

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, FEBRUARY 7, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

(HANSARD)

[[Page 287](#)]

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, it has come to my attention, with regret, that Mr. Arthur Cuthbert, who was a respected attendant of this House in previous years, passed away suddenly a little over a week ago. I'm sure it would be a wish that I convey on your behalf our regrets to his mourning family.

The Hon. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the House to give recognition to a group of very distinguished visitors in the galleries today from Fernie: Mayor Vernon Uphill, who is a son of Tom Uphill, who graced this House for 40 years; and Alderwoman Mrs. Williams; Mr. Frank Butala, the city clerk of Fernie; and two delegates from the Board of Trade, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Majic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Rossland-Trail.

MR. C. D'ARCY (Rossland-Trail): Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave of the House to introduce from the City of Rossland Alderman Harry Lefevre and Mr. Andy Chapdelaine.

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

MR. E.O. BARNES (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome a group of students from the City of Vancouver — Lord Nelson — who are visiting this assembly for the first time. I hope that they will have experiences that will last them throughout the coming years in their pursuit of an education experience.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to welcome a very special guest of mine today. Please be on your best behaviour — my mother is over today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I think that would apply to the Premier more than anybody.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO CONTROL PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. McGeer moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 60 intituled *An Act to Control Pyramid Selling*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 60 read a first time and ordered to be placed on the orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

**AN ACT TO AMEND THE POLLUTION
CONTROL ACT, 1967**

Mr. Gardom moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 61 intituled *An Act to Amend the Pollution Control Act, 1967*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 61 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

(Continued)

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Burnaby Willingdon.

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Commercial Transport): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the first opportunity that I have had to congratulate you on your election as Mr. Speaker. I wish you well in that torrid area. (Laughter).

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on which we are debating for the fine job that they both did. I would like also to congratulate the 28 new Members who are gracing our chamber this year — 28 Members that have never set foot in this palace before. We wish them well. They've all spoken — we've heard them all, from all parties. I think we all agree that they have done a terrific job and we can look forward to a few years of very high level debate in the chamber.

To those four that suffered an absence, I want to say welcome back. We're glad to see you back again, with the exception of one gentleman who was voluntarily absent. But we welcome you as well. (Laughter). For those that have returned, I admire your survival instinct.

I would like to start discussing for a moment the question of — but before I go into that, I might say that there are some differences over on this side of

[[Page 288](#)]

the House. It's very difficult to get used to coming in the different door and that sort of thing. But any of you over there that want to get over here, I want to explain to you that there are some fringe benefits. On debates of this kind

we can speak first and that's something that was very difficult to do, I found, when we were on the other side of the House. So there are some benefits.

AN HON. MEMBER: The main benefit is to the people.

HON. MR. LORIMER: Now regarding transit, I think the Government, on taking over as the Government of this province, immediately determined that there had to be a decision made as to whether or not we were going to go down the road with the automobile or whether we were going to move into the field of transit. The decision was reached that we would move towards the transit solution to the problems of the urban areas. As a result, we decided that the cities actually are there for people, they're not there for the automobile. Where there was a conflict between the automobile and people, then the residents of the cities would have to win out.

In order to proceed with the plans, 99 buses have been ordered and these will start to arrive in April of this year.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. LORIMER: Speaking about that, there are only two firms in Canada that produce transit buses. Those two firms were both asked to send in figures as to costs. As a result, instead of causing delays — we have 50,000 people in Coquitlam that have no bus service. We have people in Surrey that have very limited bus service. Delta, the same way. In order to get bus services through without delay — now you may want delay. You may not want these people to have the services that the areas and the urban areas should have. That's up to you. We decided that the system would be operational this year and instead of waiting for another year, these buses were ordered. Likewise, in View Royal and in some areas in Saanich, the bus services will be improved.

By the end of this year we expect that the services in the Greater Vancouver Regional District and the Capital Regional District will be greatly improved and there will be a start, at least, on an overall surface bus system throughout the two areas.

I have invited three representatives from the Capital Regional District and likewise the Greater Vancouver Regional District to sit on a committee to determine the matters that have to be detailed. The two members from my department and two members from Hydro and one member from the transit union.

These will be two separate committees — one for the Capital Regional District and one for the Greater Vancouver Regional District. These committees will be meeting.

I also invited the Minister of State, the Hon. Mr. Basford, to appoint two members from the federal government to sit on this committee to give us expertise and, I would hope, to give some solid suggestions as to financial assistance by the federal government. We have heard from the federal government that they are anxious to assist the urban development of the country. It seems to me that one of the major concerns in an urban area is the transit problem. However, I have received a letter from him today in which he declines the invitation and this is a disappointment to me. However, I expect to be in consultation with Mr. Basford from time to time and am hopeful that in due course there will be some input from the federal government.

The purpose of the committee basically is, first of all, to look after the transit system, to determine who should operate it — whether it should be B.C. Hydro, whether it should be the regional districts, whether it should be a Crown corporation or whatever other vehicle that may be required to operate the system. The second aspect is how is the system to be financed? What share will the regional districts pay, what share will the province pay, and so on.

I think that as far as we are concerned, we consider the transit merely to be an extension of the highways and ferry services in this province. We're looking at a total transportation system throughout the province, not only in the two major areas of population but also in the cities in the interior and the cities on Vancouver Island, eventually. The first attack will be on the two areas which I have outlined earlier, but certainly such cities as Prince George, Prince Rupert, Kamloops and so on, will have to be looked at on this transit question. I think we have to look also at smaller areas and the country communities as to how we can get people moved about, due to the fact that transit bus service

throughout the province is not quite what we would like to see it.

The third question to be determined by this committee will be the question of where these routes should go. Should they first of all appear in View Royal or in Saanich or where, and what routes should be taken? I would expect that this committee would receive representations from the general public and would act in accordance with the wishes of the people affected as far as their bus service is concerned.

The fourth thing, of course, is to deal with the local governments to determine what streets are available for transit, what corridors can be blocked off in order that buses can move down the streets. Of course when this is completed and when the bus systems have been built up, then the next survey is

[[Page 289](#)]

what do we need in the next few years as far as transit is concerned, in the more sophisticated areas of transit.

I would like to make a few introductory remarks regarding the problems of municipalities. The responsibilities of local governments are increasing at a rapid rate. The city dweller is anxious to have more services. He's demanding underground wiring. He wants sidewalks. He wants swimming pools. He wants this and he wants that — libraries and so on. That is the way that our society is moving. All these are causing additional costs to the local taxpayer and, of course, to the city fathers. Municipalities have limited areas where they can raise money. They have a land tax. They can obtain money from licensing of various things, the business tax and that sort of thing — dog licences and so on. If they have land in their name, they can sell it but this is a short-term proposition because obviously you can only do that for so long.

Populations are shifting towards the urban centres. In the country areas, although the communities or villages as centres may be increasing in size, the populations are not increasing in the country itself.

Pollution abatement is now a real problem. People are demanding clean air, clear water and unpolluted soil. They want lower levels of noise. These matters are forcing local governments to take a serious look at their future developments — not only on the local level but in the senior governments. The question of pollution has quite an economic effect on local governments. The social costs involved in our modern society keep rising.

The issues that face the large urban centres today have little relationship to the issues that faced large centres of population 50, 60 or 70 years ago. There's very little relationship between the two. In the local budgets, probably only 5 per cent could be said to be mad money. The other 95 per cent is merely funds that are required by local governments to pay for the services which were performed last year. With this probable 5 per cent, the local councils have to determine how they're going to spend this. Are they going to put it in a swimming pool, a skating rink, or do they need a new library or what not. We certainly appreciate the fact that the municipalities are not rich.

In summary, I want the municipalities to know that we appreciate their problem. We are sympathetic with their problem and we'll certainly do what we can in cooperation with the municipalities at least to take off some of the pressures. We know we're not going to make them wealthy overnight but certainly we are prepared to discuss their problems. If there is any way we can help them financially, we're most prepared to do what we can.

I was somewhat surprised at the remarks of the Hon. Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) regarding the creation of the new cities of Kamloops and Kelowna. If that criticism had come from the Liberals or the Conservatives or even the new Members of the Social Credit Party here, I would have accepted the criticism. But to get this type of criticism from someone who has sat in this House for over three years, who was involved in the debates of the situation, who has a background of municipal government, it was really somewhat quite unreal.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Our paper says he's a crucial Member.

HON. MR. LORIMER: I did not intend to discuss or criticize the performance of the previous government. I don't really see any point in doing so because we're not worried about what happened in the past. We're expecting to look to the future and govern accordingly. However, it seems necessary to answer the criticism. I must go back a

little bit in history in order that at least the new Members of this chamber know part of what has gone on in regard to this one item. I suggest that the direction that I have taken was dictated by the action and lack of action of the previous administration.

I would like to state that the greater Kamloops area, a few years back, consisted of two cities, the area on the one side of the river of North Kamloops, and Kamloops itself. They carried on as two separate communities for some time. Eventually they decided that for the benefit of the area as a whole, and for the benefit of better local government, better planning and so on, that they would amalgamate. This was done around 1968, I believe it was — '67 or '68.

AN HON. MEMBER: ...the referendum.

HON. MR. LORIMER: I'll come back to referendum, just hold it my friend.

And as a result they united in 1968.

On October 23, 1969, Valleyview was created — bordering on the city of Kamloops. And it is part of the greater Kamloops area. This is where, after the community had become united, we see the commencement of the Balkanizing of the Kamloops general area.

Then again, on April 23, 1971, the district of Dufferin was created. Now, you all remember the district of Dufferin — that's the deal there where two communities, two areas, joined together by a railway track. That was the Dufferin deal; and that consisted of a population of around 750 people right on the border of Kamloops, and partly inside. They are completely adjacent to the city of Kamloops. And so the Balkanization was proceeding. Then, on June 22, 1971 Brocklehurst was incorporated. And luckily for the area the election took place and there was no further incorporations of the region. Otherwise there would be two or three more incorporations coming

[[Page 290](#)]

about.

Criticism is levied against me on the basis that this amalgamation will be taking place without the right of a vote to the areas of Valleyview, Dufferin and Brocklehurst. Now, these three communities were created without a vote of the region. Valleyview was created by a vote of those people who presided in the new city of Valleyview. The vote in Dufferin was cut off with the vote of only those people who reside within the confines of the new district of Dufferin. 750 people total population decided the future — or were deciding the future of the Kamloops area. The votes did not take place of the whole region — there was no vote of the whole region — of the Kamloops area. The people of Kamloops who were most affected by these splinters — these take-offs — did not have the right to vote. And the vote that took place was therefore, in my opinion a rigged vote.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): All the leeches. All the leeches.

HON. MR. LORIMER: Now, a further interesting feature...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. LORIMER: What I'm saying is that there was no vote of the region. The area affected did not have the right to vote. And I as Minister feel that I am unable to allow this — protect this kind of situation.

Now, a further interesting feature in the Kamloops area is the fact that all the industrial lands were left out of the incorporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh, oh.

HON. MR. LORIMER: In the new Kamloops, all the industrial areas of the area will be in the new city of Kamloops. The new city will have a strong industrial base, a strong tax base, and will have a strong local

government for the future development for the area. And Kamloops, along with Kelowna are two of the areas which are hubs within the whole province of British Columbia. The situation is that unless you have a healthy base you'll not have a healthy town. I suggest that Kamloops will have a strong foundation along with Kelowna, for future construction — future growth and development.

In Kelowna, the government by their failure to act to allow extensions of boundaries has strangled the City of Kelowna. The City of Kelowna will now be liberated. These communities can, and are now working together planning for the future. Both cities are key cities in future development. It is our opinion that with a solid base, the local governments will survive and be successful.

It is my opinion that where communities exist side by side, and have existed in that manner for a great number of years, and each community is providing their own facilities — I believe that if the people of the area wish that this sort of thing continue, that is their decision.

Now, when the area or communities are taking advantage of one another, or using services being supplied by one, and not being contributed to by another; and where there are health hazards — where some of the communities may not be totally paying their share of the advantages that they are receiving — in cases where there has been a break down, as in the case of Kamloops, of services being supplied by one area to another; then I think it is a responsibility of the Minister to take action.

The local study committees, which consist of elected representatives in both communities, have been working very, very hard for the past two months in trying to resolve and create a blue-print for their future development. These people who have divergent views, and from different interests have been working very hard together. They've been cooperating together in a manner which has not been evident in those communities for a great number of years. They are cooperating, for the benefit of the area as a whole. And the people in that area, I suggest, are very satisfied that a rational decision has been made. We in this province owe a great debt of gratitude to these committees, and the members of these committees who are working so hard deserve our congratulations.

Now, as I have set out to the areas, if the government is prepared to give continued assistance, both in an advisory capacity and financially, it will make sure that the future of these two areas is secure.

The other remarks regarding the call from the Hon. Member to advise the areas not to cooperate — I feel were irresponsible statements and I'm not going to comment further on them.

In regard to the regional districts — I want to make mention that the regional district concept was brought into being by the former administration — and I give them full credit for it. I have before, and I think it is one of the great achievements of the previous Government. However, in some areas the regional districts have not operated in the way that probably was expected at the time that they were formed. And I appreciate the fact from discussing matters with different people in the province, that there are some problems with regional districts.

