

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

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

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

CONTENTS

Monday, February 19, 1973

Routine proceedings

An Act to Amend the Hospital Insurance Act (Bill No. 89) Mr. McGeer. Introduction and first reading — [521](#)
The Taxpayer's Protection Act (Bill No. 90) Mr. Wallace. Introduction and first reading — [521](#)
The Rural Student Travel Aid Fund Act (Bill No. 91) Mr. Phillips. Introduction and first reading — [521](#)

Statement

Statement by Mr. Smith on proposed increase of petroleum and natural gas royalties and their effect on the petroleum exploration industry — [522](#)

Routine proceedings

Budget debate (continued)

Hon. Mr. Stupich — [522](#)
Mr. Richter — [534](#)
Mr. Radford — [540](#)
Mr. Kelly — [544](#)
Mr. Lewis — [549](#)

[[Page 521](#)]

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

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

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon seated in the Speaker's gallery is the mayor of Fort Nelson, His Worship Mayor Harry Clarke and Mrs. Clarke. They are sitting in for a few minutes on the proceedings before leaving for a well-deserved holiday. I hope that everyone will welcome them to this chamber.

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

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege to introduce a class of political science and law students from David Thompson Secondary School in the district of Vancouver South, who are here today to see the House in session. They're here with their teacher, Mr. Bob Ellis.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT

Mr. McGeer moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 89 intituled *An Act to Amend the Hospital Insurance Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 89 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

THE TAXPAYERS' PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Wallace moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 90 intituled *The Taxpayers' Protection Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 90 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

THE RURAL STUDENT TRAVEL AID FUND ACT

Mr. Phillips moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 91 intituled *The Rural Student Travel Aid Fund Act*.

Motion approved, Bill No. 91 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

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

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

The matter is the devastating impact the proposed increase in petroleum and natural gas royalties has had on the highly labour-intensive petroleum exploration industry. This is resulting in a wholesale exodus by exploration and drilling companies. Hundreds of people have already been laid off. Unemployment is running rampant. The whole economy of northeastern British Columbia is in danger of collapse. I therefore respectfully invite your acceptance of my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Hon. Member is referring to a matter that is before the House — a bill that is before the House?

MR. SMITH: I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to a matter of employment of people in a specific industry.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest one thing. It's very important to all Members to know this. It's required that you give a statement of the matter to the Speaker, not merely orally, but in writing. All you've done here is that you've asked leave to move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there is a statement that I just read to the House that I

handed to the Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Please take my apologies; I didn't see it here. I saw only the motion paper. I must apologize.

Now I have to deal with the question of whether it is urgent and important. I think I've already mentioned to the House before the rule that binds me — that it must be a matter that could not be on the order paper for discussion within the foreseeable future, nor could be got on in time to deal with an urgent matter that should be debated today.

But this House has already appointed a time for

[[Page 522](#)]

the debate of the question of petroleum and natural gas royalties. You'll see on your order paper that it's so appointed. Secondly, we are dealing in the budget. Now, you can deal with the general economic situation and the incidence of taxation falling on a section of the community in the budget debate.

Principally, I suggest that the House has already appointed a time and a bill which is before the House to debate the issue.

Therefore, I would be taking it out of context to the orders of the House if I said that debate should take place today, or I should find rather that there is urgency of debate right now so that we should set aside the normal business of the House today.

I must find that the House has already settled the question of when this will be debated. They have left the matter in the hands of the House Leader to raise at an appropriate time on orders of the day under the second reading of bills.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, with due respect to what you have just said, the urgency is now. If we allow this to be prolonged, so many people are going to be unemployed as a result of actions taken to cancel out drilling leases, to do all the other things — and that is irreparable damage, Sir — it's going to result in hundreds of people being unemployed and it has already done that.

MR. SPEAKER: I've got this statement from you. You're merely repeating yourself and, in fact, debating the issue. I've had to find that this House has already ordered the debate on this subject and the bill is before the House that deals with the debate on this subject. How can I then set aside that order of business decided by the House in order to debate this matter today? I cannot, in my view of my obligation, do so.

MR. SMITH: Is it not possible, Sir, for you to request unanimous consent of the House to debate the issue?

MR. SPEAKER: It's still on the order paper and you'd have to set aside the order paper. I suggest that you could do that on a motion, but only on a motion.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Unanimous consent.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): 10 per cent unemployment. They don't care.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I must reject the matter as requiring urgency of debate today.

MR. CHABOT: 10 per cent unemployment and they don't care.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hundreds of people are out of work and they don't have a debate on it.

Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Nanaimo.

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this is really the first time since the election that I have had an opportunity in formal debate to address you and the Members of this House. I would like to make the odd general comment first. People have spoken about what happened on August 30; different Members have placed different interpretations on it. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you for a moment my own experiences after August 30.

First, on August 30, itself, I'm not sure about North Okanagan, but certainly in this area, Mr. Speaker, the sun was shining on election day. Wonders to behold — the day after the sun was still shining. Perhaps a little more brightly, but still shining. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I had occasion to be in Victoria the day after the election, driving to catch the ferry leaving Swartz Bay to go to Tsawwassen. There had been highway construction going on during the election period, as so often has happened in the last 20 years during election periods. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, as though there hadn't been any election, highway construction was still going on. The economy was still moving. People were still working in this area of the province and I assume in other areas of the province as well.

There's another little incident that I would like to share with you. It was on the B.C. ferry travelling between Nanaimo and the mainland — an incident that was told to me by one of the stewards on one of the ferries. It seems that on the way over on the morning after the election, he was serving breakfast to one of the customers in the dining room. The Premier of the day, Mr. Bennett — I don't know whether he was on the way to Buenos Aires then or whether that happened since — but the Premier of the day was not in Nanaimo on August 31. However, there was a customer travelling who ordered breakfast and ordered among other things — I hate to admit this, Mr. Speaker, but it was not B.C. produce, it was a grapefruit. The grapefruit when it arrived was in such a deplorable condition that the customer got extremely upset, told the steward that he had no intention of eating that kind of garbage, and ordered him to remove it.

The very apologetic and very upset steward

[[Page 523](#)]

offered as an alternative apple juice — B.C. apple juice — and this was accepted, though grudgingly. The customer was unhappy during the rest of the meal. When it was over, the steward, while presenting his bill, apologized once more for the condition of the grapefruit and said that after all there had been an election — this was the last of the Social Credit grapefruit. He was sure that on the way back they would be much better because they would be NDP grapefruit.

The customer was so delighted that he left a tip of \$1. And just to complete the story, Mr. Speaker, the grapefruits on the way back were indeed much better.

Another thing that has happened since then...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, I hear something about agricultural presentation. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking here today first in my capacity as the MLA for Nanaimo, and I intend to address you along those lines. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Government, I intend to discuss the budget to some extent. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture, and I intend to deal with that to some extent as well. So those who want to hear me talk about agriculture will just have to bear with me and wait until I come to that point in my programme.

Mr. Speaker, one more thing that happened after that election — saving the best for the last — one thing more that happened was that you have been elevated to the position of Speaker, and I think that is very important. I like to see you sitting there in that chair. I think you are doing an extremely good job, and I hope you will be very tolerant of me from now on after that flattery.

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign one of the things that I hoped on behalf of the riding was that there would be further development of an educational institution that is doing a tremendous job in that area. That is Malaspina College. I pledged, as the Member for Nanaimo, that I would do my best to see that there was

financial assistance forthcoming for that educational institution and that the government would pick up 100 per cent of the capital cost. At that time I had no expectation that I would be a Member of that Government — I expected a hard fight to try to convince the government of the day that this should be done.

Mr. Speaker, the job became very easy and I think at this point perhaps the Members would like to join with me in congratulating, quite on a non-partisan basis, the way in which the new Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) has taken hold of her department, the new policies that she announced, and the way in which she is working to try to improve education in this province.

This is a field, Mr. Speaker, which has been too long neglected, certainly for 20 years and perhaps even before that. Too long neglected. Under the present Minister it is coming more and more to the fore. New policies are being announced and one of those, I am pleased to say on behalf of my own riding, is that the Malaspina College will receive 100 per cent capital contribution from the provincial government.

There is another issue. I see the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) is here; I've had some correspondence with him. I have had several letters from my riding. Again I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I'm speaking as the Member for Nanaimo, not as a Member of the cabinet. Just this — questions about fluoridation. There was one on my desk this morning. Mr. Speaker, when this question first came up in Nanaimo, I took part in the campaign in favour of fluoridation. Personally I believe this is one of the areas where we have to accept the experts.

When I'm sick I go to a doctor. He may not always do the right thing but the odds are in favour of him doing the right thing. When I have trouble with my teeth I go to a dentist and I take my dentist's advice. Again, he may not always do the right thing, but I think the odds are better that way than any other way that I can think of. When the dentists and when the doctors get together and recommend that fluoridation would reduce the amount of dental decay and would reduce the costs of this very expensive health care, well then, Mr. Speaker, as the MLA for Nanaimo, I intend to lend my full support to any campaign to try to get Nanaimo's water supply fluoridated.

Another question that came up during the campaign was with regard to Newcastle Island. It is an old one in Nanaimo and an old one in this House. I've spoken on it before in this House when I was here previously. It is a question that will come up again. It came up during the campaign and I told people then that citizens of Nanaimo were spending in the neighbourhood of \$250,000 to purchase that island and save it for park purposes. An extremely important park for the citizens of that area and possibly in the future, for the citizens of a much larger area.

I spoke of the way in which the park had been allowed to go downhill since it was sold to the provincial government for the sum of \$1. I raised the question some nine years ago, I believe, as to whether the provincial government ever did pay that \$1. I didn't get an answer. However, the park has been allowed to go downhill badly.

I make no apologies at this time for what the government is planning or isn't planning. I just say this. The present Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Williams) is carrying an extremely heavy load in his dual capacity. Certainly I hope, and again I am speaking as the MLA for Nanaimo, that one of the things that happens is that his load will be

[[Page 524](#)]

lightened to some extent and that the new Minister of Parks and Recreation — if that's the way it goes — will have some time, some energy and indeed, Mr. Speaker, some finance, to do something in the way of upgrading facilities at Newcastle Island.

I would still say, and again this is an item that has come up in correspondence, that I would resist any attempt to construct a bridge between Vancouver Island and Newcastle Island. I think this would defeat the purposes of that park and that maintenance of ferry service is what we really want between Newcastle Island and Vancouver Island rather than a bridge connection.

