. Bring forward aggressive new ideas. It doesn't always work, as the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) will tell you. But if it doesn't work for a Government backbencher you can sometimes make it work for an Opposition party.

What I say particularly to the backbenchers on the Government side — it's a great opportunity — you don't need to take notes — you instinctively realize that the power is yours. Use it. Drop the dogmas of the Thirties — because if there was one shortcoming of these people who are now the cabinet Ministers when they sat in Opposition, is they were hung up on the past. Take that government into the future. Bring us forward with new industrial strategy. Then when that next election comes along, Mr. Speaker, you won't be like the last crop of Government backbenchers, you'll be coming back instead of going into private life.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): He still thinks he's a leader.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Richmond.

MR. H. STEVES (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have been amazed during the past few days at the attitudes of the last remains of the former provincial government. What a change has overcome them in four months. On Monday we heard the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) stating that the working people and Social Credit want jobs now. That the new Government was a no growth and no job Government. That after 40 years of socialist ideas the new Government could not solve the job situation in 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of Social Credit ineptness — after 20 years of selling out our resources without developing adequate secondary industries, after 20 years of exporting jobs to other lands, after 20 years of allowing our farmlands to be zapped up

[[Page 118](#)]

by land speculators and developers, after 20 years of rip-off monopoly capitalism, Mr. Speaker, the last members of a former government expect us to correct their blunders and mistakes in 4 months.

The spokesmen for the other Opposition parties, Mr. Speaker, they keep criticizing us for not doing the things that their parties have continually not done in Ottawa in the past 100 years. Statements by spokesmen from the other parties have been most revealing. By demanding more revenue we have created uncertainty in the forest and mining industries they say, when instead we should be giving encouragement to every single industry and every single person who can help provide employment. Well there's nothing uncertain about it. The bountiful resources of this province belong to the people of this province and they are entitled to a decent return.

What is most revealing however is the fact that the Opposition has spent most of their time using the employment issue to defend the profits of their friends, the big business interests in this province. They suggest, and we have heard it again today, that instead of collecting royalties on our resources we should continue to provide incentives as they have done in the past.

Furthermore in this age of ecology one Member, the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) even went so far as to say that with so much unemployment the policy must be growth.

Industrial strategy is growth. Growth to provide jobs he said. Well that is why we are in Government and they are not.

In 1971 B.C.'s gross provincial product grew by \$1.8 billion, an increase of 12.5 per cent over 1970. Yet we had 7 per cent average unemployment over the year. In 1972 the gross provincial product grew by an additional \$1.2 billion and our unemployment average 7.5 per cent. Profit rose and growth increased each year but so did unemployment. In fact unemployment is closely tied with growth but in a negative way, What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is not a patch-up job of the old system but rethinking of our priorities. Let's not treat the symptoms but get at the illness before it becomes a cancer and what the unprincipled growth advocates are suggesting could well be terminal.

The throne speech clearly states that Government policy will be based on the necessity to plan our future so that we may live in harmony with our environment and peace with our fellow man and depart from the acquisitive North American values of profligacy and waste.

Mr. Speaker, this can only be done through developing our resources by and for the people of British Columbia, not only by creating secondary industries but also new recycling industries to protect our environment by reconstituting our waste products. These are areas where meaningful employment can be created.

Along with this, new service jobs will be required to assist the aged and expand leisure, recreational and educational activities. Jobs to provide other environmentally sound services to people, such as public transit and the development of community schools and neighbourhood services — these are the areas, Mr. Speaker, where our growth should be oriented.

To live in harmony with our environment also requires re-thinking of our concepts of growth and our concepts of energy. I believe that we must start working towards a steady-state growth concept. This concept allows growth, but only within the carrying capacity of the environment. Furthermore, if social and environmental costs of growth are considered, gross national product and energy conversion become less important — still highly important, but less important. The first step in determining an energy policy is to sort out what is possible. Certainly it is not necessary to commit our resources to a nuclear reactor on Vancouver Island for some time. Nuclear power, I would suggest, is Pandora's box — possibly there are some pleasant surprises in it, certainly some demons. Some of the demons have escaped and have been identified as low-level radiation, thermal pollution and the truly awesome problem of disposing of radioactive wastes — not to mention catastrophic radiation leaks.

There is also plenty of time to develop an ecologically-based policy on the Fraser River that would deal with flood control, fish, pollution and land-settlement patterns in the Fraser Valley without building a power dam at Moran or at some other location. Hopefully, these developments or others like them won't even be needed.

Industry presently has lower hydro rates than residential users. Increasing industrial rates, particularly at peak-hour time, would cut down consumption and make present generating capacity more efficient. When one adds up the environmental costs of more dams and nuclear plants, this may be the route that B.C. citizens will want to take. On the other hand, there may be some increase in electrical consumption for necessary mass transit systems. For example, a rail system with feeder buses using the CNR and CPR tracks in my riding in Richmond to connect with the Arbutus corridor in Vancouver would drastically reduce the need for more bridges and freeways in the Vancouver area. If we were to take the San Francisco rapid transit system as an example, we find that a mass rapid transit system in the greater Vancouver area would only produce a one-time electrical energy growth of 2 per cent — not much when you consider the saving in time and environmental quality.

While on the subject of public transit, I would like to diverge for a moment and say that I find it very

[[Page 119](#)]

disappointing that the Hudson Street bridge being built by the federal government will not service Richmond but will service the airport only. This bridge is taking up the major transit corridor which could service about 65 per cent of Richmond's population with a direct public transit route to Vancouver.

Getting back to energy, the B.C. Energy Board Report last fall suggested that automobiles could be converted to electrical use. I would suggest that this would be a very uneconomic use of our power reserves. On the other hand, it is entirely feasible to use our natural gas reserves as a relatively nonpolluting automobile and bus fuel instead of exporting it to the United States.

I was quite shocked to read, Mr. Speaker, in the 1972 B.C. "Summary of Economic Activity" that we exported 264 billion cubic feet of natural gas last year and used only 120 billion in the domestic market. Yet liquid natural gas or compressed natural gas is the safest hydrocarbon fuel. When used in the internal combustion engine, carbon monoxide production is reduced by 50 per cent. B.C. Hydro tests have shown 1.9 per cent carbon monoxide emissions from a vehicle using liquid natural gas, compared with 3.9 per cent for an ordinary gas vehicle with pollution control devices, and 7.4 per cent monoxide emissions without control devices. Natural gas is an important non-renewable resource and should be reserved for our own domestic use and not exported. Once the tap has been turned on, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to turn the tap off again. Unfortunately, this seems to be the rule and not the exception. The B.C. Economic Survey also states that in 1972 export values climbed to a record \$3 billion in response to increased sales of wood products, metals in ores and concentrates, crude petroleum, coal and natural gas. The bulk of these advances were made in the United States and Japanese markets. All the front runners except wood products are non-renewable resources. These are the resources that are so important to develop here in British Columbia for our use and our secondary manufacturing industries. To produce jobs here instead of in other lands.

We have heard a lot about the energy crisis in the United States. Presently the United States, with only a small percentage of the world's population, consumes about 1/3 of the entire world's supply of oil. Their need for energy resources is expanding at exponential rates. They need our gas and our oil to quench this thirst. There is no need to make an energy resources deal, as someone has suggested. We already have one. The international oil

companies already have one themselves, as they drain off our reserves across the border, bit by bit and day by day.