I wish to state that in late fall we did have some of our representatives from our department going around to give advice, or help, or assistance to the communities and the regional districts to try and get them off the ground if possible. There are some basic problems which must be reviewed, and we will have staff people out in the province trying to assist in any area in which there are problems. I appreciate the fact

[[Page 291](#)]

that there are problems. We hope to at least resolve some of the basic problems, and hopefully can assist in the matter of regional district development.

I wish to spend a little time on the question of housing. I want to state that there was a new bill brought in by the federal government lately. There are a number of items in that bill which I think can assist our housing projects. For instance, there is the question of assisted home ownership programme. This is where they are prepared to give a direct mortgage from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for mortgage loans on old and new houses. And the difference in this is that they intend to have a sliding scale of interest rates. So that if a person is in a lower

financial category, that person may be able to receive a lower interest rate than the normal Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation interest.

In addition, although it's not in the bill I understand that the regulations will indicate that they will pay up to \$300 per year as a grant in order to help the lower income groups to get involved. Now this ties in very nicely with the second mortgage provisions which again were brought in by the previous Government. I think that we can get people who are maybe below the \$7,000 or \$8,000 per annum area into home ownership. We still have the problem, of course, of those below the \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year financial area for which we have to find alternate housing.

There is additional help for the housing assistance section, the non-profit sections, in which at the present time the province gives a one-third grant — maybe in senior citizens' homes or something of that sort — 10 per cent being put up by the organization that's operating the scheme and the rest by a loan from Central Mortgage and Housing.

Now apparently the federal government is prepared, in addition to this, to give a 10 per cent grant to that non-profit organization. So, we can hope that we will have a little help in that area as well. There are other areas of assistance to cooperative housing and the 10 per cent grant is to be given to cooperative housing as well, providing the bill passes. There are some improvements, I think, in the federal housing programme.

It is my belief that the high cost of land and the high cost of housing and the high cost of servicing, are the most serious problems presently facing the urban areas — not necessarily the heavily developed areas — but in the communities throughout the province. The home acquisition grants and the second mortgages certainly help those people beyond the \$8,000 a year level. But we still have to consider what we are going to do with those who do not have the money to purchase houses at the present time.

I suggest that the subsidized housing schemes throughout Canada have generally been to build a large complex, fill them with people that need subsidized housing and then go along and build another complex. I suggest that this certainly provides shelter but, in our opinion, housing is more than a question of shelter. The social problems that this sort of complex creates can well more than defeat the benefits received by the shelter provided.

I think we are all in agreement that in 1973 everyone in British Columbia, irrespective of their financial worth, is entitled to some type of proper housing. For a successful housing programme I believe it is necessary to have a complete mix of economic incomes. In an apartment, a condominium, in our opinion there should be a proper mix. For instance, I don't believe there should be more than probably 15 or 20 per cent of subsidized units in those establishments. The other apartments should be rented out at a fair rental to the general public, whoever so wishes to occupy the premises.

We believe that single family houses and duplexes should be built throughout the community — not in a set area but throughout the community — and that the subsidized tenants could be moved in with no problems. Now it is obvious that the Government will be in the housing business. Those suites or units not used for subsidized tenants will be used for the general public. As such, the Government will be in the housing field.

The intention is to create a large stock of a variety of housing units. And it is hoped that time will have an effect on the cost of land throughout the communities. Now I know that this is a long programme and that it's not going to have that effect immediately.

Before such a programme can be undertaken, it is necessary to create a bank of land in which the planning for the housing programmes can be carried out. I wish to report — I think it's in the answers to the question I filed yesterday — that there are 44 individual lots purchased in the downtown Vancouver area. Land has been purchased...

MR. CHABOT: What's the acreage?

HON. MR. LORIMER: I don't know what the acreage is — 44 lots — I haven't got the acreage. Land for 100 senior citizens' units in West Vancouver; land for 192 senior citizens' units in Burnaby; 11 duplex lots in

Burnaby; land for 70 to 90 townhouse units in Victoria — I think that's 4 1/2 acres that one.

MR. CHABOT: 4.3.

HON. MR. LORIMER: 4.3 acres. And in Smithers we've purchased about 26 acres in Smithers for development there.

We have under consideration land worth approximately \$13 million which can be picked up. Now, not all of this will be picked up. It's reserved in order that

[[Page 292](#)]

we can take what we require. In that grouping there is one 400-acre parcel which will tie in, if we want to proceed on this new section of the federal Act for creation of new towns and services. We can get substantial assistance from the federal government in this area if we decide to proceed with that. And 16 parcels varying in size from half an acre to 36 acres.

Now, in addition to that we have reserved 200 individual lots in groups of from 2 lots to 22 lots. We have land for 346 housings units — either row housing or apartments or whatever. We have written to cities, the federal government and to others asking to have first right of refusal for lands that the public body is intending to sell. We have placed advertisements in the newspapers for land and individual lots throughout the urban areas.

We are looking at a wide variety of accommodation — mobile home parks, apartment blocks, fourplexes, duplexes, single family dwellings. I think we have to look at the whole spectrum of housing and have a complete mix.

In built-up areas it may be advantageous to purchase some existing apartment blocks. Now, I am fully aware of a number of problems in the programme described. To obtain a maximum number of housing units for subsidized housing, it is much easier to build a large complex and classify them all as subsidized units. We have refused to take this course. Those areas that are bought will be subsidized only to a degree of up to 20 per cent. As a result, although the housing units will be constructed, the units for subsidized housing will be considerably less than the units produced.

Our housing needs will not be resolved this year. They will not be resolved next year nor, indeed, in the next 10 years. The programme that I have outlined is merely a modest beginning on what I hope to be a successful attack on our social problems.

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

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I take my place in the formal debate on this motion I want first of all to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion which is now under consideration.

In view of the criticisms that have been leveled against the throne speech, I must doubly congratulate them. It must be obvious to the Members that while the throne speech has been called "empty", the proof of it is that the majority of debate on both sides of this House has scarcely made mention of anything which was in the throne speech. Instead we have dealt at greater length with the corridor speeches of Members of the Executive Council.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have now got *Hansard* so they can read the remarks, Mr. Member.

I would hope that in future years the Government might be encouraged to put into the throne speech those things which this year it has dealt with in the corridors of this building. That's the kind of open government that we have been led to expect from the new Government.

I want especially to congratulate the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) for her remarks in seconding the motion. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Government might see fit next year to let her write the opening speech.

If I have one comment, and it's not a criticism, in the course of her remarks dealing with matters of human rights and the legislation which we are all anticipating on that subject, she used the analogy of the disadvantaged people being in a long distance race. She suggested that it was unfair that long distance races should start from a straight starting line. But rather, she suggested that we should have staggered starting positions for such a race.

I suggest to her that if she would consider the reason why, in sprints and middle distance races the starting blocks are staggered, she would realize it is because each runner, each competitor must run in his or her own separate lane. In long distance races, which as she so correctly says this life is, it is the right of every individual to run as close to the centre pole as is possible. To run at his own time and his own speed without interference from other competitors. Those are the rules. There must be no interference.

I would rather like to think that the *Bill of Rights Act* that we will have in this province will enable each person to run on the inside track if that is his wish and to provide rules that there shall be no interference one with the other — rather than a bill of rights that would tend to place each individual in some separate path which he, by regulation, must follow. I think that so to do would more likely result in the kind of society which I am sure the Hon. Member and I both hope we will one day achieve.

I'm sorry that the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) has left the chamber. I wanted to congratulate him on some of the action he has taken with regard to the urban problems, and particularly in matters of transit.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: We'll pass that on.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, perhaps the Hon. Attorney General would listen very carefully then to what I have to say.

As well as congratulating him however I feel I must take exception with one of the matters he dealt

[[Page 293](#)]

with. That was the purchase of the 99 buses. He indicated that there were only two companies in Canada capable of producing those buses. In fact, there are three. Or, at least, there is a third company which has its representative in Canada. It's the Wells Company. They supply buses which are made by the Wayne Corporation in the United States. But they're built in Canada, and indications are that this company could perhaps supply these buses for something like \$3,000 to \$5,000 per unit cheaper. We'll never really know. The reason we will not know is that tenders were not called.

Now, if these figures are accurate, then it means that the people of the Province of British Columbia could save perhaps a third or a half million dollars on this particular transaction. I don't believe that we should see in government expediency being used as an excuse for fiscal mismanagement. To conclude a purchase on this basis without calling tenders is, I suggest, fiscal mismanagement. It leaves the Government unfortunately open to charges which may be improper.

I recall to you, Mr. Speaker, that within a week following the announcement by this Government of this purchase — within two days in fact — Press statements emanating from the New Democratic convention in Manitoba would leave the impression with some people that this decision was based upon the fact that there is an NDP government in Manitoba which owns 70 per cent of the company supplying these buses, and an NDP government here. Now that's the impression that is left by the statement and that is unfortunate.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And it's false.

MR. WILLIAMS: And it's false and I accept what the Attorney General says. But the only way that you can ever assure the people of this province that, in fact, these kind of charges are not proper is by insuring that all significant contracts are called by tender. I trust that the Government will never ever again see fit to stray from what surely must be the basic principle of government financial management.

I was pleased about the suggestion from the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) that we will soon have an improved system of public transit in the Greater Vancouver area and that some of the communities that form part of Greater Vancouver will be served as they have never been served before, But I would urge the Minister in this endeavour to make certain that actions of other departments of this Government do not interfere with the full realization of this goal.

I'm pleased that the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) is in his place because I wish to draw his attention to a decision apparently made in his department which I think is wrong. Under the previous administration, Mr. Speaker, we had a decision made to build a mammoth monument, some 55 stories high, to a man who is no longer with us. He may be back, but he certainly isn't with us at the moment.

AN. HON. MEMBER: He was with us in spirit on Friday.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's right, by telephone or by telegram or something. At any rate, I applaud the decision of the Government to discontinue that particular venture. I think the building was too large. I think it was wrongly located. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Hon. Minister of Public Works, that the decision apparently taken or under consideration by the Government to provide a substitute for that building is equally wrong. The indications are that buildings of much less height will be constructed, that there will be some open space provided, but that there will be more buildings.

I want to suggest to the Minister of Public Works that that be reconsidered. I think there should be a medium highrise building constructed, Mr. Minister. I think that the location of that building should be three or four full blocks south of the existing courthouse in Vancouver. I suggest that the area between that building and the courthouse be left as open space for the moment, and I'll tell you why.

As the downtown core of Vancouver grows, the need for the public transit system to bring people to that core and to take them away will be steadily increasing. One thing that we will require is a central terminal at which those buses, those public transit vehicles, will arrive and depart. I suggest to you that if you have viewed the construction which has taken place in Block 52, and the work that is taking place today in Block 42, you will come to two conclusions. The first is that if large buildings, even medium-sized buildings are allowed to be constructed in the downtown core of Vancouver, you forever lose the opportunity of any underground development — whether it be for rapid transit, heavy rapid transit, for parking, for underground terminals — whatever may be the case.

You will never be able to face the expense of going under major building structures to make use of underground areas.

What I suggest we should have in this three or four block area, south from the courthouse to where your new Government building will be, is eventually not the heart of the downtown core, but indeed the pulse of Vancouver's core. This can be done by excavating that area. And you will find, if you watch what's happened in Block 42, that the sub-structure in that area of Vancouver provides for easy and inexpensive excavation.

If you excavate that area, you will be able to

[[Page 294](#)]

provide a major downtown transit terminal to service the whole downtown area. You will also be able to provide underground approaches to that terminal. You will eventually arrive at the situation that you can take off the city streets not only private passenger vehicles, but also public transit vehicles as well. So you would have between Burrard Street on the west and Hastings Street on the north, False Creek on the south and east, an area of Vancouver serviced by public transit providing underground throughways for private, passenger and commercial vehicles to

move and leave the entire surface free for the enjoyment of the people who live and work in that area.

This, Mr. Speaker, would be a living monument to the wisdom of that particular Minister. I suggest that steps should be taken immediately to sit down with the mayor and the council of the City of Vancouver and discuss this proposal. Let's get the planning started now. Because once you create this situation with the court house and this long open space — which will always be open, even though the undersurface is used — with the British Columbia Building four blocks south, with all the streets available for the planting of trees and the enjoyment of people, you will have a core of Vancouver which pulses with life and yet is devoted to people, not machines.

I trust that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) will communicate with his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) and with the transit committee which he has established to take steps to ensure that this result will finally occur. It's not going to be easy and it's not going to be cheap. But it will never be less expensive than if we start now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct your thoughts to another matter which I think is of significance to all the people in British Columbia, a matter which has been raised on the floor of this House before by Members in these benches — by the First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer). That is the need in this province to have established a full-time energy board.

We've had an energy board which has functioned in the past and it has dealt with matters of electric power. But we know today that there are other energy problems facing the people of this province, of this country, of North America — indeed, of the world, and that is the so-called crisis with regard to the available supply of petroleum products and natural gas. The crisis is one which, at the moment, is felt most by our neighbours to the south and it is a crisis which results from their wasteful activities. The crisis is not so much one of supply but of supply at a low price.

Strange as it may seem to you, Mr. Speaker, we do not have in Canada, nor do we have in British Columbia, any certain assessment of what the future needs will be for petroleum products and natural gas. We must have these because the indications are that within as little as three decades, some of those supplies will be depleted. I say there are indications. There are equal indications that the known resources have not been fully assessed and so the time may be longer. But we must be concerned at the suggestion that within three decades we will be out of natural gas or petroleum products.