Another thing that I spoke about in 1965 — you know, it's sort of coming back to me, repeating some of the things I said then, some of the things that were said to no avail, some of them productive. When I went to see

the manager of the B.C. Ferry Authority, for example, and when he seemed more than a little concerned at my coming before him when I was first elected, and when I wondered aloud at his concern he said it was the first time in his history as general manager of the B.C. Ferry Authority that an MLA for any party had ever been to his office to discuss the operations of B.C. ferries.

I discussed several things with him. I was concerned for example about cheaper fares during mid-week. After some five or six years, they finally go around to doing it. It took a long time. I discussed later sailings and some progress, Mr. Speaker, was made. At the time I spoke, the latest sailing between Nanaimo and Horseshoe Bay was 9 p.m. By the time I left this House in 1969, the latest sailing was 11 p.m. However, Mr. Speaker, I think it's not late enough. I agree with those who say that there should be later sailings yet.

Interjection by an Hon Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is in his chair and I am talking to him right now. He's here listening.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I doubt very much that he's missing anything. Mr. Speaker, I should think that he's probably listening more closely than some of the people opposite who are throwing in the interjections. They're looking for things to pick fault with. He's looking for advice and listening. He's been getting precious little of it from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker. Not one word so far of late sailings that I can recall.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is a solution. The problems, as he said, Mr. Speaker, were the availability of senior staff and the fact that the latest sailing right now is not being utilized to warrant having later sailings still. I agree with these problems, Mr. Speaker, but there is a solution — a solution offered by one of the crew members, quite simple.

In the case of Nanaimo, the first boat leaves in the morning at 6:15, the second at 7:15. Why not hold that 7:15 sailing and start it at 9:30? Surely anybody that wants to go at 7:15 can either go at 6:15 or go at 8:30. By starting that second ferry at 9:30 in the morning, it would mean then that the latest sailing instead of being 11 o'clock in the evening, could be 1:15 — with no increase in staff; no increase in cost; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, with an increase in utilization, because 11 o'clock is just too early to be of any use. You can't really be in Vancouver attending any function of any kind and catch an 11 o'clock ferry. You have a choice of either catching the CPR ferry at 3 o'clock in the morning or waiting overnight, which makes it much more expensive.

By simply holding that second boat — missing that 7:15 sailing in Nanaimo or the 8 o'clock one at Swartz — it would seem to me that late night sailings could be achieved with no increase in cost and with better utilization. No more staff required. I would recommend to the Minister that he consider this again.

I know that the people who operate the ferries are very slow to pick up good ideas. I advanced several of them in 1964 and 1965. It's still the same staff, but there is a new Minister, Mr. Speaker, so I'm hoping that now there will be consideration of new ideas. If there are any new ideas coming from the other side of the House, I'm sure the Minister would welcome constructive suggestions.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, another question has come up. This is with respect to ferries again and the involvement of Gabriola Island. I know there are questions on the order paper but I think I can speak on this subject without worrying too much about that. I don't think the Members opposite will really be interested in calling me to order.

There were several suggestions. There was one suggestion that the Minister of Agriculture, representing Nanaimo, has lost complete contact with the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan). The Minister of Highways is not keeping him informed. Mr. Speaker, I knew that the Minister of Highways was going to speak about Gabriola Island when he spoke. I didn't know what he was going to say, simply because I didn't have the time to go and check with him beforehand.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, I felt that as Minister of Highways, as a responsible Minister, he was doing what

should be done in that department and would consider all of the questions seriously, would consider the answers. I trusted in him to bring a report to this

[[Page 525](#)]

House. I listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, when he brought that report. Some of the people observed that obviously I was hearing it for the first time because I seemed to be listening. Well, I was hearing the detail for the first time.

I heard for the first time, for example, that the previous government knew that by 1980 the Departure Bay terminal would not be able to handle the traffic. Yet they shut their eyes to this, presumably because the man at the helm in those days thought that by 1980 even he would still not be at the helm. It would not be his problem so he was not prepared to face the political problems and decided not to move on it. What other explanation is there, Mr. Speaker? I've heard none from the other side — no excuses for having known that this was happening. They closed their eyes completely and closed their ears and did absolutely nothing about it, except have the highways department do surveys that were then carefully hidden away.

Mr. Speaker, I said in this House — some of the Members weren't here then — and I checked the date with the library just to be sure — March 12, 1965, my second session in the Legislature. I said then that the increased utilization of the ferry service between Vancouver Island and the mainland made it perfectly obvious that the Departure Bay–Horseshoe Bay route would not be able to deal with the traffic in the near future, and that the government should be looking at some alternatives.

I recommended at the time that they look closely at the possibility of a third route — not an alternate route, Mr. Speaker, but a third connection possibly involving Gabriola Island and somewhere in the neighbourhood of Steveston Point. I still suggest, Mr. Speaker, that by the time we get around to doing something about this, we will not be looking at an alternative to the Departure Bay–Horseshoe Bay route. We will be looking at the need for a third route.

Even with the shorter crossing, there's a limit to how many ferries you can move in and out of a harbour at one time. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the traffic problems created in that area would be much less if there were a terminal or if there were a route north of Nanaimo that would deal with traffic travelling north from Nanaimo or coming from the north, and if there were another route south of Nanaimo handling traffic emanating from the south or heading south. I still think, Mr. Speaker, that it will be necessary to have a third crossing, rather than moving the second crossing.

Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I've been reminded as to what I said on Gabriola Island. People have said that I told the islanders that I would not support a bridge unless I were satisfied that 80 per cent of the people on the island agreed to it. Mr. Speaker, I don't recall saying those words. I do recall whenever I was questioned on this, on the island, that I had spoken in the House in 1965 and that I had recommended Gabriola be part of a third crossing. I was very much aware of those remarks whenever I was speaking on the island. I kept that in the back of my mind all the time. I had felt that there was going to be the need for a third crossing and I was aware of that all of the time.

One of the things I did say on the island, though, Mr. Speaker, was that the island should be protected. I still feel that, Mr. Speaker. I still feel that the planning commission had better get its job done. I'm told that the population of the island right now is about 1,400. I'm told repeatedly that the present ferry service just can't handle a population of 1,400. It's not doing an adequate job.

HON. MR. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): A second ferry goes on this year.

HON. MR. STUPICH: A second ferry goes on this year — Mr. Speaker, for 1,400 people — a second ferry.

I'm told that at present on the island there are 3,500 lots. That might be a quarter of an acre, it might be 200 acres, but 3,500 parcels. If you assume an average of three people living on one parcel of land, you're dealing with a population right now — without any further development of any kind — of 10,000. I won't ask the Minister of Highways at this point to answer the question but I ask the Members to consider for one moment: if he has to put a second ferry on to handle a population of 1,400, how many ferries would he have to have on to

handle a population of 10,000? That is not allowing for one moment that there will be any further development on the island at all — just the present potential population.

I travelled on that ferry on Saturday. On the way back I barely made it, not because I was behind time but because the ferry was leaving early. The ferry was leaving early, Mr. Speaker, because there was a heart case being transported to Nanaimo. If that ferry had left, if it was far enough away so that it was too late for it to turn back, that individual would have had to wait perhaps three-quarters of an hour. What would have happened by then? This is one of the problems.

It's all very well, Mr. Speaker, for an island — an island even as large as Gabriola Island, with a population of up to 1,400 that they have now...

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Permanent — plus.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Permanent? 1,400 permanent — and to say that 1,400 people, living within 25 minutes of Nanaimo by ferry, want to live in semi-isolation. They're prepared to accept that.

[[Page 526](#)]

Are they prepared, Mr. Speaker, to speak for the 8,500 who are presently allowed for in the plans? Are they ready to say that those people will have to wait for adequate ferry service; will have to line up for ferry service when they want to travel; will have to line up for ferry service when they want supplies; will have to line up for ferry service if they need emergency health treatment?

Now it's one thing to say that 1,400 or 1,500 can live in semi-isolation. It's another thing to say that 10,000 can live on an island within 25 minutes of a city as large as Nanaimo and still pretend that they're living in isolation. It's an entirely different ballgame, Mr. Speaker. When we're dealing with a population that large, it's the responsibility of the Government to provide something more adequate than a ferry or even than a second ferry.

This is not dealing at all with the other question of providing transportation between Vancouver Island and the mainland. It's part of it. I think it's a necessary link and I think it will come. But I think it's important that the planning commission on that island act immediately, as quickly as they can, to provide for the future.

I was told yesterday by someone who was promoting a petition that she has 500 signatures from adults, permanent residents, out of what she estimates to be a total of 800 permanent adults in residence — 500 and she hasn't completed the job yet. Five hundred in favour of having a bridge connection. That's not the point, Mr. Speaker. Sure, we're interested in the 1,400 people who live there today, the 800 adults. We're also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with what's happening.

This, if anything else, is a Government that believes in planning. We're planning not to deal with the 1,400 or 1,500 who live there now. We have to be cognizant of the fact that there could be 10,000 there in the near future. This is something that we have to be very much aware of, something that we have to plan for.

They presently have the right — a right that was given to them, subdivisions that were approved by the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs. Other subdivisions were contemplated — one of 500 lots. I'm not talking about contemplated subdivisions. I'm talking about subdivisions that were applied for. I'm talking about subdivisions that have already been completely approved — a population of 10,000. The planning commission, indeed, in looking at the island, may feel that there could be further development on some parts of the island and still retain essentially the quality of life that exists on that island right now.

But every time they create one more parcel of land they're dealing with another potential of three. If they create 1,000 more parcels, which is entirely possible on an island that large, they're talking about another 3,000 people. These are some of the things that the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) has to consider. How can he possibly build up a ferry system that will supply the needs of the people who already have the authority, who have had everything approved to live on the island, as well as those who may get it when the planning commission does its job?

I don't recall this remark about 80 per cent during the campaign. But one thing I do recall saying is that

the planning commission should complete its job before there be any development on the island — whether it be any further subdivisions of any kind or whether, Mr. Speaker, it be a bridge connection. I urge the planning commission to hurry and do that job — not hurry to the extent that they do a bad job of it, but to get...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I can't see the headline from here.

...but to get the job done. I've urged them to do this in correspondence and I've talked to them. I've told them to consult the Department of Highways. I don't know how far the plans are advanced at this stage; the feasibility study is being done. I don't know how far they've gone. But I do urge the planning commission to get its job done, because it's in their hands whether or not the island will be properly protected.

I was told by one of them that there is no way of protecting an island like that when you put a bridge on it. If I'm going to accept that, Mr. Speaker, then I have to accept that there's no way at all that, as Minister of Agriculture, I can bring in a programme that will save farmland. And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to admit that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk briefly about the budget — perhaps not too briefly. I understand the Whip's having trouble getting Members of the official Opposition to speak. So he has asked me to speak for some time to sort of fill things in here. Apparently the official Opposition can't find anything in the budget to talk about and they're being very reluctant to speak in this budget debate.