Furthermore, we see an accompanying unjustified increase in gasoline and oil prices on the domestic market. And we see an unwillingness on the part of the oil companies to move into such areas as using natural gas as an automotive fuel. As one of the backbenchers who recently has been reported in revolt within our party, I would like to take this opportunity to agree with the Premier. The only way that we are to ensure that we are able to maintain our oil and gas reserves for future use and influence the domestic market is if oil and gas are brought under public control.

Public control of the oil and gas industry in British Columbia could mean not only fairer prices to consumers and an end to the energy drain, but also the re-allocation of profits towards equalizing gas prices in the north and the development of mass public transit in the urban areas. It would mean that the uses to which the oil and gas are presently being put could be reconsidered. It is quite possible, for example, that the Government after study might find it feasible to set up natural gas depots throughout the province and provide licensing and other incentives to motorists who have their vehicles converted to natural gas, and even convert fleets of government vehicles as well.

However, I would like to caution those who might get overly enthusiastic that our problems will all be solved by price controls.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or by take-overs.

MR. STEVES: It all depends upon the willingness of the oil companies to cooperate. He talks about take-overs — I'll get to that in a minute. The oil companies are not known to cooperate willingly. In fact, we can probably expect to hear the apologists for the oil companies raising their voices right here in this House.

We will hear that even though prices rise simultaneously among companies, that they are not a monopoly and that there is competition at the local level, even though the so-called independent operators are bound by iron-clad agreements with the companies. Even though they are bound to handle company gimmicks and advertising. Even as they have so-called competition from cut-rate outlets, these same outlets generally — in fact, almost entirely — are run by the same companies in competition with their own legitimate outlets.

One way that the oil and gas prices and export prices in this province can be influenced is by nationalizing the oil and gas pipelines and perhaps, I would suggest, even the wells themselves. The profits for crude oil at the wellhead amount to \$1 to \$1.80 per barrel and transition profits amount to \$25 million to \$30 million a year. It doesn't require an economist to show that savings could be made to the consumer or that energy resources such as oil and gas required as a necessity by almost every citizen must be regarded as a public utility. Oil and gas resources

[[Page 120](#)]

which, when in the ground, belonged to the people of this province in the first place.

While mentioning oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly the oil shipment problem. Supertankers sailing down the B.C. coast pose a major threat to B.C., as witnessed by the relatively — and I say "relatively" in terms of what could be a major disaster — minor oil spill this last week. And it was a pretty bad one. The government in Ottawa must be brought to realize the necessity of declaring a 100-mile pollution-free zone along the coast of B.C.

They must be brought to realize that Juan de Fuca Strait is a joint boundary between Canada and the United States, and it is a right of common law that no man be permitted to cause on his side of the fence an action that will do harm to his neighbour and his neighbour's property on the other side of the fence. Supertankers must be banned from Juan de Fuca Strait and the federal government should call a meeting of the joint international commission to do just that.

For friends here in this Legislature, who are friends also of the federal government, I'd like to point out to them that as the provincial government, we can only negotiate with the Washington State as friends and neighbours,

and rather recent friends at that. The real clout in this matter lies with Ottawa.

Finally, however, I feel that we could declare and should declare to all those who would take risks with our waters and our coastline, that those who cause oil spills and other eco-disasters will be responsible not only for the cleanup, and a substantial fine, but also for the economic costs of social and environmental damages as well. Whether it's the temporary loss of a swimming beach or the loss of a minute marine organism.

However, in taking a stand against oil tankers, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the very real danger of the major alternative, the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. The Mackenzie Valley pipeline, financed by Canadian taxpayers, would carry even more of our vital resources out of the country. In addition, it poses a great threat to the delicately balanced ecology of the Mackenzie delta. Like most projects promoted by the Liberal Party, it would produce a fair number of jobs while being constructed, but it would only produce 400 permanent jobs once the job is finished.

The Mackenzie pipeline is offered to us as the only alternative to the west coast oil tanker route, but there are other alternatives. The study carried out by Dr. C.E. Law of Queen's University for the Ministry of Transport has shown that the Mackenzie Valley oil can be transported economically and safely by rail. Failing that, the final alternative is to leave the oil in the ground until we need it and have found a safe way to transport it, and for that matter a safe way to use it.

For a number of years, Mr. Speaker, I have been actively involved in an environmental movement. And one of my major activities has been campaigning for adequate sewage treatment along our waterways. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) for bringing in a policy for a minimum of secondary treatment at Annacis Island, and for starting a research programme to develop more advanced treatment methods, which remove heavy metals and toxic chemicals so harmful to the salmon and the marine environment. I learned to swim in the Fraser River and I hope to see the day when it will be safe for my own children to go near the water.

While in a congratulatory mood, I would also like to commend the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) for his decision to remove the Nanaimo Ferry from Horseshoe Bay. Certainly it creates a bottleneck in that harbour, and there are more than 20 sailings a day out of Howe Sound that will be now removed to another location. However, we in Richmond have long feared a plan by the previous government to transfer the ferry terminal to the end of Steveston Highway in Richmond, a move that would do much to destroy the marine habitat of Sturgeon Banks, which is an integral part of the Pacific flyway, and offshore feeding ground for young salmon. They would create an additional hazard to the commercial fisheries located at the mouth of the Fraser and would also tunnel several million cars each year through quiet residential communities. And anyway, an estuary is no place to locate a harbour.

About four years ago, we presented an alternative proposal to the previous government from Richmond Municipal Council to establish a major transportation centre on Sea Island, with the ferry terminal located on Iona Island. If the ferry is to come to Richmond, then fine, it's welcome. But I would recommend Iona Island as a site, as this area is already degraded by pollution from Iona Island sewer plant and from log storage in the north arm of the Fraser River. The north arm is so polluted that the salmon no longer use it as a migratory route and, in fact, if a ferry terminal is established there, it might even help to clean the area up.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are other harbours being developed in river estuaries in the province that are not so well planned. Plans of the federally appointed Fraser River Harbours Commission, for example, if allowed to go unchecked, will convert the Fraser River into an industrial river similar to the Thames and will require several thousand acres of prime agricultural land for backup warehousing for the superport. We are long past the day when there should be a unified board in this province to help plan our harbours so that one does not work at cross purposes with the other, or go

overboard in their attempt to export our resources. Perhaps the provincial government can approach the federal government to jointly set up such a board. I hope also to see us establish a migratory salmon authority to manage

resources along our rivers to protect our salmon runs from bad farming and mining practices, industrialization and indiscriminate logging and to provide for green strips along our streams and to provide other natural run-off controls.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said in the debate on the throne speech about the freeze on agricultural land. As one who has lived all his life on the farm and spent much of that time actively engaged in farming, I would like to say that in my opinion this is the best thing that this Government has done to date. And I would like to put my support behind this move to protect our agricultural land wholeheartedly. In fact, I only wish it could have come 10 or even 5 years ago. If that had happened, myself and a thousand others like me might still be farming today. As one who was forced out of business by a combination of bad agricultural legislation by the previous government and unjust municipal zoning bylaws, I feel I have the right to speak with some authority on this subject.