Look around at all the Members here. I suppose there's scarcely anyone here who won't be alive three decades from now. Think seriously about this one problem. What would you do if you were the person to have the last gallon of gasoline, the last quart of oil? The wheels will stop turning and society as we know it, as much as we may criticize it, certainly depends upon the turning wheel. Do you want society to go back to the days before the wheel was invented? This is what we face.

Therefore I suggest that the time is right now for this Government to make the assessments that are required with regard to our future needs and the future supply, and let us have solid facts upon which we in this assembly may deliberate the actions that must be taken in light of the potential crisis. As I have said in this House before, while we must concern ourselves with the problems of the moment — and there are many of them — so, too, we have a responsibility to the future generations who will live in this province, to the future Members who will sit in this House, to ensure that the decisions that we make are made in proper time and with a full realization of the effect of those decisions upon the future, which is theirs not ours.

The Hon. Premier, in one of his press conferences, has suggested that there will be a petroleum prices review board of some kind. In that same press conference he indicated that there would be perhaps a full and comprehensive energy board, I say let's start it right now. Let us put on the board those people of expert knowledge and technical knowledge who can make the kind of assessment that must be made. We can't wait for others to do it.

It may surprise Members, as it certainly surprised me, to know that the Government of Canada doesn't have any accurate assessment of this problem. They believe they know but truly we do not have the figures, we don't have the statistics upon which any one of us can make the wise decisions and provide the wise advice.

The Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is in the House and I want to turn to a matter that he raised earlier in the debate, a matter which I applaud. He made, as he pointed out, a difficult decision with regard to the matter of ferries. I want to congratulate him for taking that position.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, in my brief experience, that that particular Minister gave

[[Page 295](#)]

every indication when he sat on this side of the House that in Government he would have no hesitation to make those difficult decisions that must be made. He has here made a difficult decision which was one of the legacies left by the former Government.

He said at the time of those remarks, and I read from page 89 of the record of debate on January 30:

"There will be problems in this transition period. There will be problems of waiting in line. There will be problems of accommodation, there will be problems of parking. I expect the support of those people in and out of this House who have been talking about the need for changing these ferry terminals. I expect their support unflinchingly and right down the line in this transition period. Because otherwise we're in for difficult times."

I second what the Hon. Minister said and I assure him here today that he will have my unflinching support in meeting these problems. I have said so publicly outside this House and I will say so again whenever the circumstances may require, whether the criticisms are leveled by constituents of mine or otherwise. Because we must make these kinds of decisions if we are to have any progress.

Some criticism or suggestion has been made that the decision taken by the Hon. Minister is going to result in the depreciation of other areas in this province. Therefore I wish to go further with the Minister and say to him that as grateful as I am for the decision to move the ferries from Horseshoe Bay, I do not want that decision to be taken at the expense of any other part of this province. I do not believe that the people of my constituency are entitled to dispose of their difficulties by thrusting them onto the backs of other citizens. I believe, however, that the examination will show that the move of the ferries must be made.

For those people who have been concerned that perhaps Gabriola or some other area might be affected, I want to direct them to what the Minister also said on that occasion. He said:

"I want to say also that if the recommendation is Gabriola Island, we already have the bylaw No. 39 protecting Gabriola Island." But he said, more importantly: "The planning commission on Gabriola Island will be part of determining the protection that will be given to that island. But I'm determined that Gabriola Island will not be destroyed."

I think that those people who have expressed concern have done so properly, but I think they must remember what the Minister said. They must remember also what I have just said about that Minister, that he is a person who will not shirk from making hard decisions. When he suggests that the planning commission will be involved in the decision-making process, I know that that will in fact be the case.

However, the Minister also said something else on that occasion. He said, on page 88:

"My friend from West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) is back in his seat, and I'm glad he's back, because I indicated to him earlier that the moving of our ferry terminals will create problems — finding other places for them to go."

I appreciate that.

He then went on to say:

"If every MLA and every other community adopts the attitude that you are taking toward a coal port at Britannia," and he was referring to me, "then we'll have no place to go with the ferry system. You said, 'No way.' No way do you want one ship a week. This proposal will take from 10 to 20 ferries a day out of Horseshoe Bay. And if you want us to do that, then you must be prepared to support us in other areas, even if it affects your constituency — because we have to share the load of protecting and

preserving this province, as well as developing the province."

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the proposition which the Hon. Minister directed to me on that occasion. I am not here to barter my vote; I am not here to barter my support. I am unhesitatingly opposed to the suggestion that a coal port facility be constructed at Britannia Beach or any other place in Howe Sound. I believe that Howe Sound should be preserved and improved as a recreational waterway and that it should not be converted into a commercial shipping lane.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. WILLIAMS: Now in so saying, while I am concerned about the recreational opportunity for Howe Sound, and while I am concerned about the general environment, that does not mean to say that I am unconcerned with the future development of this province. And I wish to develop that thought with you for a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

The only suggestion — other than from British Columbia Railway — that there should be a port development at Britannia Beach, is contained in a report made to the government of this province by Howard Paish and Associates. I urge the Members, if they have not read that report, to do so, and if they have read it, to do so again, and to note very carefully that with respect to the matter of Britannia Beach, the apparent suggestion that it be used as a coal port facility was conditioned with the words "if economic and engineering considerations demand that there be a port in Britannia." That's the condition. It's a pre-condition that Mr. Paish made in his report.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that the preliminary report?

[[Page 296](#)]

MR. WILLIAMS: This is the preliminary report.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what we have not had with regard to that proposed development is any proper consideration of the economics of port development.

The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Highways have talked about one ship a week. Well, I have something to say about that. At the same time as the Paish report was filed, there was, as part of the arrangement made between the provincial and federal governments, a report prepared and released by the Department of the Environment of Canada.

It says: "At ultimate development, the terminal," and this was the proposed port facility at Squamish, "will have an annual shipping capacity of 10 million tons of coal. The first stage, scheduled for completion, in 1974, will accommodate 2 million tons. Ships required to service the terminal will rise from 35 to 40 per year to 175 to 200 for ultimate development."

That's a statement made by technicians who made an assessment of the Squamish proposal. But I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer to you some history with regard, to the activities of British Columbia Rail in the Howe Sound estuary.

If you go back into the years of the late fifties, the Village of Squamish's central commercial core was subjected to recurrent flooding of a very serious nature. The municipal government at Squamish made approaches to the provincial and to the federal government for the construction of dikes which would protect that area from flooding of the Squamish River.

Those discussions and negotiations went on through the early sixties, through 1967, until about 1968 an agreement was finally reached between the Government of the Province of British Columbia and the Government of Canada that the Squamish River responsibility would be assumed entirely by the Government of British Columbia. That decision was made, as I say, in 1968.

It's like a jigsaw puzzle if this is put together. The second piece comes when miraculously, out of the

budgetary estimates of the Department of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, moneys were made available to Squamish to start the diking project. There was never any real estimate but moneys were found. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) who is in the House today, is busily looking for that little cache of money that he can suddenly lay his hand on. But the other Government found it at any rate.

And so the dike construction began. And it progressed one year and progressed two years. And miraculously the Village of Squamish was suddenly saved from flooding. Except that not only did the dike protect the Village of Squamish, but it kept going farther and farther down the Squamish River until it got to the estuary, and farther and farther out into the estuary, and everybody wondered what was happening. Then they learned that it was what they called a "training" dike.

Well, the next picture that goes into this jigsaw puzzle — and I give it to you in chronological order — but no one saw it in chronological order. It is now clear that in 1969 and early 1970 discussions were going on apace between British Columbia Railway and a firm of consulting engineers, Swan Wooster, with regard to the design of a port at Squamish. As I say, this was chronologically the position but no one knew about this until early 1971 and on into 1972 when suddenly it appeared that there was some kind of a port development at Squamish.

This came as a surprise, a shock to many people, but a delight also to many in the Squamish area. Until, however, it became obvious that the initial stage of the port development was to be a bulk coal loading facility — and here we have a suggestion of one ship a week.

But if you go and look at the model, or if you look at the copies of the plans which are attached to any of the reports — whether you take the federal government report or whether you take the Howard Paish report — you will find that there are a series of stages for this development. British Columbia Rail's plan for this area is a monstrous development. If you look at their model, you find not only the bulk loading coal but you find grain elevators, containerized shipping areas, a complete development of a superport.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier talks about one ship a week servicing the facility at Britannia, either he fails to understand or has not had communicated to him, the full extent of the ambitions of British Columbia Railway. Because the Swan Wooster report upon which the design for the port in Squamish was based in the body of the report says that the estimate of future PGE — as it was then called — commodity movements which could logically be shipped via Squamish were used as the basis for port planning. And those estimates of future PGE commodity movements were estimates that the engineers got from the Pacific Great Eastern Railway.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we have here is a proposal on the part of British Columbia Rail, first of all to develop in Squamish and, when it has been chased out of there because of localized environmental problems, it has moved to a consideration of the next available site which is Britannia. They say they are only to develop coal, but that is ignoring the full ambitions of British Columbia Rail.

And it's wrong. Because there are other sites on Howe Sound capable of development — at tremendous cost, I admit — but other sites on Howe Sound also capable of development for ocean-going transport. Therefore British Columbia Rail if it is success-

[[Page 297](#)]

ful, and a port is established at Britannia and the barrier is broken, and large ocean-going ships are allowed to plow up and down Howe Sound — then what is the excuse for refusing a similar development at Porteau or at Furry Creek or any of the other areas where flat land could be made available on the shore for terminal construction?

I know the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) who spoke in this debate about the problems in Indian Arm did so with a true feeling for the environment and his constituency. He spoke also of the need to have significant changes made in the development that has taken place in Vancouver harbour. I trust that he will also see the wisdom in stopping a situation in Howe Sound so that we will not face the problem years hence when we must undo the mistakes that are before us today.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the development of this province. I realize that not only for British Columbia but also for the rest of Canada it is necessary, nay it is essential, that we have port development on our Pacific coast. But we can never have proper port development if we are prepared to continue the narrow approach to that development.

How much longer will we go on with the British Columbia Railway developing its own system regardless of the impact upon the rest of the province or upon the rest of the transportation facilities of this province? How long can we let Canadian National Railway do it? Or the CPR? Or the National Harbours Board? How long can we allow conflict between whatever the desires of Prince Rupert may be and the desires of New Westminster and the Fraser Harbour Commission?

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the time has now come when we must develop to the optimum port facilities in British Columbia and the rail and highway transportation links which serve those ports. We will only develop these port facilities to the optimum if there is a cooperative effort on the part of the governments of British Columbia and Canada, the national and provincial railways, the National Harbours Board, the Fraser River Harbour Commission and the local communities at Prince Rupert or Kitimat or Vancouver or wherever such port facilities can be properly established to ensure that we best use those locations for the service of the people of British Columbia and of Canada.

That surely must be our aim. How much longer can we have the City of Vancouver warring with the National Harbours Board because of the tragic mistakes that the National Harbours Board is making in Burrard Inlet? How much longer can we allow Roberts Bank, which was designed as a superport in which upwards of \$50 million have been spent, to exist as a single commodity facility capable of berthing one ship at a time and serving the needs of one company — \$50 million of the people's money sitting at Roberts Bank when the full development plan was to have given Canada for the first time a superport on the Pacific capable of handling many commodities, containerized shipments and serving the needs of all who might need port facilities?

How long can we allow the British Columbia government and the federal government to engage in a war as to whether or not we should have a port at Prince Rupert? I say to the Member from Prince Rupert that there is no question in my mind that under the previous Government the decision to proceed with the Squamish port was only to give that Government and the Premier of the day, bargaining position with respect to the federal government and its desires for Prince Rupert.

They wanted more cards in the game. Mr. Speaker, the game has to stop and I urge the Premier of this province as the Premier to forget his role as president and chief executive officer of the British Columbia Railway, and to approach this problem and the solutions to this problem for the benefit of the people of British Columbia and Canada.

I know that politicians are only human but surely the Premier of this province and the Hon. Minister of the Environment federally can stop the kind of bickering that is going on and get on with their respective responsibilities. How are we ever going to join together in the cooperative movement that I am talking about if the Premier of this province and that Minister are continuing to battle in the Press? I don't care whose fault it is, let's put a stop to it.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources): I think the problem is jet-lines.

MR. WILLIAMS: Whatever the problem is, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, let's stop it, and let's get on.

Therefore I suggest to the Premier and the Government of this province that we do this — that we take the initiative and establish a comprehensive port development authority membership of which will be: government of the Province of British Columbia; the government of Canada — the Federal Government; representatives of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways; representatives of British Columbia Rail; representatives of the National Harbours Board; representatives of the Fraser River Harbour Commission and representatives of the local

governments of those areas which have port development possibilities.

When we have such a group they will be in a position to instruct engineers to make the kind of comprehensive study that needs to be made to ensure that what should or should not take place in Burrard Inlet is done, and that the National Harbours Board stops the waste and destruction that is taking place in that harbour. To go on with the development of

[[Page 298](#)]

Roberts Bank to whatever its maximum potential should be. To develop in Prince Rupert the kind of port that we must have if the northern areas of this province are to advance. To stop the suggestion that somehow or other the rail lines for their own profit should be permitted to bring all the goods in the north of this province to the most southerly tip and then ship them overseas — that's got to be idiocy.

With this movement we can then rationalize the difficulties, preserve Indian Arm, preserve Howe Sound, and we will have the kind of port development and rail and highway transport system which this province, this Government and Western Canada can be proud of. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, in putting forward this idea for this kind of authority should do so now and receive the unanimous consent of this House, and he should take this to the conference which the Prime Minister of Canada has indicated will be convened for the purpose of considering with the Western Provinces their economic future in Canada.