I don't know why they don't speak, Mr. Speaker. The only thing I can assume is that they don't have any time — or that they don't have anything to say.

However, Mr. Speaker, some of them have said some things...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: You did speak, yes. The Hon. Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) did speak, and I have some quotations here from him...I'm sorry, it was the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) that spoke first in the budget debate.

[[Page 527](#)]

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to make reference to some of his remarks. At one stage he said that the previous government gave 69 per cent of its expenditures to social services generally — education, health and social services. Then he said, "We come along with this new budget, this new era; it's still only 69 per cent. What have we done? What's new?" That was his question.

Mr. Speaker, this 69 per cent is of a budget that is \$267 million larger. The same percentage represents an increased expenditure in these areas of \$185 million.

If it were just dollars, Mr. Speaker, it would not be nearly so important. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker — and I know you have already listened to some of them — to recall and to think ahead, but particularly at the moment to recall the remarks — the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) is not here today; she's in Ottawa on Government business — about the new policies that have been advanced with respect to education.

The Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) spoke in this session — new policies that have been announced and applauded by some of the Opposition Members with respect to health services. It's not just that we're spending more money, Mr. Speaker. But look around the cabinet and look at the new policies that are being announced by some of the members of the cabinet. This is the important thing: not how many dollars we're spending but what we're spending it on; what we're doing with it; what we're doing with the money that is available — these are the important things. The same percentage, true; but an additional \$185 million spent, Mr. Speaker, much more wisely.

A complaint, Mr. Speaker, that we've really hurt...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, I didn't expect any at all from you, so I wasn't disappointed.

There's been the complaint, Mr. Speaker, that we've hurt the corporations and possibly, through the corporations, the lower income groups by increasing the corporation tax by 20 per cent. Now I can only hope that it was not the Minister's own calculation. I hope he relied on advisers who knew better but felt that it was a good figure to throw in.

The provincial corporation tax rate from 10 to 12 is 20 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker. They say that figures don't lie; but liars figure. I am not suggesting that you did that. As I said, I think it was your adviser that supplied this information.

The nearest estimate I can get as to what the average corporation tax rate in this country is — that is, what it will be for this year — is 47 per cent. The maximum rate is 50 per cent; the minimum rate is 25 per cent; but the average effective rate, according to the information I was able to get, is 47 per cent.

On the average, Mr. Speaker...we're not talking about 20 per cent. We're talking about 2 per cent on top of 47 per cent which is, Mr. Speaker, something like 4¼ per cent increase on the average.

If you consider, Mr. Speaker, only the lowest income corporations, only the ones that are paying 25 per cent — and they're paying the 25 per cent; they don't look at it and say, "I'm only paying 10 to the provincial and it's going up 20 per cent;" they're looking at their total of 25 per cent — now if you look at the lowest income corporations, which contribute far less in the total picture, then it's 2 per cent on top of 25 per cent which in my books, Mr. Speaker, works out to a maximum of 8 per cent.

Now where, Mr. Speaker, does this 20 per cent come from? I suggest it must come from his advisers, and I suggest that he consult his advisers and perhaps even change his advisers. He might be a good deal better off.

It was also suggested, in the same paragraph in his remarks — the way it's reported in *Hansard* — where some Member on this side of the House suggested that B.C. Telephone could very well absorb this extra 4¼ per cent corporation tax.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Yes. The Hon. Member for Esquimalt (Mr. Gorst) suggested that — and you were kind of ridiculing this. Well, the latest profit pictures I've seen from B.C. Telephone indicate to me that they could very easily absorb an additional 4¼ per cent corporation tax.

You suggest that they pass this on too easily to the consumer — and I agree with you in the case of B.C. Telephone. I think they have much too easy a job when they go before the Transport Commission trying to get an increase in rates. And I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Members who are complaining about this complain about the ease with which a corporation like B.C. Telephone passes on this additional impost. Why don't they suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we take over the B.C. Telephone so that it will not be passed on to the consumers?

Talking about the job-creating opportunities in the budget, Mr. Speaker, he says that in some areas we've simply sort of gone along with "me too." For example, in the old Social Credit budget there was a sum of \$10 million for park development — a nice provision, Mr. Speaker. He says this time we're only putting in another five.

There is a difference, Mr. Speaker. Last year was an election year; it was an election gimmick. The money was not spent. A good deal of the money is still available. The programme was planned so that it would be finished by the end of September. It was

heavy expenditures during the election period and no programme for spending since, so that a good deal of the money is still left. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister will spend that money.

On reforestation: by the end of the calendar year — that is after some nine months had gone by — less than half of the \$10 million fund that was made available for accelerated reforestation was spent — less than half. And that, too, was spent in the election period rather than planned to be spent after, or planned to be spent before. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this time the difference is that jobs will be created; the work will be done, because the Minister will spend the money, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there's all the difference in the world between putting a figure in the estimates and saying "Look what we might do," and coming before you next year and saying, "Look what we have indeed accomplished."

With respect to highways, again, I hope it's your advisers rather than you that are supplying these figures, because you start comparing apples and oranges. You take the estimates for the Department of Highways. You say, "Last year there was an increase in the estimates of \$21 million and this year there's an increase of only \$7 million."

You first point out that the estimates for last year were \$21 million higher than the year before. Then you look at this year and you take the estimate of \$179 million. To that you add the election campaign money — the \$35 million. You add that to the estimates and compare that with the estimates for this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely, if one is going to compare estimates for two years, one should also compare estimates for the next two-year period. When you look at the first period and say that the increase in estimates was \$21 million; and when you look at the second period, Mr. Speaker, for which the present Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is responsible, and relate it to estimates, you find that the increase in estimates is not \$7 million, not \$21 million, Mr. Speaker, it's \$42 million — double the increase of the previous period. Surely, if there's any job-creating ministry, it's the Minister of Highways who is going to create jobs with that additional money.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I'm being asked about the ones that I laid off, Mr. Speaker. I didn't lay anybody off. If you want to ask questions of the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those questions might very well be asked when the Minister himself is presenting his estimates.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition can raise itself to ask some intelligent, penetrating questions, that they'll get intelligent answers, But, Mr. Speaker, they'd better get another adviser when they're talking about figures.

The First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) — the only real suggestion that he had to make with respect to my department in particular, was that we remove education tax from farm land.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: All taxes. With respect to all taxes then, Mr. Speaker. I'm thinking particularly at the moment about agriculture. You said it would take something like \$8 million to remove all taxes on rural land. Was that the figure?

AN HON. MEMBER: Producing farmland.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Producing farmland. Mr. Speaker, if I could be sure that this \$8 million were going to end up in the pockets of the farmers, then I think it would be a wonderful idea. We're working on this; we will have some proposals.

At the moment my concern, Mr. Speaker, is that when a farmer's costs do come down in some areas such as that, it is something like... I think the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) referred to the purple gas taxation bit as a sop; well maybe the education tax is just a bigger sop. When you remove a basic cost like that from farmland, is it really the farmer that's going to benefit? The farmers want it — this purple gas thing. I don't think it was very important. It was something they really wanted. They want the education tax removed too. We'll work on that and I am quite satisfied that they will get it.

But in the meantime I'm not at all satisfied that it's going to put any more money into the pockets of the farmers. Because what usually happens, Mr. Speaker, is that when the farmer is able to reduce his costs, as he has

been able to do over the years — he's increased his efficiency, he's reduced the cost of producing his food per unit of food — all he has done is put more money into the pockets of the processors and the retailers and provided cheaper food for the consumer.

I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, with getting a better way of life for the farmers. I'm not at all convinced at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the first step towards doing that is to remove education tax from farmland. If the First Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) or if those Members of the official Opposition who have not yet thought of anything to say have any specific suggestions, if they have any comments on this particular proposal, if they can convince me that this indeed would help the farmers — not in the short run, for in the short run it would, but in the long run — well then I'll be able to put a much better argument before the Members of cabinet. But at this point, it's

[[Page 529](#)]

awfully hard for me to argue that this is really going to help the farmers, when I question it very seriously myself.

Now there are other Members to speak and perhaps they will be able. I'll be listening, Perhaps they'll be able to convince me that this would indeed be a good measure to adopt.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): You supported it during the election.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Yes. I supported it during the election. I still do, not just from farmlands, but from residential land and improvements as well. Not from farmland because it was going to help the farmers, but because in my mind and in the minds of those in the party who support this, land and improvements should not bear the cost of education. I still think about that, I still believe that.

I was amused by the Hon. First Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer) when he was suggesting that we remove these taxes from farmland. Then I asked him whether or not in addition to that he would still leave the farmers completely free to subdivide their own land. He said: "Well, we'll cross that bridge when we come to it."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of planning that this Government is not prepared to do. And that is why we're not prepared at this time to move in that direction. It will be part of a co-ordinated policy. It will be part of a co-ordinated policy. There will be action on that, and I'll be listening carefully to see whether we get any reasonable suggestions from the Opposition.

The Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) expressed some concern about the utilized capital tax. Now there are Members still to speak. He expressed concern about it and said that this will be applied even though a corporation lose money. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's only one tax that I can think of offhand that applies to a corporation only if it makes a profit, and that is income tax. This is not an income tax — it's one of the expenses of doing business.

Would you suggest, Mr. Speaker, or would the Members opposite care to suggest, that if a corporation is losing money it should also be relieved from paying land and improvement tax or that it should not have to pay excise taxes on materials that it's buying?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Member talking about a bill before the House?

HON. MR. STUPICH: No, Mr. Speaker. Did you think I was?

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately I didn't check this...

MR. PHILLIPS: It's O.K. for that side of the House but not for this side.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, I'm soliciting some advice and I've heard precious little. I've heard precious little on this matter. I've heard some concern, but I've heard no suggestion from the other side that there should be some exemptions. Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: In your remarks? I missed that. I've gone through your speech, but I might have missed that. However, I guess that I have to be a little bit careful, in spite of my flattery. Mr. Speaker's attention has now been drawn to what I've been saying and I think I'd better be a little bit more careful.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, you should always object if you've noticed it, you know.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, Mr. Speaker, they're new. You can't expect them to know that they have the right to object at any time. They're new, and at least, Mr. Speaker, they are awake. I do appreciate that.

MR. PHILLIPS: We're alive, too.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Oh, I'm not sure about this business of being alive, Mr. Speaker. And if I could, maybe I'll draw on that a little later. But at the moment I'll tell you another little story, Mr. Speaker.