Prior to 1956, Mr. Speaker, my riding had 24,000 acres of the most fertile agricultural land in Canada. In 1956 during one evening at the Richmond Council, at the urging of certain land speculators, 12,000 of those 24,000 acres, including our own farm, were rezoned for industrial and residential use. In many cases, the farmer didn't even know what it was all about until he tried to build new barns and dairies to comply with the new milk industry regulations brought in in 1958. And we saw our taxes rising.

What resulted, Mr. Speaker, was haphazard urban growth that saw housing and industries sprawled all over the community. Consequently, the costs of servicing the scattered developments with roads and drainage and eventually sewers, were monumental. Taxes soared to the detriment of all. And this is what will happen throughout British Columbia if land-bank legislation such as what we are proposing is not legislated. More recently, Mr. Speaker, land speculators have been sitting in the wings waiting to have another go at it.

They want to elect a council in Richmond responsive to rezoning another 12,000 acres. I know of one instance where a land speculator has paid \$9,000 an acre just to take that chance. And another, a director of Crown Zellerbach Company, living in California, paid \$2,400 an acre to a poor unsuspecting elderly farmer and listed it as industrial land for \$15,000 an acre, even though that land is zoned for agriculture both municipally and regionally. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm glad the rip-off is over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. STEVES: It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can get the farmer out from under the yoke of the processing companies. Out of the vertically integrated system of contract farming, which regulates farmers to the job of being sharecroppers on their own lands. Give the farmers a fair break in taxation. Give them a break on farm marketing and help protect the farmers against the subsidized products that are being dumped in this province from outside of British Columbia and outside of Canada.

Farmers I have talked to who are really serious about farming welcome the legislation we are bringing in, and they look forward, Mr. Speaker, to further legislation which will put agriculture in this province on a sound economic footing for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Attorney General.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, usually when a person takes part in the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne, you speak about your own riding, and I want to say a few words as a private Member — if I can say that I wear three hats for that particular purpose — about Vancouver East and the kind of things I want from my cabinet colleagues. And I want to say something about some of the things in the Speech from the Throne. For example, the death of Herbert Anscomb, whom I knew a little bit and knew more about from history. And when, Mr. Speaker, we have so many gosling parliamentarians newly arrived in this House and making such a good showing that they kind of show up the older Members, I would like them to think too of the example of a man like Herbert Anscomb with whom I would agree on practically nothing (laughter), because he was a Tory and not even a red Tory.

He was a man who spoke from his head and his heart and his guts and he was never urbane or bland or unctuous or vaguely equivocal. A man with whom, therefore, you could disagree, who spoke his mind, who you

could discuss, debate, exchange ideas with. When politics becomes too bland a profession I think we'll remember with regret people like Herbert Anscomb. And Houses like this will miss him. And disagree with him as you must, I think he's the kind of example who should be remembered by all of us present here.

Speaking, Mr. Speaker, for the riding of Vancouver East, I wish to suggest and hope and pray that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) will proceed to give some financial support to what he calls — and I believe that he intends to go ahead with this — "community and recreational facilities." I think in a big area like the lower mainland of ethnic communities — and in some of these cases, such as in the case of the German community, they have their centre and their halls. Others have not as yet been able to

[[Page 122](#)]

manage, through the finances and through the property location, to bring together something in the way of an ethnic hall — open to all, open to all, but basically promoted by groups within that city.

The Italian community is another one. And I think we can be good enough Canadians by this time to recognize that part of the strength of Canadianism depends upon the diversity of the cultures and the ethnic diversity that has gone into making this a great nation. I think it would be a pity if we lost that. I see nothing wrong with people having two cultures, because I think the Canadian nation that we seek to build and make strong from coast to coast will be all the stronger for not forgetting that kind of a heritage. And I think of the Indian people in that connection too. I would hate to see the time when all of the historical and ethnic and cultural differences between the peoples of the world were reduced into one common sameness. Because I think the world would be a far less interesting and exciting and imaginative place if that were to happen.

AN HON. MEMBER: We wouldn't have any more Scotchmen.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And I don't overlook the Scotch — particularly the Black and White.
(Laughter).

I think too that I would like the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) to think in terms of opening the doors of opportunity to the higher professions to all of our young people, boys and girls alike. And I think in the case of the medical profession of good remuneration and great social need out there, particularly in the hinterlands of British Columbia. Too few of our young people have the means or the opportunity in terms of the restrictions on entry to medical school. They have the door of opportunity slammed in their face, even though they may have all of the talent and the dedication that could be devoted to the people of this province.

MR. WALLACE: Are you going to increase the medical schools?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I would increase them...yes, very definitely. And I would hope that we could increase the paramedical services. And I hope we could increase the number of dentists who are allowed to train in this province. And I would hope that we would be able to increase the number of lawyers...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: ...who could receive a legal education — is there some difficulty with my words, Mr. Speaker? — in this province. Because you take in the case of the legal profession about 500 to 700 qualified young people coming up year after year and knocking on the doors of the one law school we have in the Province of British Columbia. 500 of them are being turned away and 200 admitted, the 200 having super marks — well over 70 per cent, no sups, that kind of thing. A very limited stream of people who are allowed to obtain legal education.

To me there's something undemocratic about that. I think that for qualified people the right to study the law, which is an ancient and honourable learned profession, should be a democratic right. And I would like quite frankly to see — and I am sure that there's a great interest in that also in this area — that there should be a second law school

in the City of Victoria.

And if you say, "What's that got to do with Vancouver East?" I say to you that most of the young people of Vancouver East are barred from anything I have been talking about today. Very few of them are able to take advantage of professional advancement. That's true in all kinds of the areas of the province. And we have to have the kind of boarding allowance and the kind of open university system that will help to democratize educational opportunity in this province. I would like, of course — and I am not going to say much about this — that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) would proceed with his plans for improvement of transit services.

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Send me a letter. (Laughter).

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I'll see you tonight. (Laughter).

I know these things, Mr. Minister, cost money. I know they cost money. But it may be that the horseless carriages will have to pay something to look after the real social transit needs of the footsore pedestrians and the ordinary straphangers. Because pollution and congestion on our highways is something that must give way to a more rational system of moving people that will conserve some of the dwindling energy resources of the earth, and help to keep our cities and our small towns clean.

I wear, as some Hon. Members know, two hats — I am the Attorney General. I can remember that. (Laughter). I can remember that because I used to be a lawyer — now I'm a reformed character. (Laughter).

The other department I wish to speak about for a few minutes today, rather casually, because we're in the process of developing what I hope will be a total new approach in this industrial field...to begin with, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the name of the

[[Page 123](#)]

department. It says Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce, and I can barely remember that name — and I'm the Minister. And I don't think it expresses the important objectives that we have to achieve in this province, which are economic developments...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. Mr. MACDONALD: Well, I hope I don't let failure go to my head. (Laughter).

But I would like to see the department — and there will be legislation to reorganize that department in this session — called the Department of Industry and Trade Development; of Industry and Trade Development.

I don't like the word "industrial" in there, because I think that industrial expansion must embrace other areas of our economy — and I include particularly agriculture and the service industries, which are intensive in terms of employment of labour. So I think "industry" is a broader term and I think we can better express our objective.

On the matter of agriculture, may I say that I am cooperating with the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) in connection with various projects which may very well require industrial assistance by government as well as the research facilities of government.