This should be one of the main positions that we take and it is a position, Mr. Speaker, in which I am certain the governments of the other three western provinces will join. I am sure that if we take this tack it will be another monument to this Government and to British Columbia.

It won't be easy. I know the Hon. Ministers sitting in the Treasury Benches have difficulty in negotiating with the federal government. But I suggest that this kind of movement, supported as I am certain it will be by the people of British Columbia and of the other western provinces — that that kind of joint action is action which the federal government cannot — dare not — reject.

I suggest as well at this particular time, with the difficulties that the federal government faces, that if they dare reject this kind of proposal that the national leader of the New Democratic Party could be encouraged to remove some of the support which heretofore he has given to the federal government.

That sounds like a threat. If we have to use threats let's use them but for Heaven's sake let's get this problem solved, so we can put it to one side and stop worrying about whether our activities in the development of this province are going to destroy our environment, or whether the preservation of our environment is going to interfere with the proper development of our economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Prince Rupert.

MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert): Mr. Speaker, I bring you greetings. And to all the Hon. Members of this chamber I bring you greetings from my riding, Prince Rupert. Before getting to the central topic on which I'd like to speak today, I'd like to make a few general remarks — general remarks and observations that I've made, some conclusions that I've come to from those observations, both here in the House and out of the House.

I would like to admit at this time that I came down here in the fall session — the small fall session, quite willing to dislike all Members of the Opposition. Now, I can't really do that. I would like to say that there are Members over there that I've become friends with.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: O.K. name names. I'd like to name the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) and the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis). I think that we could all learn a lesson...

AN HON. MEMBER: Two!

MR. LEA: ...that no matter what our political philosophy is, or our political ideology, we have to give those other people the right to those political philosophies and ideologies. I really believe that the Social Credit Party have a philosophy, that they belong and believe in. I believe that the Conservative Party does. I give them both that right to belong to it. And when the Liberal Party finds one I'll extend that right to you too. (Laughter).

Now, the reason I say that is that I think it's obvious there isn't too much a political philosophy within the Liberal Party, because we can look at the federal Liberals — well, it reminds me of a story of the fellow who was winding up his speech and he said: "Now, those are my political philosophies. Those are my policies, and I'll stand by them no matter what. And if you don't like those I have some more." That seems to be what's going on federally at the moment. And I think possibly that's what happens to Liberal Parties all over the country.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: We're holding the country together. (Laughter).

Now, I'd also like to thank a Member in this House for giving us from time to time a lecture — a member of the Liberal Party. I'm not going to mention any names, except to say that he did sit one time in the House of Commons. (Laughter). You know I'm amazed at his patience with us — he does have patience. He gives us a lecture on parliamentary procedure, economics, philosophy — and he's patient. He knows that some day we'll be smart too. I'd like to thank him for that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Some of them take longer than others.

[[Page 299](#)]

MR. LEA: Well, that's within his own party.

I'd like to touch on a few other subjects. I noticed the other day when the Hon. Member for Delta (Mr. Liden) was speaking he mentioned the fishermen's union — the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union — and the ex-Minister of Labour (Mr. Chabot) put an interjection in. He said, "communist front." In my constituency in Prince Rupert we have a great many fishermen who belong to that union — the biggest work force in our community. You can imagine the frustration they must have felt having a Minister of Labour who took that attitude.

Can you imagine the kind of response they would get going to him, and asking for his help as the Minister of Labour? Now, there's been a great deal of talk in the House, especially from the official Opposition, about the number of hats that are being worn by some of the Ministers of the Government. I can only mention that, no matter how many hats they wear, they probably wear them in a better manner than if there was only one hat passed around to each Minister in the previous Government. Talking about hats, I'm sure that the official Leader — or the House Leader of the official Opposition feels that there are already one too many "chapeaux" in this House. (Laughter).

Now, there's also been a great deal of talk on the land freeze. I think that is the way it should be. I grew up on a farm and I know what it's like to live on a farm. I know what it's like to work on a farm. I know the dreams farmers have of making that land fruitful. The Government took that farm away. I was raised in the Arrow Lakes district in the Columbia River area.

I agree that order-in-council isn't the best way to govern, but at least people did have some previous knowledge of what was going to happen. It's a lot better than some of the farmers in the Columbia River who sent their taxes in and were written back by the previous Government, telling them that their land had been expropriated. And that happened. So, I find it rather distressing that the same Government, or the same people who were in that Government, can stand up and condemn anybody for anything and everything.

The Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Brousson), when talking the other day, mentioned that North Vancouver district had been bankrupt at one time. So, you cannot really blame them for selling land to try and

get themselves into a solvent position. I'd like to mention that Prince Rupert was also bankrupt at one time. The main factor in pulling Prince Rupert out of that bankruptcy was the fact that the City of Prince Rupert owns its own telephone company. Every time they need money they go to that telephone reserve fund and they pull money out. One of the only things that has kept Prince Rupert solvent through the years is owning that telephone company.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: No, as a matter of fact the revenue from that telephone company pays for practically all the social services in the City of Prince Rupert.

Now, unemployment has been a big topic in this session. I really hesitate to call upon a government to create more jobs. I realize we live under the system we do and I suppose we have to create more jobs.

But I don't believe that's the direction we should be going. I think we should be looking at the manner in which we distribute wealth, the revenue from our resources, and have a more equitable split. I don't see why we should have elitists living off those resources that belong to all of us. I believe that the direction we have to go is to share that which belongs to us, and not keep exploiting. I think we should understand that progress and growth don't mean the same thing. I hear the people using them in a synonymous manner and I don't think we can.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: Yes, well he's gone. You're alone.

You know, the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) touched on a bit of the problem the other day of why we're in this dilemma of not having enough jobs. He mentioned automation and he mentioned technology. And I agree with him, but how do we solve that problem? Do we solve it by creating more plants, more automation, more technology? Or do we use...you know we've been waiting for this period for a long time when machines would do work for us. We could maybe sit back. Maybe people could work 20 hours a week. You don't have to take any less money. Just don't give it all to the elitists, to the capitalists. You know, I think that is the direction we have to be going because the other way is suicide, suicide for everyone in this world.

Also, the Hon. Member for Oak Bay mentioned strikes. They've been mentioned by most Members of the Opposition in saying there has to be a better way. There has to be a better way than strikes. Well you know, even under management courses, and I've taken one or two, under the capitalist system they point out to you quite often that the best way to manage is to let the people who work in the plant take part in making the decisions — in what the goals are going to be, and how you're going to achieve those goals. I think one way we can avert strikes is to let the workers have some say in their own economic destiny. It wouldn't be that bad...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: I suppose it's how you define workers.

[[Page 300](#)]

For instance, I think there are two economic factors in our life. One is capital that you invest and the other is workers. I believe that a great many people who belong to right-wing politics get that confused. They think that because they're management, they're not workers. They are workers.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: They aren't? Well, in some cases they aren't. I'll agree with you. (Laughter).

I'd like to compliment at this time the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) and the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) for the manner in which they handled the strike in Victoria with regard to schools.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): What did the Minister of Education do? Nothing.

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): You want to bet?

MR. LEA: How do you know? See, he doesn't know.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, would you kindly address the chair and less crossfire at the moment. You're busy talking to each other, carrying on a conversation. We'd all like to get in on it.

MR. LEA: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to talk about trade unions. First of all, I'd like to mention that in my opinion trade unions are the children of capitalism and not socialism, although for years and years and years the only social conscience in this country was the trade union movement. I'm afraid there are a great many trade unions now that don't take the share of the social conscience that they should. They'll take part in exploitation of other underdeveloped countries and they'll ask only for their bigger share of the pie.

At the same time, I believe that we have to look to the trade union movement to show us the way. They do represent the workers. I wish they represented a great many more workers. I hope that there is legislation soon that makes it a lot easier to make the availability of getting into a trade union much easier.

There has also been a great deal of talk, Mr. Speaker, from the Opposition and also from our own benches about the rate of unemployment — 8.3, 5.7. It doesn't matter — because to a person who is unemployed, those figures don't mean much, or anything. They are rather ridiculous when you look at the figures of some of the minority groups in our province, such as the Indian people who live in my area.

You can go into a town of 1,000 people and only 30 people are working in that whole community. I'm sure that they are not impressed by the kind of figures that we talk about in this chamber. I'd like to talk about one of those communities and discuss with you possibly a way that we can help people, specially the Indian people. I'd like to talk about the village of Haida on the Queen Charlotte Islands.

When you walk into that village, you can see despair and frustration on the faces of those people. There hasn't been any work there for generations. They've been on welfare. They don't have proper medical care, educational care, recreational care. I believe that those people do have something to offer us. I believe that we have to look and take into account and exploit the knowledge and skills that they have, that are indigenous to them.

I've brought with me on this trip some smoked salmon made by an Indian lady who lives in Masset — canned smoked salmon. I'm going to pass some of these cans around to the different caucuses and let you taste it — because it's a delicacy. Only they know how to do it and I think it's a shame that we waste that knowledge and that skill. I believe that everyone in this House should join with us when we try to put industry in that will help Indian people in this province and especially where they have been impoverished.

Did you notice anybody from the Social Credit — were you applauding when I said we should help Indian people? Good. I'd like to explain to you, through you, Mr. Speaker, the kind of help that they received for 20 years. Like no help.

But I will say one thing. During the last election campaign the person from the Social Credit Party who ran against me — and I still find this hard to believe, but it's true — went to that village that I just described — in the community hall, he took down a movie called "The Second Sequence to the Good Life," I believe, and showed that to them in the community hall. Can you imagine? They didn't even understand what he was showing them. At least some of them didn't but an old man there who was there who was blind said afterwards, "You know I'm blind, but I still saw through that." (Laughter). That's why on August 30, even though they poured millions of dollars, and the promise of millions of dollars, into those constituencies with Indian people, they still lost the election. Because they don't understand people — at least they didn't — I don't suppose they do now.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: Do I? Yes. Do you? That was another thing, Mr. Speaker. During the election campaign the person that I was campaigning against from the Social Credit Party went on the air when I criticized him for some of

his policies and he said, "For the first time in 20 years we're doing something for those people and now they complain." (Laughter).

[[Page 301](#)]

It doesn't seem to matter what topic you mention in the north, two areas seem to come to mind because they are vital to the north, and they are transportation and communication. There are experimental projects going on in the Queen Charlotte Islands right now that are astounding. There's a doctor there who is progressive. He has an administrator with him who is progressive. They say they're going to be there for five years and that's the first time we've had a doctor in the Queen Charlotte Islands for over six months. His name is Dr. McGuire. He's going to be here on February 25 to meet with the cabinet and discuss some of his ideas. I'm going to be talking on some of his ideas later on in the session.

But to give you an idea of what this man has in mind — he's already applied for a channel on the satellite that's going to be put up by the federal government — I believe in 1975. What he would like to do is to have a communications network where a doctor could be operating in the Prince Rupert General Hospital or in Queen Charlotte City in the hospital there, and it could be viewed by a specialist sitting in Vancouver offering advice, guiding his hand. He's also going to use the telephone; where he can send data down and it can be analyzed right away.

I believe that if we utilized the communication that is available to us through microwave, telephone and satellite communication — it might cost a lot of money to initiate it, Mr. Speaker, but in the long run we're going to save a great deal of money. I believe we should be looking in that direction a lot more.

As a matter of fact, there's a report put out in the United States jointly by the Council on Health Manpower and the Council on Rural Health. It's entitled, "Priorities for Increasing Availability of Health Services in Rural Areas." I'm going to be dealing with this more extensively, but I'd like to read you one paragraph because it's the top priority that has come out of this study. This is it:

"Increased study and development of a variety of alternative systems or models of delivery of care in medically deprived rural areas, with greater attention to the importance of transportation, technology and communications."

It just seems a shame that all these services are there and we're not using them. Which gets me around to transportation.

We are in dire need in the north of air ambulance services — all of rural B.C. — but especially in the north and especially in my riding where so many of the people reside on islands. The Queen Charlotte Islands are 80 miles from the coastline. We not only need air transportation from local communities to regional hospitals. We also need transportation from those regional hospitals to the urban areas where a more specialized kind of medicine can be offered, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suggest to this Government that it is our responsibility to supply that service through our medical care plan, and we should be looking towards getting aircraft to do that job. Because we can't rely on the rather sketchy service that's been supplied in the past by the military. We have to take it up. It's our responsibility. I believe that the people in the north need that service now. There are other areas that we would not like to wait for but we can wait for, but this is vital. We have to have air ambulance service in the north.

Now I'd like to mention port development and the transportation of coal from mine sites, especially that of Sukunka to Tidewater. I'd like to commend, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) for many of the suggestions that he made of getting more cooperation between the federal government and the provincial government.

First, I'd like to talk about the responsibility of port development in two different areas of the province — the lower mainland and Prince Rupert and point out, Mr. Speaker, that the BCR has its terminus on Howe Sound and that the CNR, which is the federal responsibility, has its terminus in Prince Rupert. Only months ago Prince Rupert was named as a National Harbours Board port, which again comes under the jurisdiction and responsibility of the federal government.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many years has it had the CNR?

MR. LEA: About 100.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEA: Well it was called something else before that. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, we're still paying off one of the bad deals made by the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, for acquiring the CNR.