I was at a meeting in Nanaimo fairly recently, and the head of one of the largest business concerns in Nanaimo had organized a meeting in connection with the United Appeal. I had been asked to come and speak to this meeting. He told me that in trying to get a broad section of the community — a cross section of the whole community — he had invited representatives from every type of business in the community, and he hoped that I wouldn't be concerned about this — he had also invited representatives from all of the political parties.

Then he pointed out to so-and-so and said: "He's here as a Liberal, and the fellow down there is here as the Conservative Party representative and of course you're here as the NDP." I looked around and said: "Well, which one is the Social Credit?" And he said: "By God! I forgot all about them." (Laughter).

So I'm not sure that they are alive, Mr. Speaker. Certainly in the minds of the community they're dead. Nothing that has happened in this session would indicate to anyone that they are alive, really.

[[Page 530](#)]

MR. PHILLIPS: He sure spends most of his speech talking about us!

HON. MR. STUPICH: Yes, I've got to look at my chart to keep the Peace River riding separate. The Hon. Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) said in his remarks when he was speaking in this debate: "in this I'm sincere." Well now I thought that was really something, not only that he would be sincere in anything at all, but that he would emphasize it by pointing out that in this particular respect he was being sincere.

But I do believe that the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) was sincere in expressing his concern about what the budget is doing. And in his concern, he did worry about the fact that the Government intends to go into partnership with industry. Mr. Speaker, the Government does intend to go into partnership. I'd like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the budget clearly points that out. It's not just a matter of dogmatic socialism.

Mr. Speaker, if I may read from the budget: "life has to be more meaningful for people." That's really what the budget is all about." We believe it can be, for all people in the province, through participation along with the provincial government and private industry in business endeavours. We favour partnership arrangements between industry, government and employees, rather than subsidies or loans to industry." That, Mr. Speaker, is our philosophy.

It is, Mr. Speaker, a socialist budget. We make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, if it sincerely concerns the Members of the Conservative Party that we intend to go in this direction, because certainly if we didn't go in this direction, because certainly if we didn't go in that direction, we would have no right to be here calling ourselves socialists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on and deal briefly with some of the items that might be of interest to some of the Members in the Opposition side of the House, with respect to my own department.

I'd like to start this out by quoting from a recent Press release from the B.C. Federation of Agriculture, which I think outlines a lot of the concern in their minds. Up to this point, it does not seem to have aroused any

concern in the minds of the Opposition, but it did arouse some concern in the minds of the B.C. Federation of Agriculture. If I might quote briefly from this: "With regard to the general operating funds for the Department of Agriculture, Bernhardt says he was disappointed that they will remain at the level of .75 per cent of the total budget." In other words, there has been no real increase with respect to the estimates, in proportion to the total expenditures of the whole government.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is, I think, the best criticism of our budget with respect to agriculture — better than anything I have heard in this House. I can't really compare it to everything in the community, but certainly better than anything that I have heard in this House.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, there has been some expression in this House describing this budget but not really dealing with the budget. You know, Mr. Speaker, if I had been the person responsible for presenting this budget and had been looking across and seeing somebody of the calibre of the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), I would have been worried about presenting this budget. But the calibre of the Opposition since then certainly gives no cause for anybody to be concerned about any kind of a budget speech in presenting it.

It's been called a "tinker-toy budget." What are you really saying when you call it a tinker-toy budget? Are you really dealing with the issues raised in that budget? What are you saying when you say it really is another Social Credit budget? Are you really dealing with the issues in the budget when you call it that, or when you call it a socialist budget?

Mr. Speaker, it is a socialist budget. The socialism is not all that apparent with a cursory reading of the budget speech and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all it has had from most of the Members of the Opposition is a very cursory reading and for that reason they have not been able to deal with it very effectively in this debate.

The socialism is hidden, Mr. Speaker, in the details of the various departments. As I said earlier, it is not so much the dollars, but what we are going to do with the dollar. It is not just in the budget but in the legislation that is referred to in the budget — legislation that is still to come before you, legislation that will come before you in the form of message bills. Then you will be getting the message, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're bragging.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Bragging, Mr. Speaker? I'm not bragging, I'm simply telling the House that it...

AN HON. MEMBER: Dragging.

HON. MR. STUPICH: For example, Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I say now that there will be a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor telling us about land preservation. There is socialism in that.

Interjection by an Hon Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: It's at the printers. I'm not sure what the timetable is, Mr. Speaker. I have been asked when it might come in. Depending upon the availability of the Lieutenant-Governor, I would think Thursday of this week.

[[Page 531](#)]

Mr. Speaker, there will be money provided in that bill. In addition to the estimates. Reference has been made to the fact that the estimates are the same percentage as previously. There is more legislation coming in, Mr. Speaker, and this will be socialist legislation.

Apart from that there are programmes that have been going on half-heartedly that will be beefed up. There is, for example, the B.C. Food Promotion that started last year during the election campaign and that ran out of money as soon as the election was over. This is a continuing programme, Mr. Speaker, and will be picked up, smartened up and used to sell B.C. farm produce in the years ahead rather than to promote the interests of any political party.

There will be a beefing up on the market research. While I said that I have concern about just how much effect on farmers removal of education tax will have, I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that will

help the farmers is to improve their markets. To that end we will be beefing up the market research.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session there were scoffing remarks about the 1,000 new jobs promised in one of the speeches. Those jobs referred only to the beefing up of existing programmes; they did not relate to the new jobs that have to do with new programmes. For example, in the Department of Agriculture, with an increase in staff of 29...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Well, the question has never been asked! Why don't you ask? I couldn't wait for you to ask so I'm answering it without you asking. I'm answering it right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, there are some 29 new positions provided in estimates but of those 29 new positions only 18 are included in the 1,000 figure. The other 11 are for new programmes. The 1,000 that were talked about were to beef up services that were there, that were offered to the people, that were promised to the people but that the Government was never able to deliver because it didn't have the staff to do the job.

You all know examples of this. You all have examples of home acquisition grants being held up because it took too long for the Government to process them. I'm sure that is one area at least where you all have examples. Certainly I have had lots of them. Those areas will be beefed up. Government services generally.

Crop insurance: The federal government is trying to offer a new deal in crop insurance. I am not going to say a great deal about the Peace River situation at this moment. I expect that that may very well come up during estimates, and I don't want to take the time to go into it right now. But I will say this. As far as crop insurance is concerned, if the farmers in the province had made more use of the crop insurance service that was offered, then the situation in the Peace would not be nearly as bad as it is.

To improve this insurance the federal government has suggested that they would take a higher share of the premium cost, that is, increase their share from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, if the province would take over the whole of the administrative cost.

There has been a bill introduced in Ottawa on the order paper. We don't know whether the Government is going to last long enough to go through with that bill.

MR. PHILLIPS: Ask Lewis.

HON. MR. STUPICH: We could ask Lewis, and Lewis would support us. But Lewis has no way of knowing what kind of bills the Government will introduce in the meantime in order to perhaps invite the Opposition to throw him out of office so that he will not have to go ahead with such good bills as the proposed changes to the *Crop Insurance Act*.

In any case, the federal Minister of Agriculture does want the federal government to assume 50 per cent of the cost of premiums as opposed to 25 per cent and for the provincial government to take over the whole of the administrative costs. In the hope that this actually will go through this year, I approached cabinet and said, "Will you back me up on this? May we go ahead on this programme in the hope that it will be passed in Ottawa?" B.C. right now is writing these crop insurance policies on that basis.

The federal government is paying half the premium, which reduces in effect the cost of the crop insurance premium to the farmer by one-third. There is a question in the order paper on this subject. The order-in-council will go before cabinet officially tomorrow, although I have discussed it. At that time I will be able to answer specifically the questions on the order paper relating to crop insurance.

However, this is one of the areas where we really can help farmers. Those who lose their crops, or who fear they may, will be able to take advantage of these crop insurance programmes. This is one area where I am satisfied individual farmers will be helped.

Co-operative services: We said previously — it is in our programme. I have talked about it for years —

co-op services have been neglected in this province. There has been machinery to organize co-operatives, but beyond that the Government has done nothing. Under the Department of Agriculture we will be doing educational work and promotional work in the field of cooperatives.

But beyond that, legislation will be introduced

[[Page 532](#)]

that will give the Government authority to help co-operatives financially, either by lending or by guaranteeing loans to them. I hope that agricultural people in particular will take advantage of this — either farmers, groups of farmers, or industrial concerns operated by farmers — and this assistance will be available to them.

One area again in which I feel the Government can help farmers — these are things which I think that everybody would agree with — is in the area of marketing boards. Marketing boards are really unions of farmers, getting together to try to manage their own production, in the interests of helping the individual farmers in those organizations.

Marketing boards have been in existence for some time. There has been a move more recently to co-ordinate their activities on a national basis and we have encouraged that. The new Government has encouraged this. The B.C. Egg Marketing Board, for example, has signed with the national egg marketing agency. The B.C. Broiler Board, I understand, is ready to sign. The turkey people are still looking at it and others are further behind, but we are moving in that direction. In every instance we are encouraging the marketing boards to co-operate not only in the Province of British Columbia but we are encouraging them to co-operate with the farmers throughout the Dominion of Canada.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): What about among themselves?

HON. MR. STUPICH: To farmers co-operating among themselves? Yes. I mentioned earlier that farmers may get together, for example in machinery co-ops.

There are two marketing boards for the vegetable crop. They want more help from the Government; they want more co-operation. Our emphasis for the moment has been to encourage these two groups to get together. They are talking about it. Their boards are considering it. It is our feeling that we can assist them and help their members more if they would form one board that would represent all of the producers in the province rather than helping them as individual boards, which to some extent are competing and conflicting with each other. So we are going slow on doing what they want until we can get them to co-operate between themselves — the two groups. There is I think at this time a feeling of great optimism that that will happen in the relatively...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: The two getting together? Very definitely, oh yes.

The small farm development programme — there is nothing new in that. It is a programme co-operating with the federal government to assist farmers who are trying to farm units of a size too small to be economic. It is a programme where the federal government makes money available to assist farmers in those positions to enlarge their holdings so they will be able to farm economically. We signed that agreement in October of last year.

I mentioned very briefly the Peace River situation. I expect we will be dealing with that during estimates. We are working on this continually. We did make a programme. I think you will recall that the provincial government paid out a maximum of \$1,000 per farm. The federal government, which we had hoped would match this, instead limited its maximum to \$400. We are disappointed in that; we have been in touch with people in the area; we have urged them to keep up the pressure on Ottawa. We are putting pressure on Ottawa to try to get them to improve their offer. We are suggesting new programmes, and we are hoping that if the farmers in that area and the political representatives in that area will keep the pressure on Ottawa, there may be some further assistance to the people in those areas, if not on a blanket basis at least on an individual basis.