For instance, in the Peace River area, in the Creston area, in the Vernon area — where alfalfa crops are grown — there is a need to improve our export position and our transportation position — and therefore the return to the farmers, for alfalfa cubing.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Not too much involved in the case of financing; not too much involved in the case of the kind of help that will get the thing off the ground — where the alfalfa can be grown and cut and shredded and trucked and flash-dried and converted into cubes — and far more marketable and far more easy to transport.

I would think that if industrial assistance were advanced in that kind of area we'd not only be helping employment but I think we'd be able to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayer would not lose his shirt. I think that's an important factor in all of the industrial programmes we suggest. Because I think we could own the land where the facility was located. I think we might be able to own the building in which the drying takes place, and the preparation for shipping.

This is the kind of practical industrial assistance or agricultural assistance which we have been waiting, Mr. Speaker, 20 long years to see get off the ground. And I hope that we will be able to announce that assistance very promptly as soon as legislation is passed in this House — in that particular case, because the matter has been well researched.

I want to say that a lot has been said by Hon. Members about the state of the B.C. economy and how everybody has lost confidence and how the climate is bad. I want to say the climate is good. The water is fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on in.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I'm very optimistic, particularly with this new Government, that capital expenditures in the province of British Columbia will maintain the very high level of 1972, which is about \$3.6 billion. Our forecast for 1973 — notwithstanding that some of the projects like three new pulp mills have now been completed — our forecast is for a very good year in terms of capital expenditure in 1973 at about the same level, around \$3.6 billion.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): What area?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's for the province. I would think that the gross provincial product, the total value of all the goods and services we produce in the province of British Columbia, should increase by 10 to 12 per cent in the year 1973. I would expect that the lumber industry will be relatively prosperous. We frankly depend to a very considerable extent in this respect upon the United States economy where housing starts are estimated to be, in the coming year, about \$2 million — which is a good year for them and, thereby, a good year for us.

But while I'm forecasting, I make no bones about it that British Columbia is faced with great challenges as well as great opportunities. One of the challenges, of course, is the high rate of unemployment which is today approximately 80,000 to 85,000 people. I don't like to bother too much with figures because I know beside that figure of unemployment you have to realistically set the fact that there are industries that have "help wanted" signs out. A great deal of upgrading of talents and skills is necessary and we intend to cooperate fully with the federal government in that respect.

Nevertheless it is a very serious problem. And a most serious problem when you consider that the young people are the most adversely affected by unemployment. They haven't got seniority in a trade union. They haven't got experience that they can refer to when they apply for a job. About 23 per cent of that toll of unemployment is young people 16 to 19 — in that area.

Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is going to be a problem for British Columbia, partly because of the climate I mentioned, because we have a population explosion in this province. Over the last 20 years the

[[Page 124](#)]

population grew in the whole of North America at about 1.9 per cent. We've been growing at about 3.2 or something in that area which, compounded, means that we're growing more than double the North American average. And we are continuing to grow at more than twice the level of the whole of North America. I think that faces us with a challenge. I think it faces us with a challenge particularly in the realm of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

As I say, the general economy is good. But it is not going to take care of the young people who are coming on the market. There is a need for us to complement federal programmes and they are many. There is a need for us to

complement what is being done through the ordinary financial institutions such as the chartered banks and such as the Industrial Development Bank and to move with all possible speed to assist medium and small business through the department of which I am the Minister.

I say that the climate is good notwithstanding speeches over there because we have been already assisting industry to locate — no financial assistance, we haven't got the legislative authority for that. But we've assisted, for example, in the last two months an explosive factory of Dupont of Canada, to locate in Ashcroft. That is something which is a non-polluter — a non-polluter unless it blows up. (Laughter). It is the kind of industry that is already locating in this province. But it is obviously not enough, and we need a new department that will be a catalyst to spur new development.

So, one of our challenges is unemployment. Another challenge is the European Common Market. This is a pretty grave challenge to the province of British Columbia because we depend particularly so heavily upon plywood exports to the United Kingdom. About 64 per cent of our plywood exports have gone to the United Kingdom and about 32 per cent to the countries from Denmark down through Germany and France and the Netherlands.

We are faced with some tariffs and we're faced with quotas, although they are based on market demand. The tariffs will be graduated in on plywood — anything over 3/8 over a five year period. It is terribly important, therefore, that we make a major crash effort to increase market demand in the European Common Market as well as Japan.

Now the Government might have done that by one of its own foreign trade missions. But we have decided we should in this case cooperate with the federal government, and with the industry, through the council of forest industries, and on a 1/3-1/3-1/3 matching basis put up a very substantial sum — it's \$660,000 after having been vetted for the coming year — so that there will be a cooperative marketing development programme in Europe, and one whose training personnel can at a later time switch into other areas of the world. I'm thinking particularly of Japan.

We think that the hard-headed economic research is going ahead very well under that programme which is well under way and has been, in a limited form, for some time. I make no bones about that, not under my department. But we intend to make that, and we're not worried ideologically about a thing like that. Because it is something that if it was not being done outside of Government, we as a Government would have to do it. We simply can't neglect the implications of the Common Market and the importance of our plywood industry. I say plywood because obviously for every unit of raw material that comes out of the bush, we get the best dollar return from our plywood. In the plywood industry, also, we employ more women — which I think is important. We don't have too many women fallers — none, I'm afraid, that I know of. One?

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): There used to be one.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: There used to be one. No women edgermen — and so about 2 per cent of the employees in the sawmill manufacturing industry are women. But it's 7 per cent, I think, in plywoods and can be higher. So I think that this is a most important endeavour which is being proceeded with by the Government.

Another thing we intend to do, Mr. Speaker, is to extend diplomatic recognition to Ottawa. That's part of our foreign policy. The cold war is over. You know, when you think of the kind of programmes they have and the kind of industrial activity that is taking place in the heartland of Canada — which is the Ontario region — and the opportunities for branches of some of those industries to locate in British Columbia, we find there a whole new area that, frankly is more important to us than was the California thing. Quite apart from any usefulness of any particular office there, that kind of cooperation within Canada.

In addition we intend to cooperate with the western provinces of Canada. To give you one instance, Mr. Speaker, of what I mean by cooperation, I have met with Mr. Fred Peacock, who is the Minister of Industry in Alberta. And I have met with Mr. Roy Romano who is the Attorney General for Saskatchewan. And we have agreed to set up an informal advisory group in the field of transportation to be called the Pacific Transportation Advisory Council.

I have kind of held out that the office of this council should be in the Province of British Columbia because I think that is where the transportation bottle-necks have built up. I don't mind where it is located in British Columbia as long as it is located in

[[Page 125](#)]

Vancouver East. This will be a group mainly financed by the three governments. It won't be extensive financing — about \$30,000 a year will be our provincial share. Partly financed by National Harbours Board, CN and CP. It will do what it can to advise governments how to break the bottle-necks in the transportation system, which involves everything from grain to potash to sulphur to forest products and to coal, and to make recommendations to government.

It also involves a body whereby we can concert our efforts as Westerners where we do have a common problem — and we certainly have a common problem in the area of freight-rate discrimination against the West.

Now, in connection with our spanking new department, Mr. Speaker — as I said the department is to be completely rejuvenated. I don't want to say very much about the past but I want to assure Hon. Members that all of the arts of rejuvenation will be employed from dermatology to prosthetics and we will have, I hope, a modern, dynamic department of industry and trade promotion, awakened from a long slumber, raucously alive, electric with vitality...(Laughter) with a Minister at the top of that department.