What type of port development is needed in Prince Rupert at this point in economic time, Mr. Speaker? I believe that we have to have a port that is going to be economically compatible with the kind of resource produce that we're going to turn out in the Pacific northwest of this province. We need a general cargo port in Prince Rupert.

We need a port that is suitable to facilitate two-way traffic, so that we can take imports from other nations to destinations in Canada. We need a port that will not only service the northwestern part of this province, but in time will service the Yukon. One of the biggest problems in the Yukon is that they do not have Canadian access to tidewater — and I lived in the Yukon, Mr. Speaker, for eight years, and I know that that is a concern in the Yukon.

For years, Mr. Speaker, northern port development has been used as a political football — and it goes back to 1900. As a matter of fact people are still

[[Page 302](#)]

wandering around Prince Rupert talking about Charles Hays, the man who had a dream of the grand trunk railway with its terminus in Prince Rupert. Unfortunately, Mr. Hays went down with the Titanic and people are still waiting for that dream and politicians have played with the northern port since that time.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that we are having another political game with the northwestern port. Once again the federal Minister of the Environment, Mr. Davis, is playing political football with a northern port in this province.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to an article from the *Vancouver Sun* on Wednesday, January 31, 1973 and, because I wouldn't want to do Mr. Davis an injustice, I am going to read this from beginning to end — in case some of the Members, Mr. Speaker, aren't familiar with it.

The by-line is Ottawa. It says:

"Environment Minister Jack Davis disclosed Tuesday that there is an environmental study on the consequences of a bulk-loading facility at Prince Rupert.

He denied a statement by Premier Dave Barrett that Ottawa has never done an environmental study in connection with proposals for a coal loading facility there.

A federal report released Monday recommends against Squamish as the site for such a facility. The report also said detrimental ecological effects of a coal port at Ridley Island, near Prince Rupert, 'are considered minimal.'

Davis stated in an interview that 'any proper environmental appraisal' looks at all alternatives, and doesn't just consider one proposal. He said that several years ago there was a proposal for putting a bulk-loading facility on Flora Bank, at the mouth of the Skeena River, and that when federal officials looked into this proposal they also examined Ridley Island as a substitute.

'We said at that time that Ridley Island was better,' Davis said, 'so we've made our least damage assessment.' He said that Barrett has never asked the federal government for a copy of this report.

Davis also said that provincial government environmental consultant Howard Paish did not evaluate Britannia as a site for a coal port but stated anyway that Britannia 'isn't as bad as Squamish.' The Minister also denied a charge by Barrett that the reference to Prince Rupert as a better site for a coal handling facility than Squamish was a political statement. Davis said he didn't write one word of the report — 'It was a technical report and I am sure Mr. Barrett read it as such.'"

Mr. Speaker, I have another clipping, and it's from the *Vancouver Province* from today, and the headline is "Prince Rupert Coal Port Study for Release Soon, says Davis." Now I'd like to go back to the previous Press release where he said it was released on Monday, but now its coming "soon".

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEA: Okay. You're right. But that's not the point I'm going to make.

On Wednesday, January 31, when this first newspaper item came out, I remember that there had been a study — all right, Mr. Davis was telling the truth — there had been a study done in the Prince Rupert area in the estuary near Flora Bank, on an island called Kitson Island, in the estuary of the Skeena River. I have that report. I dug it out of my files, and I'll come back to that later. I'd like to go to this second report that's coming out soon. Because I phoned, Mr. Speaker, to the regional director, Mr. Hourston, of the fisheries department under Mr. Davis — the regional director for the Pacific region — and I thought, "Well, if we haven't asked them for the report, why don't we?" So I asked him and there was a bit of "umming" and "ahing", Mr. Speaker, and I sort of got the impression that maybe there wasn't a report. But I wasn't really talking with Mr. Hourston at that time, I was talking with Mr. Rod Palmer, Mr. Speaker, whom I had been referred to by Mr. Hourston's office.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why didn't you call Davis?

MR. LEA: So, two days later, I phoned back on the Friday afternoon — and this time I did speak, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Hourston. First of all, the first report was concluded and filed, the recommendations and conclusions, Mr. Speaker, in April of 1972. Mr. Hourston, when I spoke with him, Mr. Speaker, said that on May 1, 1972, more data was being gathered near Ridley Island — that's the island adjacent to Kitson Island, about two miles away — and so it was the following month that this further gathering of data began and it ended on August 22, 1972.

He said "the data is currently being analyzed." It hasn't been analyzed yet, Mr. Speaker. There are no conclusions and no recommendations and I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that that's the report that Mr. Davis is referring to. He's telling us, "Go to Prince Rupert," when the data hasn't even been analyzed, Mr. Speaker. And that's politics.

So the only report that we really have, Mr. Speaker, is the first report that was completed and filed in April, 1972. It's called "A Cursory Investigation of the Productivity of the Skeena River Estuary," done by the Fisheries Service, the Department of the Environment.

I'd like to read to you, Mr. Speaker, the summary and conclusions from this only finished report on

[[Page 303](#)]

Prince Rupert:

"Summary and Conclusions.

The 1971 investigation of the Skeena River estuary consisted primarily of eel grass distribution, plankton types and density and fish distribution in these waters. Results indicate that Flora Bank supports approximately 60 per cent of all the eel grass and almost 100 per cent of the juvenile herring and needle fish captured between June and October at various stations in the estuary.

The planktonic community structure was sampled only twice in 1971 and does not permit comparison of Flora Bank with the rest of the estuary. However, because of the high abundance of plankton-feeding fish and the plankton-fish feeding relationship, it represents an integral part of the complex food web of Flora Bank.

The present data indicate that Flora Bank is the most important shallow water area of the Skeena River estuary in terms of rearing juvenile fishes. The proposed port development would completely destroy the complex Flora Bank ecosystem and damage to the fisheries resource of the Skeena River and its estuary would be immense.

Since the fishing industry contributes 30 to 40 per cent of the base income for Prince Rupert, it is probably that the construction of port facilities in this important tidal flat area would be economically unsound, and it is suggested that water areas

away from estuaries should be investigated as alternate port development sites."

AN HON. MEMBER: I can smell a rat.

MR. LEA: Those are the summaries and conclusions of the only report that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, Ridley Island, although it's two miles from Kitson Island, is only yards from Flora Bank — it's in the estuary of the Skeena River.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go up and look.

MR. LEA: I have some maps here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go up and look.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's what I said.

MR. LEA: Now, Mr. Speaker, there's been criticism of the Premier in his feud with Mr. Davis. I would like to say that the Premier has been charitable to Mr. Davis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how could anyone respect a cabinet Minister that puts forth information from a non-existent report? I suggest that Mr. Davis hasn't had the respect of the fishermen in this province for some time and he's now lost the support — or should at least lose the support — and respect of all British Columbians.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEA: It's the report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when a person — especially a cabinet Minister who is a British Columbian — would do this to British Columbians, that he should resign.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. LEA: Now I'd like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that in Prince Rupert we do want port development. We want port development that will be beneficial to the northwestern part of British Columbia. We want a general cargo port and, in time, I'm sure we will want bulk-loading facilities for coal.

But when you ask me, Mr. Speaker, or the people ask me to recommend that it go to Prince Rupert with only this, Mr. Davis's word, Mr. Speaker, I can't do it. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Esquimalt.

MR. J.H. GORST (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to draw to your attention and to that of the House that my 83 year old mother is in the gallery today, which I consider to be an honour to me. I would like to say that I want to give my mother my fondest regards. My mother is one of those people who was a charter member of the CCF Party of Canada in 1933 — one of those, Mr. Speaker, who has worked the 40 years to bring this party, the people's party, to office in British Columbia.

She worked for Mr. Strachan in 1949. The only thing I can say, before some of my friends over there say it, is that her son was not always so steadfast. But the wisdom of intelligence is to make the change when you know that the change is required and long overdue.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. GORST: No, I'd never go back, Pat.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Just think, you could have been leader. (Laughter).

MR. GORST: What a fate! (Laughter). Matter of fact, I might have even been in Ottawa and I would be sitting next to Pat now. That's another story.

Mr. Speaker, I also hope the former Member above doesn't have opera glasses looking down here. I'd like to welcome him to the gallery today too. While I'm at

[[Page 304](#)]

it, I'd like to say hello to my sister, my niece and my nephew. It's family day in court.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did note with pleasure that our Premier and members of the cabinet paid a visit to the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Washington in their role as Government of this province. I welcome that. I'm sure we all welcome this move to better know our neighbours to the south, so that we in British Columbia may cooperate with that state, that government, on matters of mutual concern, particularly as they relate to the environment. The honour to make such a visit was mine as an individual who received an invitation from the Speaker of the Oregon State Legislature. That visit I made just two days after the Premier and the Cabinet went to Washington. They upstaged me.

January 18 and 19 of this year I spent in Salem, Oregon — in that state's capital. A very beautiful capital it is, too. While there, I was invited to take part in several legislative committee hearings. It may be that some aspects of their legislative procedure would be of advantage to us here, and hopefully that will be considered as we move to bring about certain changes in our own procedure. I feel that the people of Oregon afforded myself and through me, the people of British Columbia, a great honour when I was asked at that time to address the Oregon State Senate and, later in the same day, the Oregon State Legislature.

The government of Oregon, Mr. Speaker, has asked me to convey to all here their best wishes for our success in our deliberations during this session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I found in Oregon, as I am sure the Premier found in Washington, that they are struggling to find solutions to many of the same problems we are faced with here in British Columbia — fisheries, forestry, agriculture and that very burning question of farmland status.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the final stages of this debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne it is, I am sure, obvious to all that nearly everything that could be said in that regard has been well stated by all Members of this House — the important area of a bill of rights, proposed government auto insurance, amendments to government pension plans, proposals to revise some departments so to reflect the thrusts and priorities of this new government and changes in the health care to chart a new course in that field. These and many more major changes of direction are embodied in the theme from the throne speech, a theme I find long overdue and one offering the people of British Columbia great opportunities. One of the major debates in this House has been that revolving around the freeze of farmlands and land use and ownership.

First, let me say the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) has my full support on a most courageous and socially conscious act. I listened with awe and dismay to the official Opposition and also to the lesser oppositions of this House as they went into great efforts in what would seem an outpouring of concern for the farmers of this province, a concern which is not substantiated over the 20 long years of their government. Theirs was a government that in 20 years brought the farmer and the agricultural industry of British Columbia to the critical economic position it finds itself in today. Now, it's even more intriguing, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that the Leader of that Opposition, which has flooded this chamber with doom and gloom over this issue, is serenely enjoying a world cruise, first class, on one of the most beautiful and palatial ocean liners afloat.

I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to credit their concern with any sincerity. Rather I suspect, in the opposition

arguments, that the farmer and agriculture are being subject to rhetoric. Because the real concern and the true interest of that group is with the ever insatiable appetite of the speculator and the land developer.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have, in their speeches over the past week, indicated the sad state of land-use planning in our province. My riding of Esquimalt suffers from the same inadequacies as the rest of British Columbia. The feelings of the people of my riding match those of the rest of the province in calling for orderly development and land use based upon the greatest lasting benefit to the people of the province as a whole.

There is a valid public awareness and interest in directing growth and development in the province and in preventing the misuse of land and the sprawl of suburbia. The people know that unlimited and unregulated growth leads inexorably to a lowered quality of life. British Columbians want sensible planning from the grass roots district level right up to an over-all plan for the province — planning which will protect the young couple who move into a new subdivision which is carefully planned, and properly placed environmentally — planning which will allow out young families to settle in peace, knowing their district is safe from the past practices which laid to waste many of our subdivisions where no land-use planning protected the environments.

Our citizens see the critical necessity of total planning, which will bring multiple benefits — total planning, which will provide a planned use for all land. It will provide the opportunity to maintain the integrity of our cities and cut down on the enormous social costs brought about by suburban sprawl and core disintegration. It will give us the chance of integrating transportation, energy, education, health services, industry, water and sewage systems so that we can hopefully, ahead of expansion and development, direct its course, rather than trying desperately to catch up with growth for which there is no planning.

[[Page 305](#)]

We must have correct land use to protect all aspects of life in our province, remembering that we, the adults of today, are but the caretakers for the children of tomorrow. We must protect the farms of the Fraser Valley, southern Vancouver Island, the Okanagan and other prime soil areas of maximum food production, from the pressures of people. Adequate planning would give us a tool to divert growth and development to the areas of the province where it is needed and where it would do the most good.

There are other speakers to go today, so I will complete my remarks on that topic at another time.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the subject of our shorelines and in particular to the oceanic coasts of the Queen Charlottes, Vancouver Island and the fjord-indented mainland coast. The shoreline: that narrow strip of transition, the interface where the sea meets the land. Perhaps here nature is at her finest. Here there is constant flux of two opposing forces sometimes battling in angry confrontation yet always mixing; blending one with the other. The shoreline — its unique identity is a deep and powerful part of the heritage of British Columbia representing in its very nature that spirit which makes our people proud and dedicated British Columbians and Canadians.

Recreationally, the coastline is probably our most significant resource, not only for our residents but for the visitors who travel to our province. At Long Beach — Pacific coast of Vancouver Island — over one-half million people used that coastline during the first eight months of 1972. The West Coast Trail, a wilderness parkland strip on the Pacific coast from Port Renfrew to Bamfield, is one of the most intensely used wildland park areas in the province.