But I will say this, Mr. Speaker. The Government of British Columbia, while it did take longer to act in this respect than I had hoped in the beginning, because it took time to get the information and it took time to determine the course of action and to get agreement with Ottawa, nevertheless, although they got a maximum of

\$1,000 in B.C., the farmers on the Alberta side of the border are still waiting for their cheque from their provincial government.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It was mailed last Wednesday.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mailed last Wednesday. Ours went out very early in January; theirs went out then something like over a month later. Of course, goodness only knows when the federal government payment will come through.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Is that why it took so long? Well, in any case the New Democratic Party were quick to act. And I think that's the point I want to make at this time.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, this wasn't a new problem in the Peace River. This was one of five years of losses in that area. Now, I don't recall ever seeing or reading or hearing anything about the Members opposite urging their government to do anything about this in the previous 4 years. It seems

[[Page 533](#)]

to me they were quiet about it.

This year there is a new government. This year there's action. That's the difference, Mr. Speaker.

Other legislation that will be coming in.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, I hear a voice saying "I wasn't here." And, Mr. Speaker, there are some times when I wish that voice still wasn't here. But there will be changes to the...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: When that voice goes on for 2½ hours late on a Friday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I think there are 53 other Members of the House who will join with me.

There will be further changes. And again it's a matter, as I said earlier the only real suggestion I've heard from the other side of the House — there may be more coming — the only real suggestion is that we back up from our land preservation programme and let the land go. And secondly, that we take the education...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STUPICH: ...take the education tax off farmland. Mr. Speaker, I'm not particularly enamoured at either one of those solutions but there are other things that we can do.

On the books there is an old *Farmers Land Clearing Assistance Act*. It's been used specifically for clearing land, and for drainage purposes. It is our intention to open this Act. Really in part to change the name, but more than a change in name, it's a change in application of this assistance. Instead of limiting it to drainage and to clearing we want to make this Act available to those — for example in the Okanagan country, those who want to renovate their orchards; who want to take out the old trees and plant new trees — better varieties of apples. Or people who may want to change from trees to growing grapes. People who want to increase and to improve the productivity of their farm — long-range improvements on farmland, of one kind or another.

Drainage, but also irrigation. Anything that will in the long run improve the capability of that individual on that particular land to improve his financial conditions. This is one of the areas in which we will be moving, and will be moving soon.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: It's still coming in under the old *Farmers Land Clearing Assistance Act*; the rules will be the same for the time being. We'll get some experience in this in the months ahead and see how it works, and this too may well be developed and may be changed.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of what I said earlier, I think it's not necessary for me really to go on much longer. There is one thing though, that I would like to say.

When I talked about the land preservation programme, I introduced a subject very late on a Friday by saying that this was something I had been trying to...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: I have no intention of talking about that debate, it would be out of order. It's just to introduce another subject. But this was something I had been talking about publicly for some 23 years. There's something else I was talking about publicly, Mr. Speaker, for 23 years it was my concern when I was at university when I was studying agriculture.

There's a lot of research going on in this province, a lot of research going on in the country and in other countries. But a lot of research going on in this province. Too often the research is not co-ordinated. It's done by the universities, it's done by the federal government, it's done by the provincial government. And they may co-ordinate it, they may know what's going on. They write learned papers and they exchange them. But when does the farmer hear about it?

Now, this is one of the real problems, I think. One of the points that I tried to make as a student at university was that there isn't enough effort put in to making sure this information is available to the producers out in the field. I was concerned about this. I must be really making a point, Mr. Speaker, if I can get the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) to agree with anything I say. It makes me wonder whether I'm saying the wrong thing. (Laughter)

However, there will be provision for a demonstration and applied research programme. We know what's going on — we have access to this material. We intend to spend a good deal of effort in the year ahead in making sure, by showing farmers — by actually doing this; inviting them to come and see. Showing them what is being done in the research way, what is being done on experimental farms, or on the provincial government farms — show them what is being done. Let them come right out in the field and see it in the hopes, Mr. Speaker, that they will go back home and apply these new ideas, these new varieties, new programmes to their own farms.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, as was discussed in the question of the whole agricultural land preservation programme, the emphasis has to be not only on preserving land but on how do we make farming

[Page 534]

economically viable for the people involved in it.

Mr. Speaker, I've suggested a list of about 10 points that we're already working on, or that we will be working on. Mr. Speaker, if anybody on the other side of the House has anything constructive to add to this, I'd be only too happy to listen to it. I'll be listening to it during the debate. If I have to leave the House occasionally, I look at it in *Hansard*. And I do want constructive suggestions from the other side of the House. Really that's my job to make agriculture economically viable. Any way that I can work towards that — removing of education taxes is really not that all-important.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STUPICH: At Vernon? Well because I don't think there's anything that we can learn. The Member opposite, Mr. Speaker, is asking about the possibility of using the Vernon sewage effluent on vegetable crops, Now, this has been tried and I don't know that we can learn anything new by it — or from further experimentation along those lines.

However, we are in touch with the mayor of Vernon. He's been down to see us. He's been talking about using the L-and-A Ranch, he's been talking about using other areas. We've promised him every co-operation in

extending that system so that it will use all the material that is available for this fertilization — and use it productively in agriculture pursuits. And whether it be in vegetables or not, I don't know — but certainly we do want to co-operate with them. We think this is an excellent experimental programme. It has been done, Mr. Speaker, with vegetables. I'm not convinced at this point — I haven't got a closed mind, and I haven't got closed ears. I'm not convinced at this point Mr. Speaker, that we can learn anything worthwhile by going along the lines that the Hon. Member opposite suggests. But, on the other hand that doesn't mean that I'm not listening.

Mr. Speaker, I've spoken in this debate because I want to ask the Members opposite for some constructive, reasonable suggestions to help the agricultural industry. We'll be listening, and we'll be reading. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Boundary-Similkameen.

MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, It was interesting to note the cursory coverage that the previous speaker gave of his own department. I particularly appreciate his request for suggestions from this side of the House. I recall when I was Minister of Agriculture that we didn't get very many suggestions over from the Opposition, but we certainly got a lot of criticism.

The suggestions we received at that time certainly weren't within the ballpark anymore than what the Minister has just indicated to the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan). They just weren't in that category.

But I do want to say something, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the statements that were made about Gabriola Island. Now, I don't want to accuse the Minister of misleading the House. But, previously in relation to Gabriola Island an inference was left with this House that certain approvals were given by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Campbell) in relation to subdivisions.

Now, this is not so. Because previously — and there were public hearings — under the appropriate legislation that has been used for administrative purposes in recent times by the now Government. And the previous minister made no commitments in relation to subdivision on Gabriola Island. It would be my contention at this point that we should be debating resolution 6 on the order paper. And then we would get the facts because it was all taped. Now we're talking here, through the Minister's statements, talking about putting 10,000 people on Gabriola Island. And the former Minister assured the people of Gabriola Island that it would remain a rural area.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. RICHTER: Well, it seems to be that I've heard a point that I haven't heard for a long time. I'm very happy...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. RICHTER: I'm very happy that the Minister is here from the lower part of the building here — down on the first floor. We welcome you here Mr. Minister, and we're very happy to have you. We like to hear your voice. (Laughter).

MRS. JORDAN: Instead of feeling the whip all the time.

MR. RICHTER: However, public hearings were held in relation to Gabriola Island, and I think it's been well documented in the Press what occurred at those hearings. Today's dissertation by the Minister left us, I think, somewhat misled because previously the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Campbell) did put a restriction on Saltspring Island and on Gabriola Island — first of 10 — acre subdivisions and subsequently of 5-acre subdivisions. This was with the intent of proper land management — to give an opportunity for hearings and for public input.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: I'm not going to debate that portion any more because I know that there is a motion on the order paper in which we can get the facts by way of the tape recordings if the Government sees fit to permit us to bring the motion to the floor and to accept it.

The Minister (Hon. Mr. Stupich) gave us a cursory review of his Department of Agriculture, but most of the time he was covering the conglomerate of government policy plus other Ministers' responsibilities.

At this time I would mention the very fact that the Minister brought up the subject of the percentage of the total budget that goes into agriculture. I was always criticized on this point; my successor was criticized. Today you haven't seen one bit of change. It's the same percentage — a little bigger budget. Percentagewise there'll be a few more dollars in the department.

But that is not the point. The point is: How are you going to spend it? Tell us that. It's not being spelled out in any legislation we've received to date, although we have been advised today that additional moneys will be made available for the socialistic farmland policy that you intend to bring in. Well, why don't you put it in the budget if you know what it's going to be?

It's the same as another bill that's before this House. We don't even know the rates. Give us the facts. This is what we need. Never mind bringing it in at a later date. Give us the facts now so that we can properly assess them. We don't want to be criticizing something that we should be praising you for. For goodness' sakes, give us the advantage of this at least in your submission.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: I really appreciate the remarks of my good friend the Premier and Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett). You know, I think he's getting fatter by the day and I certainly don't want to ever have him referred to as a "fat cat." Let me tell you, he's doing well. I'm sure he's eating well. I'm sure he's sleeping well.

In the agricultural field, if an animal in a feed lot doesn't rest well and doesn't eat well, he really doesn't do well. Our Premier is doing really well. He has a good conversion factor, as they would refer to.

Mr. Speaker, on an earlier occasion when I spoke in the throne debate, because of the direction in which the debate had gone, I purposely did not mention matters pertaining to the constituency of Boundary-Similkameen which I have the honour and privilege of representing in this House.

I would like to dwell for a few moments at this time and put before the government matters which are of grave concern to the electorate and others of my constituency and in the adjoining areas. Actually my remarks in relation to the fruit-growing industry could be applicable to other areas where agriculture is important to the economy.

As a past Minister of Agriculture, I have seen definite progress in the management of agricultural affairs both at the local level and in government. However, agriculture still remains the "poor cousin" of our economy. No matter how hard local agricultural organizations and local governments work towards a solution to this problem, they will never accomplish by themselves their objective of obtaining equitable returns for their production commensurable with other industries and professions.

The most recent gleam of hope that I have seen towards solving this problem — and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) will note this — is that made by the Hon. Eugene Whelan, federal Minister of Agriculture, who personally recognized the problem and has made statements to this effect.