I don't want to go into bureaucratic details of the new department, except to give some indication of the kind of thrust it should have. Accordingly, I'll say something about how it will be organized, apart from its spanking new name.

We will have three new branches in that department. One will be a promotion branch, which will be responsible for promoting industrial development and trade; finding industrial prospects; operating business development and trade missions — which I think are terribly important — trade missions to other parts of the world, based upon hard-headed economic research taking place first; identifying the product — where British Columbia has a natural advantage; identifying the market; making a market survey in that area; and then going in with your trade mission to sell. That's the way it should be done and the promotions branch will be in charge of that kind of mission, including developing joint ventures and licensing agreements.

There will be a business research branch, which will be responsible for identifying industrial opportunities — something of what I have been talking about; carrying out industrial projects and market studies; identifying industrial prospects and carrying out preliminary feasibility studies as a screening process for the development corporation. I would hope — and I speak here as the Attorney General, borrowing a line from the FBI — that the business research branch of this department would publish a list after the most careful research of the 10 most wanted industries for British Columbia. Based upon that kind of research and that kind of practical objective, I think we can help to bring to this province the kind of industries that we need.

We will have an information branch, which will be totally non-political in anything that it publishes. We will have an industry branch in Vancouver which will maintain constant regular contact with the businesses of this province, at least on an annual basis, if it's only a courtesy call. If it's only a call to see if somebody needs technical expertise tunneled in here, if they need financial expertise to help them in that situation. If possibly they need trade promotion help or advertising help. If possibly they need industrial assistance to diversify and expand their business. That Vancouver branch should be in constant touch with all of the businesses of British Columbia and have reports and, as I say, stand ready to assist.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Oh, yes. Certainly, of course. The economics and statistics branch will continue to gather economic information upon the trends of our own economy and British Columbia's place in the world economy.

I would hope, without going into more details of departmental organization — except to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we also intend to move the offices of the department from the Douglas Building in Victoria closer to the business community in Victoria and that our offices in Vancouver will be in the heart of the business community and adjacent to the Canadian offices of the Canadian government. I think it is terribly important that we don't have wastage and duplication because, for example, even in the City of Seattle we have a Canadian consul, we have trade commissioners. We have them in San Francisco, and in Los Angeles. There's no use of us building up our bureaucratic machinery and neglecting to make use and to have our people make use of these services, which are already staffed by very qualified, energetic, self-starting people.

When we think in terms of industrial assistance, you think in terms of what can be done that will be economically sound. I think we should also think in terms of social objectives. Let me give one or two examples.

One of them is the problem of industrial land in the Province of British Columbia. In the last very short while a South American group — who I won't name because there's nothing wrong with what they did — purchased near Langley 2,000 acres of potentially industrial land. Probably land that isn't going to be used for farming. Two thousand acres. The price of that land in the Fraser Valley has been soaring from about \$9,000 an acre a year ago to \$12,000 to \$13,000 an acre at the present time, maybe higher.

[[Page 126](#)]

MR. CHABOT: No, not nearly that.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, these are the prices I'm thinking about — of potentially industrial land — and there has been a tremendous inflation in values. We have developed a shortage of good industrial sites for industry. At the same time we have seen more and more of our province pass out of our hands into private hands and private interests. I would hope that an industrial corporation, along with other agencies of government, could move in the field of helping to provide industrial sites; acquiring land; cooperating with municipalities such as the City of Nelson, which has the land in a raw condition and requires the money to see that it is properly serviced to be available for industrial locations. The same in the Mission area.

I think we can construct the buildings where an industry is logically able to survive. Because, as I say, in that kind of industrial assistance the taxpayer will not lose his shirt. He will have the assets if the industry does not succeed and it will be on a leasehold basis. Yet we will be able to give the kind of assistance which, in a small way, B.C. Hydro has been giving. Because B.C. Hydro has about 500 acres of land, mostly adjacent to trackage, and they may very well be one of those who come to the industrial corporation and says that with so much assistance to service that land with power or transit or natural gas and to put it into proper condition or put a building on it, industry can be located in that area. I think that is one of the social objectives that we should pursue. Another one is to disperse as much as we can — subject to the iron laws of economics — the small secondary industry of the province throughout the whole province, and not all piled up down in the lower mainland.

If there is any way in which we can assist an industry in a small town such as the town of McBride, where people may have the land, they may have a partial living from farming but not a living without that secondary industry located in their community — if we can assist in that kind of community's salvation, we will still have those little communities in 20 and 30 years' time. Otherwise we are going to see them go down the drain one by one.

I would hope that among the social objectives, Mr. Speaker, that we might look at would be situations where the consumer has not been getting a proper deal. I refer, for example, to the cement industry where, Mr. Speaker — I hope you won't repeat what I am saying ...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not allowed to.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I wouldn't want it to go any further than between the two of us. I have long been of the opinion that the price of concrete and ready-mix has been excessively high in the Province of British Columbia. I am of the opinion that another cement industry is a perfectly feasible enterprise for British Columbians to engage in in this province, provided we have the limestone. We have a need for competition. We need the

industrial land properly serviced, probably with natural gas and transportation adjacent.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Yes. And I would think that one of the objectives of the corporation should be to look at that kind of a situation and give it the balance of the doubt.

And we might even extend, as my friend says, some industrial assistance to the new auto insurance corporation. That's the kind of thing that can be done.

I think there are many imaginative things that can be done in the Province of British Columbia. For example, we sit on a gold mine, really, of peat in this province — great reserves in the lower mainland and in the Queen Charlotte Islands. The technological research is proceeding in terms of the commercial exploitation of those peat bogs. But nothing is being done in terms of business research, the market feasibility studies, the production studies.

The B.C. Research Council, as I say, is doing very good work in that field. And they've already discovered that peat is a great odour-absorber and has other industrial uses. But here is a potential secondary industry that could be of great importance to the Province of British Columbia, based upon a natural product that is part of our economy. It exists also in Quebec where they're beginning to consider its exploitation too and which can provide jobs and export dollars if we devote to it the necessary research which has to be not only technological but business alike.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we can have a dynamic and flexible and imaginative industrial and trade expansion programme in the Province of British Columbia. I say we should not have great expectations but we should have reasonable expectations. I say we should not have growth for growth's sake. But when we look at the unemployment, and when we look at our potential, I think we can plan things that are financially sound and ecologically sound and work our way with that kind of a dynamic programme toward a better province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Delta.

MR. C. LIDEN (Delta): Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members, it's an honour for me to represent Delta in this House. Delta is the heaviest populated constituency in the province. With 52,000 voters and a great many

[[Page 127](#)]

problems, it's a big job. And I'm pleased to be able to take the people's problems and represent them in this Legislature.

I think it's because of my early instructions from my father that I learned that we must share everything we do with others. I learned that we must always cooperate with others. And I learned that what we desire for ourselves we want for all. And I think it's for those reasons that I'm standing as an NDP member of this Legislature and very proud of it.

Perhaps that's the same reason why I started to attend union meetings when I was very young and found a cooperative way in which to try and effectively change the things that were bothering me and bothering other people that I worked with.

In the fishing industry, where I worked most of my life, there are a great many problems. And a great many of them are due to the fact that in B.C. we have no provincial interest in fisheries. At one time there was a Department of Fisheries in the province. But the Social Credit Government did away with it a number of years ago.