The shorefront urban parks such as Beacon Hill in Victoria and Stanley Park in Vancouver receive an extremely heavy shoreline recreational use from the local public.

Aesthetically too, the coast is a highlight of our province. Although it is true that the oceanic coastline represents but only one segment of the British Columbia landscape, when it is recognized that three-quarters of the province's population live on or directly adjacent to the coast, then its high relative importance is clearly apparent.

I am sure, though, that we all recognize these values of our coastline. However, we are aware just how

rapidly those values can be lost or destroyed if we do not carefully manage this shoreline resource. This magnificent coastline, a very special area biologically, is one of those that most profoundly reacts to the impact of human activities upon it. In British Columbia, the coasts, splendid as they may be, have suffered great abuse due solely to the helter-skelter development which has occurred with no overall consideration being given to the rational planning and management of this resource.

We here in this province have allowed our coastal lands to be alienated and despoiled, often on the blind excuse that such actions were required for the expedient progress of free enterprise. Thinking only in the short-range terms, the previous government of this province, Social Credit, preferred to make a fast buck rather than give any thought for the future or to recognize that a precious resource was being rapidly dissipated.

As an example of this, let us take a look at Vancouver Island's east coast: an endless procession of private property signs; subdivided beach fronts. Hardly anywhere is there an easily accessible route to the shoreline. In fact, from Victoria to the northern tip of this island, less than 12 miles out of a total of 600 miles of shoreline on the east coast of Vancouver Island have been preserved for the public's use. Not much of a legacy, Mr. Speaker, for the future generations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am strong on this subject for I represent Esquimalt, a constituency whose people maintain very close ties with a natural coastline and who have on many occasions rallied to save a beach or regional park. I personally have seen priceless recreational shorefront lost to public use to satisfy the more limited desire of the developer.

I know, too, how rapidly the shores of the mainland and the Queen Charlottes are being altered. Mr. Speaker, the whole process appears so harmless.

A lot purchased here, a subdivision there. But when added up at an accelerated rate, it is taking place and soon a whole section of coast is alienated permanently. There is no effective overall planning. Each subdivider is concerned with only his own interest. By this type of shorefront development, the best shoreline is acquired by a few who can afford the very high price. Or it is cut up into one attractive subdivision and the people are left the inferior remains of a resource that might have been of more significance.

On some of our Gulf Islands, this situation is already a fact. The degree of private ownership makes access to the coast very difficult. I ponder what will happen to these islands and their value as a release valve to the large populations of the lower mainland and the capital region if all the shoreline areas are unavailable to the people...

MR. CURTIS: Or from ferry terminals.

MR. GORST: ...except those few — and not all of them resident in this country — who are fortunate enough to acquire seafront property, as the former Premier of the province has on Saltspring.

The escalating cost of shore property that accompanies the waterfront land speculation makes it difficult, particularly in the populated areas where

[[Page 306](#)]

the need is greatest, to establish any significant coast parks.

In dealing with the problem of retaining some control over the development of our shoreline, it is important to say a word about the role the major forest companies could play in altering the onshore lands. A few of the giant forest companies — Macmillan-Bloedel, B.C. Forest Products, Crown Zellerbach, Rayonier, Pacific Logging, CPR — have extensive private land holdings on key shore properties, some of which they intend to engage in the subdivision and real estate business. In fact, the public outcry at Galiano this past year was because of that kind of activity where tree farm land was to be subdivided. Only the action of the New Democratic Party Government and the Minister of that department prevented that carving up which would have adversely affected the character of that island.

Overnight, in a manner of speaking, the serene beauty of our coast could be drastically affected by the ill-planned subdivisions — the get-rich-quick real estate promotions of those who would divide up these islands. We have to move, Mr. Speaker, to enforce legislation that will ensure that the people of British Columbia control the shorelands of British Columbia.

The foreign land investor is now acquiring some of the best coastal property in the province. The Opposition would no doubt say he is just being enterprising but what really concerns me about the foreign investor is that he is operating in British Columbia because good coastal properties are getting more difficult to find in his own country. Obviously, we should recognize this as a warning of things to come. Should we not first gain control of our own shorelands.?

The problem of acquiring control and development of our coastline is not unique. Other governments — Britain, New Zealand, Denmark, Australia, Sweden, Norway — have demonstrated that it is not necessary that this resource be lost to haphazard development.

We should learn by the experience of others how we might best manage our shorelands. Washington State has been very progressive in their approach to seashore conservation. That state established the *Seashore Conservation Act* in 1967 for the purpose of acquiring shoreline property from Juan de Fuca Strait to the mouth of the Columbia River. But this year the people of Washington State passed a referendum requiring that all state shoreline be subject to comprehensively planned master programmes in order to:

- (1) Recognize and protect the state interest.
- (2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline.
- (3) Result in long-term benefit over short-term benefit.
- (4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline.
- (5) Increase public access to the shoreline.
- (6) Increase the public shoreline recreational opportunities.

By this Act, human activities and developments are classified into categories of permitted uses and non-permitted uses. Priorities are obviously being given to the former over the latter. All in all, the Act is a far-thinking one which we should investigate.

California this year followed Washington's lead when the public in that state passed by plebiscite a bill that would institute a comprehensive master planning and regulation of California State shoreline. I think that in this case it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that with regard to the California referendum, the people of that state voted in favour despite the fact that real estate promoters spent \$1 million in an attempt to defeat that plebiscite. That must surely indicate how concerned those people are for the preservation of their coast.

Surely the people of British Columbia are equally concerned about our coastline. Therefore, I strongly urge that in accordance with the environmental philosophy dictated in the throne speech, we establish programmes to enable British Columbia to realize the full potential of such a precious resource as represented by our coastal shorelines.

I would suggest that an acquisition fund be created to purchase back key land areas of our coast that have been alienated. As an example, there is the beautiful Prevost Island which, with such a coastline fund, we could acquire for the people of British Columbia.

All the B.C. coastline, private or Crown-owned, should be subject to comprehensive master plans which would be developed to regulate and ensure wise use of all coastal areas.

The programmes of the States of Washington and California should serve as examples to us when we initially

institute shoreline management for British Columbia. When such plans for this province have been completed they should be enforced by laws that operate similar to zoning bylaws of a city. For example, in areas designated by the plans for subdivision and other private uses, development in such zoning laws would require that a substantial greenstrip be left in natural state for use by the public.

Crown shoreline should be retained in the public domain and even leasing of shoreline properties should cease or be seldom permitted. These are the programmes required to protect our shores but before I leave this topic I want to reiterate the question of why must such ownership be located directly on the shore. Why could it not be located just back from the shore so that all, not just a few, will enjoy it?

I am not advocating that the entire coastline should be one long park. This jurisdiction is often

[[Page 307](#)]

inappropriate. However, what I am saying is that the shoreline should be retained through sensible planning and management in as natural and as accessible a state as possible. High use in key areas will certainly necessitate park status. Yet I see no reason for example, why public forest land — coast strips could not remain under the forest service.

I see the coastland often being defined as a strip scenic recreational easement, be it on Crown land or on private. The urgency to undertake this system of progress cannot be underestimated, for as each day progresses we are continually losing our right to this beautiful coastal area and at an alarming rate. We have no time to spare. We must preserve it now.

Mr. Speaker, so long as I am addressing myself to the topic of coastline protection I think it would be logical to discuss the oil tanker problem. And management of the sort I have been speaking of is going to benefit our coastal area, then that area must be subject to the likelihood of oil spill pollution.

I would venture that there is little need to further discuss the actual hazards that the proposed supertanker route would represent to the ecology and the aesthetics of this coastline. There has already been much talk on this by Members of all parties. Perhaps for once we have an issue here where socialists and free enterprisers are in accord. However, I would like to approach this subject from a slightly different angle than the ones normally taken.

The Premier has voiced his concern in this matter and the difficulty we have as a province to deal with what is essentially a federal responsibility. I think this should bring us to a clear awareness on the nature of the problem which is one of international character. It is in most respects beyond the legal control of British Columbia, for at no time will the tankers actually enter Canadian waters, therefore it is a matter that must be handled through Ottawa, and the Department of External Affairs.

If anyone is going to stop this thing from the Canadian point of view, it is the responsibility of Ottawa. To date I would suggest that office has not been terribly effective or as concerned as one might expect. The Canadian government has taken the approach that it can only protest the oil tanker route in the hope that such a protest will create sympathy and embarrassment of the U.S. federal government to the extent of influencing that government's decision makers to call off the proposed route.

However, recognizing the degree to which the United States seems to be committed to the route, we should hardly expect that a formal protest from Canada, regardless of how long or how strong, is going to be effective. The United States is concerned about a self-inflicted energy crisis and is only going to continue its good neighbour policy toward us, respecting our formal protests, so long as that policy is not going to interfere with the flow of desired energy resources.

And I think this should be a lesson for the future.

Whenever the United States will need energy or other critical resources, she will not tolerate our attempting to slow things up — unless Canada today, on something as critical as the oil tankers, strongly asserts her position

that we are not simply the good provider for all American needs, in a language they will understand. The language of economics.

Canada cannot prevent passage of the oil tankers but we can introduce legislation whose effect will ultimately unfavourably influence the benefit cost ratios calculated by the oil companies who will use the tankers to transport the oil. Canada could pass legislation specifying that any party guilty of spilling amounts of oil would suffer severely in paying fines and clean-up compensation.

The Canadian nation does not have immediate jurisdiction over the passage of these tankers. But it should have a definite say on the matter of damages — for compensation if oil enters Canadian waters. And improved tracking systems able to clearly identify the guilty party would be required. Oil spill observation flights by Canadian Forces aircraft — radar tracking — would cost but it would work. Why shouldn't Canada attempt to go beyond the simple diplomatic protest and try to provide an economic deterrent in order to re-direct American thinking?

At this moment I am sure the Americans feel that the simplest part of transporting the oil is getting it past the British Columbia coast. They are not encountering the same static on this as they are from their own people over the Valdez pipeline route. Protecting our coast in a more vigorous way than at present I strongly urge, as I am sure others here do, that we intensify our efforts to get more dramatic results from our federal government on this issue.

I am concerned that Ottawa is not actually sincerely promoting the interests of British Columbia as well they might. I have a couple of reasons for wondering just how deeply and effectively Ottawa is committed to halting the oil tankers.

During the recent spill of the Irish Stardust the public was awakened to the dangerous situation on our coast. Perhaps the province was not 100 per cent prepared for that spill but we learned fast and I would expect that should another occur, we would to the best of our ability be ready to meet the situation.

However, to be technical it is the national government that is perhaps the most responsible agent for the protection of our shores. Yet the only spokesman I heard for Ottawa was the chief enforcement officer of Environment Canada. What did the federal Minister in charge of this department have to say on the Irish Stardust spill — the new Minister whose home riding is on the coast — nothing. There was no statement from him — not one of any significance. I saw little evidence of any effective contingency plan of action

[[Page 308](#)]

by that Ministry to handle the spill, despite the fact that supertankers seem to be coming and everyone, particularly the federal government, expects them.

When I see just how ineffectively the federal government reacted to this situation and I realize just how ineffective their protest to the United States has been; and when I realize that the ship involved was not a supertanker, not even a tanker, I become sick at the prospect of what our beaches will possibly look like in a few years.

My message is clear and by no means original. We in British Columbia sit on the edge of a catastrophe. We are mostly powerless to prevent it and our only possible hope, the federal government, seems only semi-concerned of our plight.

Just how unconcerned the federal government is to the danger an oil spill might wreak upon our shores can be demonstrated in the information which was made available last April, but which at that time failed to significantly reach the B.C. public.

I have here a map of oil exploration permits on our coastal waters. Now all those areas marked in black — there is the coast of British Columbia — all those areas marked in black, which is an appropriate colour for oil, are under permit to oil companies for exploration. Companies such as Shell, Standard — for offshore oil and gas, By March 1 of 1972, 237 permits had been granted on this coast by the federal government. 40 of them were issued in

1971. None, not one had been revoked despite all the concern in British Columbia over the danger of oil spills. It would seem to me as if the federal government would not be very worried about oil tankers if they were promoting such oil exploration.

This map also shows 14 drilled well locations, several off the coast of our newly created Pacific Rim Park. You will see on the map that some of those oil permits for exploration are right here in the Straits just 2 or 3 miles from the parliament buildings.

We would not have much of an oceanic park at Long Beach if by chance oil leaked from a well-site to the shore. We all remember Santa Barbara. I would say that the federal government and the Minister of Environment are not doing their job insofar as protecting British Columbia's coast from the very possible desecration by oil pollution. British Columbia must impress upon Ottawa the urgency of this situation. We have had enough rhetoric from Ottawa and now we have to have action — and not the kind associated with granting offshore oil exploration permits.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to say something about the capital seat of British Columbia. I feel that we must, without delay, form a provincial capital commission to take this capital region out of the hands of the developers and to ensure that public funds are used for the benefit of the people as a whole; not for the benefit of the developers.

Right at this moment thousands of dollars are being spent to upgrade Wharf Street and Johnson Street — in the Johnson Street Bridge area; money being tossed in after the millions poured into the inner harbour for the betterment of those developers who would prefer public park-like settings for their towering hotel, apartment and condominium developments.

For years the people of this province have deplored the condition of the entrances to the capital city: the dilapidated inner harbour, the polluted Gorge and sanctimonious agreement by the politicians that something must be done. Planners and other interested people have gone to a great deal of trouble to offer solutions. There was the Old Town report, the briefs on waterfront development, the Colquitz River plan and the hopes for the Gorge waterway and Portage Inlet and Selkirk waterway, which I and the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) have worked together on for a number of years — I'm sorry he's not here at the moment.