However, the solution would have to come from federal government policy in regard to the unfair competition that our farmers face by way of subsidized imports. The Hon. Mr. Whelan's view is to this effect: unless these products, both seasonal and otherwise, have barriers imposed which would make them competitive price-wise with the cost of our production here in Canada, then it is a foregone conclusion that we will see a continuation of the decline in agriculture in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we have many, many areas — and I know we have to deal in world markets which have subsidized agriculture — in competition with our own production which is of a high-cost nature in Canada, and particularly in British Columbia. It's not possible for the farmer to compete in this respect.

We will see a continued decline in industry by way of lack of incentive to the young people of this country to return to the land — which many of them wish to do but the questionable viability would not give them the security commensurable with other occupations. This point of view has been concurred with by all Ministers of Agriculture across Canada in their representations made to the federal government. Unless there is some incentive for the young person to go back to the farm because of its environment — the healthy living and so on; unless they can see their way clear to make an income commensurable with other occupations, there's really no incentive for them to go back there.

So we must make — as the Minister has indicated his intention and his desire — agriculture a viable industry commensurable with other industries. I am very happy that the Minister mentioned this; I know that he will do his best to work in this direction.

[[Page 536](#)]

Our water resource — a resource which is so important to the Okanagan because of the nature of our main Okanagan Valley which has much of its floor covered with water — has been a subject of an intense study that has been carried out through the co-operation of the federal and provincial governments. It is known as the Okanagan Water Basin Study. This I'm sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will interest you because of your profession, in having clean, potable water for human consumption.

The terms of reference are rather wide and a great deal of input has been required of the technical people doing this study. Many facts are being brought to light that will be most helpful in developing methods of handling our water resources to bring about a higher quality and to retain such a quality.

The Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. R.A. Williams) is deeply involved in this particular phase and aspect of a technical study. I am sure that he will see that it is carried on to its ultimate end to get the best benefits from it.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to the all-important question of highways — and I am sorry the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is not in. A continuing programme has been carried out on improving the main east-west highway from Hope to the Alberta border in the south. There is no question that the degree of traffic now using this important artery that leads in and out of our province requires substantial improvement, particularly on the part known as the Hope-Princeton section.

The trend towards truck transportation has increased many-fold over the past few years and will continue to do so, both by the multiplicity of vehicles and the increase in size of trucking units. It is imperative that the government give high priority to bring Highway 3 up to a higher standard.

I want to express my appreciation to the Minister of Highways for his prompt reply to a number of questions which I placed on the order paper pertaining to the highways within the constituency I represent. Highway 3, leading to the east Kootenay, through the southern part of the province, is being brought up to a standard commensurate with the traffic volume. However, there are a few short sections that require attention and I would hope that the Minister will see fit to continue the projects already underway and implement further improvements so that the sections not yet receiving attention will receive some action.

For approximately 20 years I have personally worked with many organizations as well as the Department of Highways to gain a bypass route around the City of Penticton west of the Okanagan flood-control channel. A great deal of advice was given during the election campaign by the various political candidates and their supporting speakers.

From a political platform, there was no question as to how simply this problem could be resolved by obtaining a highway right-of-way through the Penticton Indian reservation. Certainly, I do not think any of the civil service, and particularly the engineering branch of the Department of Highways, or the regional district planners would agree, along with myself, that there is any easy solution.

As I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I have worked diligently for 20 years, even carrying the matter to the level of the federal government and the Minister of Indian Affairs, without result or encouragement from that high office. It appears to me at this time, in light of a question answered by the Hon. Minister of Highways which I had put on the order paper at this session, that we are not any closer to a solution. This problem has grown into

an impossible situation and must be resolved by whatever action is necessary.

I'm particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Highways will be undertaking a programme of development and improvement of Highway 97 from the international border at Osoyoos through my constituency to Trout Creek, near Summerland. The only question that is in my mind at the moment is that no provision has been made for a new highway location on the east side of the Okanagan Valley between Osoyoos and Vaseaux Lake.

I have always advocated that this relatively undeveloped land, where again we run into possible complications of crossing Indian reservation land, that the highway should be located on the east side of the valley to prevent disturbing existing developments along the present Highway 97 between the international border and Vaseaux Lake. With the new highway location, the present highway could be used as a service road for the present development without any substantial alteration or expense.

Mr. Speaker, tourist industry, resort and park development are an extremely important part of the economy of the Okanagan Valley and are progressively gaining stature. The proximity and climatic conditions, both winter and summer, and availability of accommodation make my constituency the proverbial playground of the great mass of population residing on the lower mainland, south of the international border and, yes, even Alberta. A large number of areas are presently set aside for public use, although they lack in development to some degree. I would earnestly request the Government and the appropriate department to give earnest consideration, because of the demand for facilities, to a continuing programme of development.

A very disturbing situation, Mr. Speaker, has come about due to the flood disaster that struck the Similkameen Valley this spring. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first occasion that a flood problem has harassed the residents of that area. In

[[Page 537](#)]

1894 a flood occurred which was remembered by many people as probably the "daddy of all floods." However, in 1948 an almost equally devastating flood occurred and again this year. In my opinion, probably the worst flood of all occurred in the Similkameen watershed.

Many of the areas, because of the dikes and other structures, were not inundated by water as they were in 1894 and 1948. Now very restrictive measures have been brought into being which affect many people who wish to put in various installations, namely septic tanks and other services — even restrictions on buildings on land that was not affected either this year or in 1948 by way of the high water level.

I've had numerous letters of complaint, which I have taken up with the department concerned. It would be my recommendation, Mr. Speaker, to the Government that rather than employ the regulations on the broad and general aspect of the area, it should be more definitively applied on the basis of merit or demerit of the individual application.

We have never had any real pollution problem because of the general make-up of the soil mass in the floor area of the Similkameen. The density of population is not great. I would ask the Government to give their earnest consideration to applying the regulations in a manner in which those priorities of merit could be granted the necessary permission to construct their facilities. Granted there are areas that would have to be rejected. However, I'm not convinced that all must be rejected as is presently happening in the unorganized area, while immediately inside an organized boundary approvals are being given on a continuing basis.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that a brief has been submitted to the Department of Health. I'm sorry the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) is not in. This brief was presented to the health security programme by the Similkameen Public Health Society. In it was clearly defined examples of the overload of work the local public health nurse is attempting to cope with. It goes without saying that the expanding population of the area and the distances to be travelled between schools and populated centres make it utterly impossible for one individual to adequately give the services required on a part-time basis.

The time available under the present arrangement is nowhere near sufficient to serve the school pupils, let alone the adult population, a large majority of whom are retired and elderly people including many pensioners who have found the area a desirable place to settle. As the elected representative to this Legislature for the area, I

give my full support to the brief submitted. I'm urging at this time, as I have in the past, that the Minister and his department take a very serious look into and take the necessary action to bolster the staff in this important field of preventive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, this is the twentieth year in which I have risen in my place on behalf of my constituents to speak in reply to the budget speech. In these 20 years this is the first occasion that I have had grave concern as to the implications of the fiscal policy enunciated in the speech.

It is a speech in which the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) uses the rhetoric of Social Credit administration, and I quote: "We believe in maintaining cash reserves whenever possible as a safeguard against short-term developments outside the province's control." Yet having examined the speech, Mr. Speaker, I find it singularly lacking in both the philosophy and the ability to make it work.

Much of the language of this budget is related to the past performance of the economy and, as such, is a growing tribute to the fiscal management of 20 years of Social Credit government. It admits the success of those policies. Then, in effect, it goes on to say, "but it was too successful. Now we must slow it down. We must put the brakes on." This speech is filled with political hangups of the Fabian socialist philosophy. You speak of turning attention from quantitative progress to qualitative measures.

AN HON. MEMBER: Full of clichés.

MR. RICHTER: Mr. Speaker, where is the quality in the 10 per cent unemployment? Where in this speech is your answer for the 90,000 British Columbians who don't have jobs? I've tried hard to imagine what was in the mind of the Minister of Finance when he sat down in the comfort of his home to draft his budget speech.

Before he put pen to paper, I think he must have stretched out his arm and scratched the head of his pet Yorkshire terrier and said, "Now, Ernie, your Fabian friend Harold — what would he have done in this situation?" I'm sure Ernie must have told him that his Fabian friend Harold is on record as having said, "Without an economic base, all talk of social improvement is folly."

However, with the Minister of Finance's public record of paranoia in relation to economic expansion and his wild rhetorical opposition to those who have helped create thousands of jobs in this province, this was too much for him to swallow. Instead of accepting this sensible economic premise, he cast aside the comments of his faithful Fabian friend — and what do you find in the composition of his speech? Not the energetic enthusiasm of the Yorkshire terrier but a paltry portion of Yorkshire pudding. It looks large in size, is well-coloured but is deadly indigestion.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It's like an oatmeal sandwich.

[[Page 538](#)]

MR. RICHTER: This budget, Mr. Speaker, is indeed plain fare for the people of British Columbia at a time when we need every impetus in increasing input to keep the wheels of industry turning for the provision of jobs for our people.

All that this budget does is to impose an increasing burden on industry at a time when the vagaries of international finance and foreign markets are casting grave shadows across the ability of British Columbia producers to compete in the markets of the world. We do not have a preferred position with our commodities in world markets. In a recent speech to the Truck Loggers' Association in Vancouver, Robert Bonner pointed out that British Columbia only produced 15 per cent of the world's supply of chemical market pulp, 5.5 per cent of the world's newsprint production and 6 per cent of the world's softwood lumber.

I may also point out that all Canada possesses only 3 per cent of the world's known resources of copper, 13 per cent of nickel, 20 per cent of zinc and 12 per cent of its iron ore. Yet these are the very industries which this government is seeking to destroy in its imposition of increased tax burdens.

These industries are the very foundation of the British Columbia economy. Almost every other industry depends upon the spin-off from these to survive.

Where are the jobs going to come from when you put the economic thumbscrews to these industries?

The recent drastic devaluation of the American dollar is a glaring example of the economic uncertainty which faces the primary industries of this province. While this is not an entirely new situation for industry in British Columbia, coming at a time when industry is facing the imposition of increased provincial tax and the shadow cast by thinly-veiled threats of legislation to place the industry under increasing measures of state control, I would suggest to you that unless this government changes its attitude to industry, the outlook for the unemployed and many who are at present holding jobs is extremely poor.

You talk of government partnership in industry. Taking your public utterances into account, that means putting the government "fox" in the industrial "henhouse".

Who can believe anything you say? You were socialists; you are still socialists, and your philosophy remains as being the ultimate state-ownership of land, capital and the means of production. You have already implemented the first tenet of that philosophy in the virtual state control of farmland. If anyone doubts that you really were socialists when you were first elected, they have no doubts now.