It may be news to some of the people here that all the east coast provinces that border on the Atlantic have provincial departments of fisheries. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, even little Prince Edward Island has a department of fisheries. And I've visited those places and I've visited more than one of them. And I find that they involve themselves in what's happening in the fishing industry of that province. They work together with the federal Department of Fisheries and they have an effect on how the people work and live in the fishing industry of

those provinces.

In B.C. we've one of the greatest food resources of the world and it has had very shabby treatment indeed in the last number of years. There are other industries that have made progress at the expense of the fishing industry. We have recently seen some publicity about log jams in spawning streams - those sort of things. I've been visiting those sort of things all of my life and watching these things happen.

There's been publicity also of some pollution from mining projects and those sort of things. But I think perhaps the most telling story is in the Stellako River — the Stellako log drive of a few years ago — where a private company owned quite a large storage of logs and wanted to drive them through the spawning grounds. They were refused by the federal Department of Fisheries; they were not allowed to take those logs through the spawning ground. But the provincial government decided to get the company off the hook and what they did was to take over the logs, drive them through the spawning ground, destroy the spawning ground and then turn them back to the private industry.

To me that's the kind of treatment that I've seen in the fishing industry in all the time that I've worked there, because in all those years we've had that old Social Credit Government that brought about that sort of thing.

We've seen pollution developing all over the province, and certainly pollution of the water affects the fishing industry more than anything else. The north arm of the Fraser River used to be a place where a great many people earned their living — they used to fish in the north arm of the Fraser River. Today no fish travel in the north arm of the Fraser River. And we're gradually seeing the pollution added to the south arm. Certainly the decision of the previous government to allow sewage to be dumped in the Fraser River — all at Annacis Island, after only primary treatment, was an example of the kind of treatment we've been seeing.

I have lived on the Fraser all my life. I've seen what happens in the Fraser. I know that it's contrary to what they try to tell us, that all these things flush out to the sea very quickly and there's no problem. But I've seen in the winter months and in the early spring months, before the freshet, where the Fraser River backs up and the things that are deposited in the river stay there for a good long time — many tides. And with the addition of the chlorine that was planned for that primary plant, we would have not only a bad situation for mature salmon going up the river, but we'd have a deadly situation for the fingerlings going out in the spring of the year.

To me it seemed only logical that the new Government should move very quickly and declare that we must have secondary treatment or better for the treatment plant at Annacis Island and the fishing industry applauds the Government for their decision.

Certainly the people in the fishing industry are pleased to hear of the change of the Horseshoe Bay ferry from Horseshoe Bay over to the mouth of the Fraser River somewhere. But I just want to express a word of caution. If the ferry is to go at the end of the jetty, as has been suggested might be one of the considerations, it could create a real problem for the fishing industry and the ferry service. Because in that area you have a great many fishermen trying to make a living, and in the darkness I've many a time tried to run a boat into the Fraser River through all the nets that exist there and find it a very difficult chore. I'm sure the ferry would find itself with no end of problems if that were chosen as the terminal. I sincerely hope that the feasibility study takes a good look at the aspect of the problem and gives serious consideration to the better site, in my view, at the outside of Iona Island, where the fishing industry has already been destroyed.

Fisheries are a very important part of the economy of British Columbia, but they're certainly more than that. They are an important part of the world food resource and they can continue to be an important part of the economy and the fisheries can continue to

be a very important part of the world food resource if we do something to protect it. I'm pleased that the policy of our party calls for a provincial department of fisheries to be reinstated in British Columbia. I'm hopeful that that part of our policy will get high priority and that we'll take our place with the rest of the provinces of Canada so that we

can do something about the problems that face that very, very important industry.

In my time in the labour movement I watched a repressive Government gradually drive the working people of this province against the wall. It seemed that step-by-step the situation became worse. Bill No. 43, Bill No. 42, Bill No. 33 right on down the line. That legislation caused credit unions to be saddled with injunctions. It caused the trade union movement to spend a great deal of their time in court and to spend a great deal of their money on lawyers and court costs. That legislation is what brought the working people out of their political sleep and got them involved in the political movement to the extent that they got rid of that repressive government and we're now on the road to changes.

The legislation that we had brought about heavy fines on working people and their organizations. I've personally been involved in those struggles and I've seen what has happened.

I was involved in the trawl fishermen's strike. The attempt of the trawl fishermen to get their first collective agreement in British Columbia. The trawl fishermen tried this in 1947. They tried again in 1952 and they tried it again in 1967. That was 20 years after their first attempt. Injunctions were granted by the courts to the employer. Those injunctions would have been successful in breaking that strike as well as the strikes that were broken in the early days. But the fishermen said, and I attended meetings where I listened to old-time fishermen saying, "We tried it in '47. We tried it in '52 and we're going to make it in '67. We've got to make it in '67. We've got to have a say in our destiny." And they did. They did. They won, but the price was high. The price was terribly high. The blame for that lays at the doorstep of the old government.

The first trawl agreement was signed in 1967. The first trawl fishermen's agreement in British Columbia and I believe it was the first trawl fishermen's agreement in Canada. But the union paid a fine of \$25,000. Three of its officers went to jail. Two of them stayed there for a year, There was a \$100,000 judgment against the union. All as a result of the kind of legislation we had from that old government. The union didn't have that kind of money, and the union couldn't match the requirements that were set down by the court. All of those people who were involved were therefore called upon to meet the requirements. I felt it like so many others. My home was fully mortgaged by the court and my savings taken from the credit union because of that kind of legislation. It wasn't until September 1, 1972, that I actually got my home back. I think that that's a pretty sorry record for that government that we finally threw out of office — and it's why I'm here.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LIDEN: That's the kind of legislation that we've had in this province.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. LIDEN: Oh, he upsets easily. We have been assured by the new Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) that there will be an overhaul of the labour legislation. There is going to be a thorough study made. I'm hopeful that some of the legislation will come about very soon. Some of the most obnoxious legislation that you people imposed upon the labour movement will be repealed. I hope that it will be done this session.

But there are a number of other issues that have to be a part of that study. We have to bring about proper bargaining rights for fishermen so that they can take their place in the labour movement and have a say in their destiny in the proper manner.

We have to have some changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act so that fishermen are automatically covered.

I want to explain just one sorry incident, because it happened to a neighbour of mine. Fishermen are able to buy compensation on a voluntary basis at the present time. The boat that I'm thinking of, they bought their compensation for the entire crew and they went up to Alaska to fish halibut. They have to buy their compensation for a certain period of time — three months. Whether they need it for one, or two, or three — they must buy it for three. When they returned from the halibut fishery, they go out here in the Juan de Fuca Strait and fish in a company

operation. They are automatically covered by compensation on that part of the fishery. As a result, these men had a double coverage for one month because they didn't use up all they purchased earlier. They had coverage on the automatic programme because they were registered as employees during the period that they fished salmon in Juan de Fuca Strait. When that season was over, a couple of these fellows went out fishing in the Gulf of Georgia on a little boat where they weren't automatically covered, but failed to take out compensation. The boat swamped and sunk. One man was saved and one man lost his life. That surviving family did not have the coverage from the compensation that every worker in this province ought to automatically be covered by. I hope that situation will be cleared up. I hope that we can change a number of things that were brought

[[Page 129](#)]

about by that government in the labour field.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about another problem — *The Landlord and Tenants Act* — because in White Rock, in the area that I represent, there are a great many senior citizens. A lot of them live in the apartment houses. I've had a number of complaints from the citizens down there. They told me they had a rent increase in September, they got their Mincome cheques in December, then they were notified of another rent increase on January 1.