Little has been done — perhaps because of the lack of a co-coordinated body to take over the responsibility. So here we sit in this old building — a spectacular building which dominates the landscape here by the inner harbour. But I wonder for how long before it's cowering in the shadow of the surrounding high rise towers.

The public will have to face up to the financial as well as the environmental cost of making this a city fit for developers to get rich in.

Take the inner harbour as an example. The City of Victoria has purchased the Ocean Cement plant with federal and provincial funds — public money as well as the city's money; all of it public money on three levels — at a cost of \$1 million for 2 1/2 acres. Add to that \$1.5 million or so to demolish the old buildings in that plant and develop it into a park, which is the intent. The city also wants the rest of the foreshore all the way to the Johnson Street Bridge, likely bringing the cost to \$3 million.

And what is it all for? Well there is, of course, the Reid Centre. Some of you here may not be familiar with that. But there are those here who are. And there are people in the gallery who know all about the Reid Centre with its towers. A public park would really enhance the looks of such a development.

The Reid Centre, if you want a similarity, is Victoria's own Four Seasons complex.

Then there is the money to be spent on the causeway in front of the Empress Hotel, and on buying the CPR property right outside the front door of the Parliament buildings. I wonder why we have to buy that CPR property. They are leasing it from the

federal government. Couldn't we just take over the lease?

Back on this side of the harbour there is the projected 700 units of condominium and hotel accommodation slated for the Bapco Paint property which is owned by Canadian Industries Limited. I imagine that company will appreciate the city's greenbelt efforts on its behalf.

Such development will likely make the owners of those properties across the harbour — again in Victoria West in my riding of Esquimalt — sit up and take notice. And we can expect to see more buildings on that foreshore across the harbour.

Now how do we stop this alienation of our waterfront and the crowding out of the parliament buildings to be dominated by other structures when it's quite obvious the architect who designed these buildings meant for these buildings to be the dominant feature of this area?

Well, there have been a few good ideas out of Ottawa even if we've never had the right kind of government there. One of the best ideas was the National Capital Commission. It is a body funded by the federal government and responsible for the care of waterways, foreshore, open land and parks. It works with local city government in improving the area of the government precinct, helping with necessary roadwork, taking up unused railroad tracks, caring for bridges, and also looking after the siting of new government buildings when necessary.

I would call for a provincial capital commission modeled along the lines of the National Capital Commission which could work with the regional government, watching over the entire capital region city area. Such a body could acquire all the property along the inner harbour, buying out prospective developers and returning the waterfront to the people. It could work to restore Victoria's Old Town — that area of fine old buildings between Wharf and Government Streets which should be named an historic site with funds for building restoration where necessary.

At the foot of Fort Street in Victoria where the proposed Reid Centre is to be built is the exact original location of the City of Victoria — Fort Victoria. That is the historic heritage, the historic homeland, the heart where Victoria began, and here we have an opportunity to maintain this. There is the imminent alienation to take place and a twin 14 story tower and shopping complex to go up there. I think we would be doing ourselves a great service if we brought it back into the public domain.

Waterfront development could continue up the Gorge waterway — a scheme which I think would gain approval from the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands. It's in his riding — part in his and part in mine; it's got a split personality.

There is a need for government offices to replace the old jalopy-type buildings on Superior Street and Michigan Street. A provincial capital commission could look for land in other areas of the city for these buildings — not necessarily just in the City of Victoria but perhaps in some of the other ridings in the regional district — Esquimalt, Saanich, Oak Bay, so as to avoid compounding the traffic problems in the legislative precinct area.

But what is the use of this government worrying about traffic problems and bottlenecks in this part of town and talking about staggered hours for civil servants, if the city council is allowing more and more buildings here? The development slated for the Bapco Paint property will bring in a minimum of 1,400 residents when the two-stage development is complete. And that will negate any patch-up arrangements by the government to reduce the traffic in this area.

No one knows how many more buildings can go up here, bringing pressures upon services and the extra costs of police and fire protection and, later on, of new water and sewer pipes and roadwork. After all, there was a building started just a couple of blocks from this legislative chamber quite recently, and an excavation the size of a city block dug without the council's knowledge, because the planning would not contravene the existing bylaws. It was all a surprise to the city council and an unpleasant problem for the local residents.

When I spoke of the Reid property at the foot of Fort Street, I think that we could suggest to the City of Victoria that they turn over to the provincial government the Crystal Gardens building and that site — which is

valued at \$600,000 — and we pick up the Reid property. Therefore, the provincial government would then come into ownership of both those pieces of property for perhaps something like \$200,000 to \$300,000.

James Bay, this area where the provincial parliament buildings are located, and the inner harbour, are of course the most obvious areas where development threatens the beauty of the provincial capital. However, a provincial capital commission, after dealing with these emergency problems, should be able to act with foresight and prevent future emergencies.

There is in the Esquimalt riding a great deal of federal government land, from Work Point barracks through to Rocky Point. Sooner or later this land will come on the market and unless there is a body ready to take it over from the higher level of the federal government, we shall see it all on the market, as did happen two years ago.

The federal government had 77 acres of national defence property that they saw fit to put on the market, and instead of returning it to the people of the District of Colwood and Langford, they made them buy it for something like \$200,000. The federal government never paid anything like that for that

[[Page 310](#)]

property when they got it in 1946 for national defence purposes, so why do the people of the community have to pay to get their own property back?

So the federal government puts it on the market. We shall see it all snapped up — waterfront property — by the developers. We must be ready to prevent this additional alienation and to make sure that land bought by the public so many years ago and used for national defence will be returned to the general public use as soon as the national defence needs are no longer required. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge this Government to set up such a provincial capital commission at the earliest possibility.

It is only right that we should do that. The capital area should be one of pride and it should reflect the desire and the dignity of British Columbians in their province.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to say to you and the Members of the House that I have taken much time today on several subjects and I thank you for your attention to subjects that I consider of importance — and you will note they all revolve around the question of land and its ownership. Without taking too much more time, I would like to say that there is no doubt in my mind that this question in the not-too-distant future will involve all of us in a deep and serious debate. Let us admit that which has been known for a long time — that land is a resource, not a commodity which can be bought and sold in the manner of other commodities.

You know the old saying "Corner the wheat market." There are those in this society today who apply that thinking to land. Mr. Speaker, land values are clearly linked to the growth of our cities. Profits in land are not a function of any particular merit or action of the holder, except perhaps that of patience and timing. So may I close my remarks today on the following note: He that steals gold is put in prison. He that steals land is made a king. Nature has appointed neither him nor me nor anyone else lord of this particular land. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Kamloops.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Hon. Members. I'm just wondering if that was "hello" to me or "goodbye" to someone else. I'll have to think about that a while. (Laughter).

It's a pleasure to participate in the throne speech debate and to represent the riding of Kamloops. But I had the feeling, Mr. Speaker, when the Lieutenant Governor restricted his speech to just over eight minutes, he was attempting in a subtle way to convey a message to this House. These Maritimers can be very subtle, I understand. If that was the case, it seems that the message was not received as intended or else I was mistaken. So I'll join in the swim.

I'm delighted with the section of the throne speech dealing with automobile insurance, particularly as my 16

1/2 year old son received his driver's licence a short time ago.

The automobile is no longer a luxury. In the absence of rapid transit and the necessity of so many of our people in this province to drive a car as a prerequisite to earn a living, this important field of auto insurance should not be left to the tender mercies of a group of private companies to set rates and offer conditions as they see fit without necessarily having the greater good of the total automobile driving public as their prime concern.

Also, Mr. Speaker, these poor companies have made public statements many times in the past that they make very little or no profit on their auto insurance division, and they're only in the business as a service to their customers who buy the other types of insurance coverage they have to offer. I was very surprised some months ago to read in the Press and to hear on the radio that these companies were willing to spend \$100,000 to fight to keep a section of their business that shows such a poor return. I suppose it's because they're such great philanthropists. They hate to see someone else taking over this charitable work they've been indulging in.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that a modest amount of research on the part of the auto insurance companies will soon unearth the fact that there are many more groups in this province that could benefit from their charitable inclinations.

Many other sections of the throne speech have already been dealt with at length. But I would like to make reference to the section referring to changes to the *Ambulance Services Act*. In the riding of Kamloops, Mr. Speaker, we have a variety of ambulance services covering the whole range, from good services in the city itself to none whatsoever in the outlying areas.

In the community of Blue River on the North Thompson highway, one of the chamber of commerce members is called when someone is hurt and the patient is placed in his private automobile and driven 75 miles to the new hospital in Clearwater.

Now, for the information of the Members who perhaps don't realize it, there is a hospital at Clearwater now. It's a small hospital built of modular sections that somehow took four years to build, from the date the previous Minister of Health gave the commitment of its building to the Clearwater residents, I cannot believe that our construction industry is so out of date that their methods were the cause of the delay, Mr. Speaker. But I understand some of the Members of this House are better acquainted with the reasons for the delay than I am.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, the patient now only has to be driven 75 miles to Clearwater instead of 140

[[Page 311](#)]

miles to Kamloops as was the case in the past. There are many sympathetic people in these areas who are always ready to help a neighbour in distress, but in most cases they are untrained and they lack the proper vehicle to transport sick or injured people. It's my understanding the new legislation will alleviate some of these problems.

While I'm talking about ambulance service, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the Members of this House, through you, Sir, of a unique experiment that was tried in Kamloops and has been working quite successfully for some time now. Because of the remoteness of some logging camps and mines in the Kamloops area, the lives of injured men were being lost, as they sometimes were driven up to 30 miles in the back of a pick-up truck on a rough logging road and were then transferred to an ambulance, if they were lucky enough that an ambulance were available, for the remainder of the trip to hospital.

The need for something better was known for quite some time by many but nothing was done until the good people of the ladies' auxiliary to the Royal Inland Hospital took the necessary action. These ladies raised a fund of \$5,000 to guarantee the costs of flying expenses to Okanagan Helicopters when they would fly a patient to the hospital. The helicopter company responded by stationing a helicopter in Kamloops that can be converted in moments to a two-stretcher ambulance with room for pilot and first-aid attendants. It was often difficult, Mr. Speaker, to recover flying costs of \$275 an hour after some patients had recovered. This \$5,000 fund resolved the problem for the helicopter company but, sad to say, some costs are still not being recovered and some way must be found to build up the fund again before it becomes exhausted.

Five men with industrial first-aid certificates volunteer their time to go with the helicopter on its mercy flights and their employers allow them time off to go when required. So, with five volunteers, one has always been available so far. Dispatching is done by the RCMP through their patrol car radios. After ascertaining that it is serious enough to need the flying ambulance, the message goes to headquarters and the helicopter is dispatched. A local manufacturer has donated all first-aid supplies necessary including oxygen for the service. The local oil refinery donated and supplied the materials to construct the heliport.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, a wonderful community effort that has saved many lives to date. I repeat, however, that some way must be found to replenish the \$5,000 to cover these uncollectable charges against it.

I am very interested in the section of the throne speech that says we are to plan our future and depart from North American values that have seen profligacy and waste on all sides. I think, Mr. Speaker, that section must be aimed at the Kamloops riding. There's been more profligacy and waste in and around Kamloops than any area I know of. It's been going on for years and years, until we were becoming almost a disaster area.

We usually have a very benign mother nature smiling on us in that area. But last spring I imagine most Members of this House read of the disastrous floods around Kamloops. It was before we took office. So, if there's any truth to this story about the plug-in to the Almighty, there must have been a short circuit of some kind.

Then, just a month ago with an early spring, we had flood from the hills. Fastback developers who put in the housing projects with no storm sewers or even open drains, and had left the area...the people that bought these homes found this water running off the hills and into their basements, rumpus rooms, soaking the plaster, carpets, stereo and so forth.

I'd like to quote from the October, 1972 issue of *New Horizons* magazine, Mr. Speaker. The author is commenting on the August election in British Columbia, and he had this to say: "On August 30 Kamloops was rehabilitated and socially improved with the election of 'so and so', a political unknown."

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I don't agree with this statement, because the rehabilitation of Kamloops is only beginning. And I am speaking to the cabinet through you, Mr. Speaker, when I paraphrase the popular song and say, "We'll get by with a little help from our friends."

For the past 14 years, Mr. Speaker, there has been a gold rush in Kamloops. The gold is land and subdivisions. It's a completely unregulated growth with no over-all plan for the total area. I've heard so many speakers refer to the amalgamation issue in Kamloops I was beginning to think perhaps someone else was representing the riding. On January 20 of this year Kamloops was graced by a visit from the Hon. leader of the Liberal Opposition to attend the annual meeting of their constituency association. I like to see these associations keep going, Mr. Speaker, because as a believer in democracy I like to see an Opposition. I was happy to find out that there was a big enough turnout to elect a five-man executive for the group.

I read to you now from the Kamloops *Daily Sentinel* of January 22, Mr. Speaker. It was the Hon. Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) who said: "From what information I have, amalgamation is itself a good idea. However, we should have tried to sell the idea to the people first." They even want to sell ideas, these private enterprisers.

For the information of this House, Mr. Speaker, the idea of unity has been offered for sale over and over again locally, But it continually ran up against entrenched interests and council members who were

[[Page 312](#)]

in a position to shoot the idea down every time it was proposed.