One of your first actions was to place your political commissars in control of government departments. We are already seeing the fruits of that blatant piece of patronage.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Name names.

MR. RICHTER: They are all foreign names from different parts of the province. You have them in Mines, you have them in any number of departments.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Don't slander the civil servants.

MR. RICHTER: They're not civil servants, Mr. Premier. They're not civil servants; they're put in as executive assistants.

AN. HON. MEMBER: You had one yourself.

MR. RICHTER: I did not! I did not have one, my friend, I certainly did not. He was a civil servant and he gained his position by way of competition. That's more than yours did.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. RICHTER: One that I formerly administered...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: In the Department of Mines, for one.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: It's quite obvious that they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Political hacks.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You're attacking the whole civil service.

MR. RICHTER: I'm not attacking the civil service because the civil service is not involved. It's the special people. You brought them in from Saskatchewan, you brought them in from Manitoba.

In the senior civil service, professionals are being moved into basement offices.

A perfect example of this Government's understanding of its role is in the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources' (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) "popcorn stand" concept of administration.

Mr. Speaker, if the potentials of this budget were not so tragic from the point of view of the working

people of this province, it would make a perfect script for a comedy — a comedy of errors and omissions. While Members opposite may laugh on their way to deposit their increased indemnities in the bank, the people of this province must face the folly

[[Page 539](#)]

of the socialist experiment.

Socialism has not worked, is not working now and will never work — here in British Columbia nor in any other place throughout the world. It has trailed the burdens of bureaucracy in its wake. What the British Columbia economy needs now is decision-making on the part of the Government. But in this context, what do you have in this budget? Next to nothing. The Government is floundering around in a sea of indecision while the economy, by force of this Government's non-action, is being made to mark time.

This is a dangerous budget — dangerous in the things in which it fails to say and do.

AN HON. MEMBER: A "peephole" government.

MR. RICHTER: What are you waiting for? Where is your real programme? Why are you afraid to tell the people your real programme?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Car insurance.

MR. RICHTER: That's laughable.

Why are you so afraid to tell the people your real programme? Are you waiting for the green light from your partners in the Federation of Labour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Labour party.

MR. RICHTER: The new measures you have taken are all punitive and retrograde. On page 14 of your speech you describe these measures as being "minor adjustments to tax measures." Since when, Mr. Speaker, was a 30 per cent increase in tax a minor adjustment?

AN HON. MEMBER: What on earth are you reading from?

MR. RICHTER: From the budget debate; I'm quoting from it.

How can you describe as "a minor adjustment" the 20 per cent increase in corporation profit tax when a representative portion of the major industry in this province had an average return on money invested in a three year period — 1969, 1970, 1971 — of less than 5 per cent?

Add to this the unspecified increase in rural property tax and its potential impact upon the industries in unorganized areas, and further to this the tax on employed capital, and what we have in this so-called "minor adjustment" is what appears to be a deliberate attempt to destroy the ability of industry to survive in a competitive framework of international economics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time. Time, please.

MR. RICHTER: The potential of our economy is controlled, not in the limited sales opportunity within British Columbia, but in the marketplace of the world.

What are the real intentions of the Government? Are these measures merely the "gloved fist"? If these measures are really "minor adjustments," is industry to expect further tax impositions? From the smile on the face of my friend, the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick), I am sure I can contemplate this with his mining legislation.

MR. CHABOT: The look of brilliance.

MR. RICHTER: Mr. Speaker, this budget bears the hallmark of state control of our basic industries. Little wonder they are hesitant and holding back. Someone must feel they were hoodwinked at the time of the last petroleum rights dispersal; they just didn't know what was to come.

The tragedy of this Government's attitude to the business world of the province is that the ones who are suffering and will suffer are the masses of people who do not have a job now, and the many more it will rob of the employment they now have.

I think this is a glaring example: we attempted from this corner of the House today, to put before this House a very, very important measure where many, many drilling rigs are having their contracts cancelled, pipelines are having their contracts cancelled; and this is reflecting on many, many hundreds of jobs and will continue to reflect.

AN HON. MEMBER: I don't believe it. Whose pipeline?

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): You'd better wake up, my friend.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which pipeline?

MR. RICHTER: Where in this budget is there hope for these people? It appears you have deliberately created an atmosphere of uncertainty in the very industries which are the lifeline of job creation.

You know what you have done in the field of petroleum exploration. If you don't, you will undoubtedly be advised in short order. As a haven of hope for the working people of this province this budget and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) are an abject failure.

The workingman is being sacrificed at the altar of outdated and ill-proven socialist theory. You have

[[Page 540](#)]

padding the pockets of your political friends, but you have thrown the future prospects of the workingman to the wolves. Admit your socialist theories will not work before it is too late and thousands more are unemployed in this province.

For the people's sake, do something now to put new life into the economy and create jobs for the people. Ten per cent unemployment is completely unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the galleries of this House in vain for some sign of the union leaders of this province. Two years ago, when the unemployment rate was only half of what it is today, they sat in the galleries while the rabble who accompanied them from Vancouver were rioting in this chamber. Where are they today? The answer is obvious: they have achieved their objective.

AN HON. MEMBER: They can't afford to come across.

MR. RICHTER: They have a government which is helping them destroy the industrial management of this province with punitive legislation. They are on their way to the pinnacle of imperialistic power. That select band of fat cat union bosses are now calling the shots for their NDP partners of the Canadian Labour Congress.

I studied some of the speeches of your Minister of Labour. Again it is the workingman who will suffer the consequences of the unholy alliance. Another group of people to suffer from this Government's actions are the farmers of the province. The land freeze policy is an example of a retrograde measure imposed by this Government. This action ties the farmer to his land regardless of its economic viability.

If you had been in earlier, Mr. Premier, I explained it to the Minister and he gave us the assurance that he was going to make the farms viable. It should be made available. I'm sure there isn't one of you who could run a farm. However it might be well to note that at least the Premier did pluck some vegetables in his earlier days.

There is no assurance for a farmer that the returns from the productivity of his land will be sufficient to, pay the taxes, let alone the provision of a living income. This could well be due to any number of factors — lack

of source of irrigation water, type of soil, or even adverse climatic conditions. Every man in agriculture throughout the province is prone to suffer the vagaries of elemental conditions in a manner in which no other industry is faced.

Let me assure this Legislature the official Opposition is in favour of the preservation of farmland, but certainly not at the expense of the farmer and his family.

The answer to preserving farmland is to assure the farmer of an adequate income from his land and you will thereby induce the young people to return to the healthy outdoor life of agricultural industry. There will no longer be farmland for sale if this should occur or could be made to occur. During the election many promises were made by the socialist NDP. Much was said about the removal of education tax from the land. While at that time they did not really believe that they would become the Government and have to measure up to their promises, it was a good catchy vote-getter.

Now they are Government, they are obviously having difficulty keeping their avowed promises. However within this budget a pattern is evolving. While the Government is attempting to sort out their political promises, they will be collecting additional money — which incidentally the Minister of Finance has indicated they don't really need — from the newly imposed business taxes.

In this way they expect to make up the revenue that would have been collected by way of the education tax when it is removed in part or in whole. Now, Mr. Speaker, who is taking out of the taxpayer's right pocket to put it into the left? It may well look good to some people to see industry carrying an ever-increasing burden of taxation but in the final analysis the resultant inflationary trend will strike hardest at the individual taxpayer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this budget speech with its attack upon industry and its job-creating capabilities, through its punitive taxation and paradoxical hesitancy in decision making, may well be likened to the old story of the old man standing at the execution block.

The executioner was noted for his dexterity in his deadly art. The victim after many moments of waiting, cried out in anguish, "Executioner, don't hold me in suspense, do your job quickly," to which plea the executioner replied, "Sir, just nod your head."

It is my belief that the punitive measures now taken and the apparent hesitance to reveal the full intentions of Government policy may well have already severed the lifeline of the British Columbia economy. Mr. Speaker, for this reason I cannot support this budget and fully intend to vote against its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the First Member for Vancouver South.

MR. J. RADFORD (Vancouver South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last speaker, Member for Boundary-Similkameen was the past Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources and, Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Hon. Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) asked leave of the House to discuss an emergency unemployment problem in his constituency caused by the petroleum royalty increase.

[[Page 541](#)]

We just heard from the former Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources and he did mention one or two words, or a one-liner about this concern — about this real emergency. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what kind of cheap politics are they playing over on the other side?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. RADFORD: Well, it don't cost nothing, Mr. Speaker, it's low-down politics also.

AN HON. MEMBER: You'll eat those words when you go out to campaign in the north.

MR. RADFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the budget. I won't wait till the end to give my opinion on it. I rise to support the budget. However, I do have reservations and criticisms in one area that I will discuss later on in my speech.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that has been presented to this province will provide jobs and work opportunities for all those seeking employment. This is truly a people's budget.

Let us examine some of the job-producing programmes of the budget. Let's examine the \$33 million provided for the Department of Highways. This will bring jobs into the province. Five million dollars added to the accelerated parks development for jobs. This additive will be good for future leisure time that many of the working people will have in this province. Five million dollars added to the accelerated reforestation fund for jobs. This will bring more jobs into the province. Ten million dollars set up as a community recreational facility fund for the province to share in jointly-financed community construction projects. This will be shared one-third by the province. This will also bring new jobs into the province.

Also, Mr. Speaker, \$5 million set up for the provincial research and economic studies fund for research assignments as required by the provincial government. This is a beginning for new innovations in the province where a ready source of research on specific projects can be made available from the private and educational sector. This will also bring in new jobs.

Fifty million dollars has been added to the provincial home acquisition fund to continue the home grant and second mortgages programme. This will aid citizens of B.C. to acquire their own homes and this also will create new jobs in the construction industry.

It should be realized, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the jobs created from this programme that we just mentioned, that a spin-off for a multiplying factor is created to form more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the infusion of a one year increase of \$45 million into our educational system will provide our young people with the skills and abilities to face the problems of the modern world. A country's ability to prosper and progress is built on the cornerstone of its educational system.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an increase of over \$3 million to recreation and conservation. Of this amount \$1.2 million has been added to last year's budget of \$2.9 million to the fish and wildlife branch. This is an approximately 43.9 per cent increase. Even though this is a very significant increase, the fishing and hunting sportsmen of B.C. are still being shortchanged by the lack of concern and the lack of awareness of the economic values generated by the most natural of all natural resources, our fish and wildlife.