I have checked the *Landlord and Tenants Act* and it says that: "No Landlord shall increase the rent for residential premises, and no tenancy agreement shall provide an increase in rent for residential premises during the first year of the tenancy agreement." And then it goes on to say: "No landlord shall increase the rent for a residential premise after a period of one year without first having notified the tenant in writing in the manner provided, and at least three months prior to the date of the increase."

That's interpreted by some landlords to mean that there can be in fact a rent increase every three months. There is apparently more than one kind of interpretation on that section of the Act. It's being suggested by some people that the senior citizens should very well take the landlord to court because he's going to go ahead on his interpretation from his legal advisor. I am pleased when I hear that the government is taking a look at this Act. I'm hopeful that there will be legislation brought in in this session to correct that situation, so that we don't have a situation where the people — the senior citizens particularly get their Mincome cheques and then have it taken away plus some additional because of the action of a few landlords who would take advantage of the situation. It doesn't really apply to all landlords.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, say something about the Automobile Insurance plan because the people out there are waiting for it. The people out there are demanding government automobile insurance. They've had enough of what has been happening in the past. I want to report to this House one instance that recently occurred.

There was a family in Delta that had an accident with a 1968 Parisienne Convertible. It's estimated to be worth about \$700. The damage on the car was \$517. But they're still using the car and driving it back and forth to work, even though the snow and the rain was coming in the window. The other driver in the accident was charged, so there was no question of who was liable. They wrote to me and told me about the situation because the insurance company had said that the car was a total wreck, that they were going to take it off their hands, that they were going to give them \$200. They also said in their letter, and in their phone calls to me, that they didn't think there was anything anyone could do. But after I did some phoning and talked to the insurance company a bit, we found out some new things. First of all we found that both cars were insured by the same company. And they sometimes make different kinds of decisions as to how they handle their deductible. After a number of phone calls, the company told me that they were sending a manager out to have a look at the situation. Before the day was out, they had changed their opinion on that accident. They had written the family a cheque for \$517 to cover the damage on their car — told them they could keep the car and have it repaired.

That's the sort of thing that the people are saying they've had enough of. They don't want any more of that kind of business. 84 per cent of the people out there are saying they want government automobile insurance, and they want it now. I'm proud to say that they're going to get it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one other situation that I'm concerned about. That's the question of pension plans. There are far too many pension plans in this province in my opinion. Pension plans that tie people to their jobs, tie them to employers, or tie them to their various trades. Some people would like to move. They can't move because they would lose their equity in their pension plan. Nowadays a number of people change jobs three or four times in a lifetime. Some of them hardly stay long enough in one job or another to reach their vesting in their pension plan. They often leave and lose their equity.

We have the Canada Pension Plan that has done something in the way of providing portable pensions for all people. But it's not enough. There are more pension plans being developed all of the time in this province and in other places in Canada. And it seems to me that all these various employer plans, and the various plans that are conducted by the trades themselves, tie people into their jobs and lock them into a position where they find themselves very reluctant to take up grievances with their employer. Because not only are they in danger of losing their jobs, but they are in danger of losing their pension plan and the equity that they have in it.

It seems to me that the longer we go on the more of an unholy mess we will be developing in the pension field in this province. I think that we need a portable provincial pension plan for all of the people in this province, and the sooner the better.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the land freeze, because there are a great many people in Delta that are concerned with the agriculture picture. There's a lot of farmland in Delta, and we know that there are a lot of problems.

In this party we've been discussing the agricultural question for a long, long time. We've discussed it at every convention — and there are many farmers who attend those conventions and discuss the problems.

[[Page 130](#)]

The policy that we enunciated during the election campaign, and the policy that the Minister has spoken about when he instituted the farmland freeze, is that the produce of the land sustains the life of society. We cannot ignore the problems facing the 130,000 people who work on the land in British Columbia.

The number one issue in our land-use policy says: "We will establish a land zoning programme to set aside areas for agricultural production and to prevent such land being subdivided for industrial and residential use." That's precisely what we're doing.

We've watched in Delta and we've watched all over the province as to what is happening to farmland. And what do we see? Farmland is disappearing. Why? Why is the farmland disappearing? And who's making it disappear?

Well, we've got a policy that says that we're going to prevent it from disappearing any further. Our policy also goes on to say that we're going to make farming a viable industry in this province — and we must do so.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to something that I take from *Hansard*, the statement that was made by the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) on Monday. The Hon. Member for North Okanagan was saying, referring to people who are ready to retire and in ill health, "Their land was up for sale. And you know, somebody was going to buy it...and it wasn't a speculator...it wasn't going to be subdivided. Another farmer was going to buy it, but their sale is frozen. The option was dropped."

She goes on to say that if we say "no," we should tell that to them — tell it to the farmers.

She went on to say that, "...the point is, the option had been dropped. They want to retire. They have ill health. The people that were going to buy it have now gone to Alberta, and there's no chance for him to sell this land until the whole matter is cleared up."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've read the orders-in-council, both of them. I don't see anything in there that says that

land cannot be sold. Land can be sold. Farmland can be sold for farming purposes. There's nothing in the order-in-council to prevent that. And I think that it's shameful when someone in this House deliberately misleads, or tries to mislead, the people.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not in accordance with the rules to charge another Member of deliberately misleading. It may be a mistake on her part. This happens from time to time.

MR. LIDEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) made a mistake (laughter), and said that there was a freeze on land sale. Sorry about that mistake.

AN HON. MEMBER: North Okanagan made a mistake.

MR. LIDEN: In Delta over the years we've seen a great change in the farmland. We've seen farmland changing to other uses. And it's been an issue in Delta for a long, long time.

1958, when the Deas Island tunnel — or the George Massey tunnel, as it's now called — was built, the people started to flock in to Delta and much land changed hands. People came from near and far and bought land in Delta. Some became rich. Land prices soared. Many people from Vancouver came to Delta and bought one, two or three or four lots; only to hold them for awhile, to see the price increase, and sell them again. I don't think that they did so well — not nearly as well as those people who came and bought up farms and had them rezoned and subdivided them and created the problems for the future.

In those days in Delta, when it was faced with those kind of problems, aldermen were elected and defeated on the question of their land use policies, and their involvement in land use. I said in the fall session that speculators were involved in elections and they were involved in elections. I know, because the speculators in Delta said that Liden had to go from the Delta council no matter what the cost, because he wasn't prepared to rezone farmland for their individual use.

But what happened? What happened in Delta? We had a farm community at one time. We had a farm community and we had a farm council. And I think they did a good job in those days. But once the speculators entered the field and things started to change, the whole concept of Delta changed. It was awfully hard for the farmers to refuse the money that was being waved in front of them for the sale of their land. It was very difficult. And it was good for some of the farmers to be able to unload their land and sell it and make some money, I suppose.

But was it good for the community? I don't think so. We have evidence of that situation now. Many people moved into Delta and gradually the complexion of the municipal council changed. You know there were a number of new people elected to that council in those days. They hired engineers and planners and solicitors for the first time in some of those rural farm areas. The planner that we hired in Delta in those days when I was on council is now sitting as the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) on the Government side of this House.