Speaking for myself, Sir, as a resident of Brocklehurst — and unlike Joseph, being not of the lineage of David — I favour integration as proposed of the Kamloops area. And I did not mind "going down to my city to be justly taxed."

Mr. Speaker, Brocklehurst incorporated as a district less than two years ago. We're bounded on the west by Kamloops Lake, on the north by hilly grazing land and on the east the Paul Creek Indian Reserve. So we only had one way to go. I'll confess that many of us in Brocklehurst have been gazing avariciously to the south with the idea of taking over that rich tax base in Kamloops some day. Now the problem's been solved for us.

Let's look for a moment at a sampling of public opinion in Kamloops, carried out by a local newspaper, the Kamloops *Daily Sentinel*, December 30, 1972. They report on eight people, Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the area. Only one was against unity as this lady felt she lived too far out from the city centre to receive any immediate benefit. For the information of the House, Westside is approximately a 5,000 population unincorporated. We have Dallas to the east, Barnhart Vale to the southeast, Knutsford to the south and Rayleigh and Heffley Creek to the north. So we have communities everywhere that would have organized in a very short time.

These people are from the surrounding areas. A man from Westside said, "It's the only way to go. They should have done it long ago to put a stop to some of these people who are going around building Kamloops like a garbage can." Now I find it hard to understand that reference, unless he means that they keep stuffing one mess on top of the other until you can't get the lid on and the odour affects everyone.

"A small number of people wanting to be stupid shouldn't be allowed to hurt the whole area. Mr. Lorimer was justified in doing this. If people haven't the brains to do the right thing, somebody else has to do it for them."

Another chap from Brocklehurst: "It's unfortunate it couldn't have been done by the democratic process, but with all the bickering between the various city states it just never would have come off. Four mayors and 22 aldermen was a farce. It was just four or five little pockets of men playing politics and looking like boys."

Another man from Westside: "It was tremendous, because it never would have happened any other way. It's great for the area. The only way we're going to advance. Everyone figured taxes would skyrocket but it's the only way to get services at a fair cost to everyone. It's stupid to have all these mayors and aldermen."

And the lady who thought she was too far out for benefit said, "It's probably a good thing for the close-in areas but it's difficult to see how areas like Dallas, Barnhart Vale and Rayleigh can benefit by such a move. These people cannot be bothered to come into the city to partake of these supposed benefits of amalgamation."

Then a man from River Road in Kamloops says: "This is the best move that could have been made. Ten years from now we'll look back and realize this was one of the milestones in the city's history. The only mistake could have been not taking enough space now and then finding the same problem ten years from now."

A man from a mobile home park on the Indian reserve: "It was a decision someone was going to have to make sooner or later. A central governing body will be more beneficial to everyone concerned over the long pull. The move will be an aid to progressive development. The present system was no doubt realistic to the four mayors and 22 aldermen, but it couldn't be beneficial to all."

A man from Kamloops says: "I think it's a good thing. It makes the outlying areas pay their fair share of benefits. Dealing with one municipality should be an aid to developers and planners."

Another man from Dallas, which is the other unorganized community to the east: "In the long run it's best for all in the districts concerned. It took a strong man to make the decision, knowing he would make some enemies doing so. It will definitely help Kamloops grow in an orderly manner."

Now, these are opinions of ordinary people picked at random in the street by a roving reporter. I believe it sets the record straight for the benefit of those who are too far away from the action to have a proper perspective.

We had this situation, Mr. Speaker, for years, where communities were springing up everywhere you looked. Our population has been growing at a tremendous rate, with all the headaches this brings in supplying services people require. The area known as Dallas-Barnhart Vale to the east and south of the city has two private water systems and one water improvement district. And still there are 40 or 50 families who are hauling water to their

home to use.

There's a fringe development to the north, beyond Westside, where people have to haul containers of water in their cars for four or five months of the year. They're doing it now. I know of a half-section ranch that I believe will now fall within the boundaries of the city, or certainly close to it, that was sold five years ago for \$35,000. Now, a short time ago this ranch was sold to another party for \$90,000, Mr. Speaker. I'm not a rancher but I have many friends in the ranching business. They inform me that that kind of money for a half-section of deeded land could only be for the purpose of subdivision. I'd regret very much if this was allowed to happen.

There's another famous old ranch in the area that's

[[Page 313](#)]

just lately been purchased by Canadians from its American owner who lived in Texas. These Canadians had to pay over \$600,000, Mr. Speaker, for a 500-head ranch. Unless they're allowed to sell off some of the land that's unsuitable for ranch use, it will take many generations before the capital cost of this venture is returned. I'm hopeful that some suitable arrangement can be made or will be contained in the legislation that is passed in this session. There have been two surveys run on the future population growth of the Kamloops area, Mr. Speaker. They were within 5 per cent of each other in their forecasts. They agree that within 10 years the area within the new boundaries will grow from 50,000 to 100,000 people. I submit that this kind of growth needs the most careful planning.

There were great hopes for the future of the area with the formation of the regional districts, Mr. Speaker. But what was the result? What was the result? At least three studies were carried out at the request of the municipalities by the regional district, and they're all gathering dust on the shelves in the regional district office.

When the studies were completed, at a cost of several thousand dollars each, and the recommendations of the experts and technical people were known, always at least one of the four municipalities would opt out. Their position usually was that, "You others go ahead if you want to; but we don't want any part of it."

The result, of course, was that the project was impossible for the remainder because of geography or financing, so the whole business has to be shelved.

I'd just like to read a couple of short quotes from the Kamloops *Sentinel* of Saturday, January 13, at the inaugural meeting of the new officers of the regional district. The chairman is not of my own particular persuasion, but I have a lot of respect for the man in his ability to get things done. The newspaper article says:

" 'The Thompson-Nicola Regional District will be stronger because of the integration of the greater Kamloops area, though much of its heavily populated area will now be lost to the new city,' said Regional District Board Chairman, John Harwood. Mr. Harwood said the Board of Directors, planners and staff would all be better able to service the district because of the amalgamation move. He said planning in the past has been slow because of difficulties with the multiplicity of municipalities in the Greater Kamloops area, but the regional district can now more readily go into areas such as this. 'Now we have one body with nothing to fear from the regional district. We'll be able to work together on planning and make the entire area stronger.' "

I was going to make reference, Mr. Speaker, even as a new Member of this House, to the statements made earlier by the Hon. Member for the neighbouring riding of Cariboo (Mr. Fraser). However, an editorial in the Kamloops newspaper of February 3 says it much better than I — and it's a pretty good newspaper, Mr. Speaker. It only misquotes me about half the time. Since I'm not used to the rules of the House, I will change the name to the title of the Member. The editorial says: 'Amalgamation Defiance Proposal Just Nonsense.' Utter nonsense, Mr. Fraser, if I'm allowed to use it.

"Alex Fraser, Social Credit Member for Cariboo, advocates opponents of amalgamation in Kamloops and Kelowna defy the December 21st amalgamation order of Municipal Affairs Minister Lorimer. He told the Legislature these people should simply ignore the order.

"To begin with, it is ridiculous that a member of a body of lawmakers should publicly advocate that people break the law and an order-in-council is a law itself. Besides, Mr. Lorimer has said he would bring a bill confirming it before the Legislature.

"Furthermore, Mr. Fraser is ignoring the fact; and it is a fact, that a great many people support amalgamation, suggesting that the opponents arbitrarily decide on behalf of everyone to defy the law."

HON. MR. BARRETT: Is that a newspaper? Which paper?

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: It is. The Kamloops *Sentinel*.

"He forgets one simple fact in his call for defying the order — to tell whoever would follow him just exactly how one goes about defying a government edict or ignoring a law. What would he have these people do? Picket? Refuse to pay taxes? Refuse to take part in amalgamation preparations? Refuse to vote? How does one defy?"

"And who would be hurt most? The new city or the individual who ignored the law?"

"His statement is nothing more than nonsense, political guff from a spokesman from a part that permitted the hodge-podge in the first place. The shambles that arose in civic administration in greater Kamloops was precisely the result of the sort of fuzzy thinking Mr. Fraser displayed.

"Because his party seemed unable to take the bit and pull the people of this area together, it permitted one after another small group to incorporate independently, leaving small pockets of separate units all around the area. Lacking the courage to take the obvious step to fix the problems it created, his party then imposed regional districts over the area to give it some weak cohesion."

End of the editorial.

[[Page 314](#)]

I was in Kamloops last weekend, Mr. Speaker, and I spoke to some of the members of the 15 man Letters Patent Committee who are laying the foundations for the new city. The foundation of my city. They supplied me with minutes of their meetings to date and I'm pleased to report that the committee is making excellent progress. All have settled down to work in a constructive manner, and many people including myself are very excited about the prospects for the future.

There's something I wish to refer to, Mr. Speaker, and that is the frequent reference in this debate to socialism and the death of free enterprise. Free enterprise, in my opinion, has been moving steadily for years toward its own death. It is being replaced by corporate enterprise. For an example of this, we had three free enterprise sawmill owners in Kamloops. They were good operators and ambitious to start a pulp mill. The problem was money, Mr. Speaker. They didn't have enough, so they went into partnership with the giant Weyerhaeuser Corporation in the United States.

The publicity was really something. Canadian know-how and American capital. Hands across the border. Just a small pulp mill, employment opportunities, et cetera, et cetera and on it went. The deal was made.

What is the situation now, about seven years later? It's all changed, it's all changed. The Canadians have been bought out, and their sawmills shut down. The pulp mill has been expanded to five times the production of the original installation, and this American giant has bought almost every mill from Merritt to Valemount — a distance of over 200 miles — and shut every mill down, throwing the employees out of work and ringing the death knell of the communities who depended on these mills for their existence.

This was because the giant needed timber, and was not interested in the mills and not interested in the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: Now, the small independent businessmen in these towns are facing bankruptcy, and unless this corporate giant shows some sense of good citizenship and opens some branch plants in the affected towns, there is going to be more and more bankruptcies.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): All I get is the stink.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: Can this truly be called free enterprise when it means the end of the small businesses and businessmen? If it is, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see it.

The small grocer has almost disappeared and half of the consuming public of British Columbia is clasped within the loving arms of the Weston Corporation. The small sawmills are disappearing. The small ranches are disappearing. And small appliance dealers are harder to find. Yet some people and the Hon. Members would have us believe that we're in a free enterprise economy. If we are, Mr. Speaker, then give me socialism, where these independent businessmen will be able to get some protection and assistance instead of bankruptcy.

I'd like to touch briefly on two other subjects, Mr. Speaker, and the first is the subject of nuclear power.

Before taking up the trade of politics, I have been engaged as a stationary engineer for 16 years and more, and as such have had to attain a certain knowledge of power generation. This was reinforced by the subscription to magazines such as *Power Magazine*, put out by McGraw-Hill, containing the latest advances in electric power generation.

I feel that nuclear power is now at a stage where it is practical to be used in British Columbia as an on-site generation. In this way, we avoid the loss of river valleys behind hydro dams and the scarring of the landscape necessary for the power transmission lines to distribute the electricity for thousands of miles.

MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver–Capilano): More, more.

MR. G.H. ANDERSON: I will admit that personnel must be well-trained and construction of such a nature that leakage is impossible. But these requirements, I am convinced, are technically possible. The biggest problem would be the disposal of radioactive waste, but I am very sure that this is a problem that with our technical abilities, we can overcome.

We were getting very concerned in Kamloops, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to put a dam down at Savona and flood the whole Kamloops valley including Kamloops Lake.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the transport of oil from Alaska down the north Pacific to the United States. I feel that the people who adamantly oppose this move have not made a thorough enough study of the problem and all of its ramifications. Oil has been transported by tanker from the Middle East through the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic for over 50 years and I am informed that the beaches of southern France, Italy, and Yugoslavia are still beautiful indeed. Certainly, the tourists are still flocking to these beaches by the thousands.

I believe that our main concern should be to try our best to see that the tankers stay well out of the high seas, where captains of large ships prefer to be in any case of safety, and we should concentrate on trying to keep them out of Puget Sound where the

[[Page 315](#)]

real danger lies.

These tankers could dock in some bay on the west coast of Washington or Oregon, unload into a tank farm and pipeline the oil to wherever our American friends wish to send it. They could even be unloaded in a type of dry-dock where the gates could be closed and any possible spill contained.

It's Puget Sound that worries me, Mr. Speaker. But in the past I have sailed deep sea for some eight or nine years and I must say that the tankers on the high seas do not alarm me as they seem to alarm some others.

As a last thought Mr. Speaker, let me say how proud I am to represent the riding of Kamloops. The people of Kamloops riding are independent hardy people who need very little assistance to achieve a good life for themselves and their children. We will need a little help from our friends — but I am looking forward to representing the people of Kamloops at least for the next three or four years and doing all I can to assist them in achieving their goals.

Mr. Barnes moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Stupich files answers to questions.

Presenting reports.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I wish to present the report of the special committee which was to report on the list of Members to compose the select standing committees of the House and I ask leave that the report be taken as read and received.

Leave granted.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I move that the rules be suspended and the report adopted.

Motion approved.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to submit the report of the same special committee with respect to the oil spills membership. I ask leave that the report be taken as read and received.

Leave granted.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I ask leave that the rules be suspended and the report adopted.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Strachan files answers to questions.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You deal with the Whips. Once, years ago I got involved in those kind of negotiations and got my hand chopped off. Deal with the Whips.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

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