But because some people didn't like what was happening, speculators involved themselves in elections and defeated some of those councilors, those aldermen — and they dismissed the engineers, the planners and the solicitors. There's been a long road back. It's been a long road back. I think that now we see the situation that Delta has recovered a great deal

[[Page 131](#)]

from what happened in those days. The aldermen that have been elected in the latter years have not allowed subdivision to develop. They've been under a great deal of pressure from the speculators in Delta. That pressure changed to the regional district in the last while. But now that pressure is on the provincial government, because the provincial government has become involved in the real job that has to be done in saving the farmlands in this province.

I attended a Chamber of Commerce meeting not long ago where there was a report made by the agriculture committee that made very sharp criticism of the land use policy that had been announced by the Government. They

were very critical. They said that the governments had been the worst offenders to the land of the delta, and certainly that's true. There is one farm that was once a 100 acre farm that's now merely 40 acres in two or three parcels. There's another farm that's 160 acres originally. It's now only 35 acres and it's in five pieces as a result of Hydro expropriations, highway expropriations and railroad expropriations and so on.

All this sort of thing has happened without too much planning on the part of the old Government. The result is that some of those farms are in bad shape. But nevertheless, while this action should have been taken 20 years ago, it's never too late to save what's left of the farmland, in Delta. There's a lot of it left and it must be saved.

I found, after the chamber of commerce report, that many of the farmers, who seemed to be in support of the statements that were made there, came to me and said that they agree with the Government policy on saving the farms. A great many farmers have phoned me. There was a farmer in this building a few days ago that told me that his land will increase in value for sale as farm if we go ahead with the programme of making the industry more viable.

I've got a letter from one farmer that I'd like to read to this House because it sort of sets out the feeling that a number of farmers have expressed to me. It says:

"As a resident and dairy farmer of Delta, I fully agree on the action the Government has taken in regard to the land freeze. The farm I presently operate for the last nine years as a tenant has been priced by the landlord so high that it is impossible to operate it as such. By zoning it as agricultural land, I hope to be able to rent or buy a farm and operate it as efficiently as possible, instead of the wait-and-see attitude that I have at the present time, because the longest lease you can get is for three years. So many young farmers are faced with the high pricing of farms that they are unable to start. The Minister may have opened the road for them and blocked those land speculators which were having a field-day"

Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of reaction that we are getting from the real farmer. I think that when people are saying that we've got to make sure that we separate farmland from what isn't farmland, I think we've got a bigger task — and that is to separate farmers from those who are not farmers, those who only own land for speculation.

We have a major problem in the Delta constituency, both in south Surrey and in the Delta municipality. That is the diking of the lowlands, the flood plains, as my friend from Langley (Mr. McClelland) spoke about. I'm sure that we are going to be able to work out something with the federal and municipal governments that will provide better solutions to these problems than what we have seen in the past. Last July there was a flood of some of the farmlands in the Serpentine area. The farmers were quite concerned as to what had happened as a result of a heavy rainfall. They were offered, I think, some seed to replace the lettuce seed that they lost in flood, but that doesn't solve the problem because once the period of time has gone for seeding, they lose their markets. That's the thing that they have been developing and trying to build up for a number of years.

If we get into a proper diking, drainage and irrigation system — which I'm confident that we will — we will begin to solve these problems and we will make the farming industry an industry that people will be proud to be participating in.

Not only do they grow lettuce and celery and onions, as was spoken about, but they grow beans and potatoes and peas and so on — fodder for the dairy herds and for the beef farmers in Delta. Much can be done. Many extra crops can be taken off the farm if it is properly diked and drained and irrigated. They can get on the land sooner in the spring and they are able to get the best use out of it by irrigation in the hot of the summer.

In general, Mr. Speaker, in all my discussions with the farmers in my area, the real farmer supports the land-use policy. I'm pleased to be able to report that to the Government.

In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, we have another land-use problem. That's the Burlington Northern Railroad that runs along the beachfront in White Rock and Crescent Beach — probably some of the best recreation area in the lower mainland. I don't think it's the best use of the land to have a railroad run on the beach. I've been at that beach, in the tourist bureau, and sat and watched out the window when a long train has been parked there and watched people crawl across that train from the beach to their cars and from the cars to the beach. That's a very unsafe

situation and a situation that must be corrected.

The previous Government promised year after year to move that railroad out of White Rock but it's still there. The last I heard was that there was some

[[Page 132](#)]

attempt to find a new site for the railroad through the farmlands of south Surrey. Of course, that creates another problem. I think that we have to take a good look at this situation because there are some other alternatives.

My suggestion is that the alternative that we take a good look at is that we stop the Burlington Northern Railroad at the border, period. That we stop it at the border. If they want to connect into the railroad system in British Columbia, they can join in the existing railroad through Sumas and go up and join into the B.C. Railroad. There is no need, in my opinion, to cut up some more farmlands in south Surrey to provide another link for a railroad that can find its way through the present railroads that are there.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of transportation. In Delta we are very pleased that there was an announcement by the Government that they are going to purchase some buses because the transportation system in Delta is nonexistent. There just is no bus service in that area. Not only do we need buses but we need to be part of a staged development of a proper transportation system.

The people of Delta line up every morning at the Oak Street bridge and the Fraser Street bridge in Richmond, at various places on Highway 17. Highway 17 is now being widened. They are going to improve the interchange to get on Highway 99 to go through the tunnel. But we are just moving the plug around because the traffic has been plugged up in one place or another for years. There is only one kind of solution and that is to bring about a proper transportation system that doesn't see one person per car travelling to Vancouver every morning. We need buses from Delta to Vancouver but we need more than that. We need privilege lanes for those buses to travel in so that there is some opportunity for those people who travel by bus to make a more rapid progress in getting into the city than what they make at the present time by sitting in the line-ups.

Besides that, we need an internal grid of bus systems in the lower mainland. Right now the situation that exists in Delta is that everybody must have two cars. If you don't have two cars and one person uses the car to go to work, the other person has to sit at home and look out the window. The only way they can get away from the house at all is to have a second car. That's a bad situation. It has been developing for years and it is something that must be reversed. I hope that we'll do it by the announcement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer). I hope that that has a high priority — not only the purchase of the buses but the development of a real transportation system. I'm pleased and the people of Delta are pleased that the announcement has been made and the start has already taken place.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that some people on the Opposition benches said something about the confusion with regard to Mincome. I suppose there has been some confusion. I have had some people come to me but I'm pleased that when I've raised it with the Minister, they have been solved.

I can say to this House and to the Minister concerned that I have a message from the senior citizens and the disabled people of Delta. Most of them who contacted me and said that they were pleased that they received their cheques before Christmas and they want to thank you, Mr. Minister, and they want to thank the Government for bringing about that improvement. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Cocke moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall), motion No. 2 standing in my name on the order paper, that a special committee be appointed to review the problem of oil spills on the coastal waters of British Columbia, with particular emphasis upon joint action with the State of

Washington; and to make recommendations to the House which they deem necessary in the public interest; 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.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Strachan files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Stupich files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Cocke files the 76th annual report of Public Health Services of British Columbia, Health Branch.

Hon. Mr. Barrett files 32nd annual report of the Public Utilities Commission.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

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

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