Recent studies completed for the Fish and Wildlife Branch like Pearse-Bowden were mentioned the other day by the Member for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson). These studies show that our fish and wildlife in the Province of B.C. brought about a direct expenditure to our province in the amount of \$103 million annually or per season. Yet, Mr. Speaker, here we are attempting to manage this valuable resource on a budget of \$4.1 million. It also should be recognized that over \$3 million of the \$4.1 million budget is derived directly from licenses and tags and fees from the fishermen and hunters. So it is really amazing that the input to manage a valuable resource of \$103 million annually is costing less than \$1 million.

154,000 resident hunters in the 1970-71 season, and that is only one season, spent \$40 million on hunting activities in B.C. This is an average of approximately \$290 per hunter per year or \$21.50 per day. The value of the non-resident hunter to B.C. was \$10 million. This is the non-resident hunter, To calculate these figures I have just mentioned, the study evaluated the cost of transportation, guns, ammunition, license, tag fees, food, lodging, meat processing, guides, taxidermists and so on.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be realized that these are not all the inputs. I would like to read to you from the Pearse-Bowden report some of the things that are left out of this study. It says:

"The study deals only with the province's game resources and the value they create through recreation provided to hunters. They do not encompass the sustenance value of fish and game as a source of food for some persons, particularly native people, nor are they concerned with the values of the province's many non-game species of wildlife.

"Also over-looked are the values of the wildlife resource in terms of non-consumptive recreation and in many cultural, aesthetic and scientific values. Thus while these reports for this study reflect a major facet of the use and value of British

Columbia's game resources, it must be emphasized that other significant values are not discussed and the values estimated are by no means all-encompassing."

In other words the study that was done does not encompass all the values. The study that we are talking about is just concerned with hunters and fishermen per day on the money that they used to carry on this recreation.

During the season of 1969-70, 203,000 residents of B.C. obtained fishing licenses. Added to this was 96,000 licenses for non-residents. So the total resident and non-resident licenses for that season totaled 299,000 people. Resident and non-resident anglers spent a total of \$53 million in B.C. during the season of 1969-70, and we should remember I am talking about one season and this is annually. This is for fresh water fishing only and does not include salt water fishing. We are also not discussing here non-licensed fishermen who amount to quite a few — these are the people under 18 years of age. They are not taken into consideration in this study.

Resident fishermen spent \$41 million in that season that I'm discussing and non-resident fishermen spent \$12 million — this brings it to the total of \$53 million. The largest share of resident anglers' expenditures went for the purchase of boats, motors and other major equipment items. Food and lodging were secondary in importance, followed by the travel costs and fishing tackle purchased. For non-residents food and lodging and travel expenses accounted for 75 per cent of their total expenditures.

There was also an employment study done on non-resident fishermen only. In this employment study on the effects on the non-resident fishermen in B.C., it showed that 938 people were employed in the service industries and 644 people in retail jobs for a total of 1,582 full-time jobs created. During summer months this amount increased significantly. So we can see just in this one small area on non-resident hunters the effects on the employment situation in B.C.

Mr. Speaker, the capitalized value of our residential hunting resource has been calculated at better than \$255 million. The capitalized value of our fresh water sports fishery has been estimated at \$395 million. The fish and wildlife resource has suffered in the past from a lack of recognition from government of its worth and importance to the economy and people of B.C. In the past there has been an absence of information and study concerning the value of wildlife resources. It was difficult for those who must allocate public funds to determine what level of expenditures was adequate for wildlife management and development.

It is quite apparent that there are serious problems in the management of wildlife resources in B.C. today. Those responsible for protection and management of wildlife find it difficult to substantiate what they feel are justifiable budget requirements. Until recently the abundance of game relative to the number of hunters in B.C. made it possible to satisfy the demands of hunters with modest annual budgets. But these fortunate circumstances can no longer be relied on and game managers are under increasing strain as they attempt to meet the demands of hunters and fishermen with the budgets which are proving inadequate.

AN HON. MEMBER: The wolves are getting them all.

MR. RADFORD: The past provincial budget for fish and wildlife management last year was under \$3 million — which was most inadequate; so inadequate, in fact, that before the last election they added \$4,000 to that department. There was a persistent feeling that the legitimate needs of wildlife resources are overshadowed by the demands for public funds, particularly those demands which can more readily and easily demonstrate a monetary means of visible benefit.

Probably one of the greatest reasons fish and wildlife resources and other outdoor recreations have received only a token consideration in over-all resource management planning is particularly where they have come in conflict with the other resource uses such as mining, forestry practices, water resources and others.

The Fish and Wildlife Branch in the past has not received adequate tools to do their job. They have been understaffed, overworked and frustrated. The conservation officers and others of that branch have been more than dedicated to put up with what they had to in the past.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite enlightening to notice that in 1966, there were 75 conservation officers employed by that branch. Last year the amount dropped down to 68 conservation officers. Lo and behold, we find that the amount of resident licenses sold in 1966 were 134,000 and last year they went up to somewhere in the

neighbourhood of 155,000. So, with the increase of hunters we had a decrease of conservation officers. The number of licensed hunters has more than doubled since 1950, rising from 68,000 at that time to 154,000 today.

We have an area, they call it region seven, eight and nine. If you drew a straight line across from Quesnel, Valemount right out to the coast, this would make up region seven, eight and nine. In that area there are 260,000 square miles; and 13 conservation officers are supposed to handle that area. This is joke, Mr. Speaker. It's a joke.

In the past the abundance of our wildlife was taken for granted. The abundance that we once had is not now visible. Management over wildlife has been

[[Page 543](#)]

confined largely to attempts to manipulate the size of harvest by manipulating bag limits and the closure of certain areas.

Hunters and fishermen are concerned about the quality of hunting in B.C. In a survey taken, 78,000 hunters and fishermen in B.C. felt that hunting and fishing quality was declining rapidly in B.C. Some of the reasons given, Mr. Speaker, were that there was a great increase of hunters, which I just mentioned, and fishermen. An increase of hunters and a decrease of game can only lead to one thing, and that is the lack of quality.

Poor land use was another area which was given for declining hunting. We have the situation in the lower mainland of the urban sprawl. Not too long ago we could hunt for pheasant and ducks and other species in the lower mainland without any trouble. But because of urban sprawl we now find ourselves, and myself included, going to provinces like Alberta to hunt for pheasants and other upland game birds. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the majority of sportsmen of B.C. are extremely happy with the *Agricultural Land Use Act*, especially those sportsmen who have hunted and are presently hunting in the lower mainland.

The future looks bright because of the land use programme, Mr. Speaker. A programme is now underway by which the farmers in the lower mainland and the Fraser Valley will use their land for pheasants and other game purposes. A programme is underway where clubs can be formed and hunters can be allowed on the property under the guidance of the farmer. The farmer is only too happy to have this happen. In many instances the farmer will derive some extra benefits and money from this programme.

It's also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the sportsmen of the lower mainland would like to see a pheasant hatchery come into being in the lower mainland. I think this is possible now that we know that most of the land will be saved for agricultural purposes. When we're talking about hatcheries, Mr. Speaker, I think it's sad that we should talk about artificial means of producing our game and wildlife.

Hatcheries are a last resort. I think they're an admission of defeat, really. It's a shame that we have to go to these ends to bring back some of the species that are disappearing.

Also, Mr. Speaker, opening of access is another problem. We have more roads in B.C. We have more availability to go into a lot of these areas and get into herds that we've never been able to reach before. Poor management, as I've mentioned before, is another lack of concern. This really revolves around the area of lack of funds and concern by governments in this area.

Habitat is the key to the survival of wildlife. Far more animals and birds have been destroyed through the loss of living space than hunters will ever take. Moose, deer, elk and other animals are particularly reliant upon wintering areas that are critical to their survival. These areas are usually not too extensive but in many instances have been denied use by wildlife because of man's intrusion with industry, settlement, grazing and other incompatible uses. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that legislation is required to ensure that any developer, whether it be a Crown corporation or a private agency, who intends to change or transform the environment to any significant degree must fund studies to prove or disprove the net benefit to the environment of a proposed development.

If we wish to retain wildlife and other natural values throughout our province, we must integrate the management with the development of our other resources. The rights of wildlife with equal status to other resources should be recognized. Wildlife management requires a great output of public funds. In contrast to other

common property resources, wildlife receives virtually no contributions towards its management from the private economic sector. The contributions of licence fees, tag fees, et cetera, are not sufficient in themselves to maintain the resource, even though hunters and fishermen would pay more if guaranteed that their money would be returned to wildlife management.

A study was done on this, Mr. Speaker. Most hunters — I think it was in the area of 78 per cent — indicated they would be in favour of paying more for a general hunting licence if the money were spent on game management. At the present time, a general hunting licence is \$4. In this survey that was taken, they asked many hunters what they would be willing to pay to hunt certain species. When all those amounts were added up, Mr. Speaker, it came to \$14.5 million. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that the hunters and fishermen of B.C. are willing to pay more for their resource.

Non-hunters or other citizens who desire to retain wildlife as a part of the B.C. landscape must and should be prepared to contribute to its upkeep out of general taxation, just as we all contribute to the upkeep and management of highways, hospitals, parks, schools and other things of general social benefit. It should be quite obvious to everyone that the number of game animals and other wildlife can only drop rapidly and the quality of the hunting and fishing deteriorates for everyone in B.C.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real need for a new outlook and approach to the fish and wildlife in B.C. West Germany, one-third the size of B.C., harvests 600,000 head of big game annually, which makes our harvest look very pitiful. Many European countries without the natural habitat and geographical size of B.C. have and enjoy a better harvest than that of B.C. Many biologists and animal husbandry people that come to B.C. and fly over some of our game areas are

[[Page 544](#)]

astounded and sad to view the lack of game that we have in B.C., although we have a geographical area and a habitat that would and could support much more game.

We are not utilizing the resource of our fishing and hunting to their optimum, Mr. Speaker. It is for these reasons that I would appeal to our Government to establish a game management area set up and managed for the optimum production as practised successfully in West German, Austria and other European countries. This programme would be operated by the wildlife branch. It would be a first in North America. This programme would not be an experiment. The system has been used successfully in Europe for many years. This effort would be on a trial basis, Mr. Speaker.

The world is changing. We either change with it and adapt or we do not survive. Surely a system that has proven so successful for so many years is worth one small area in our province. I might note, Mr. Speaker, that meetings have been held on this subject. Only last spring, 17 noted wildlife and conservation people met in Vancouver, some of these people being: Mr. Howard Paish; Dr. Barry Leach, director of the Institute of Environmental Studies at Douglas College; people like Lee Straight; some of our own wildlife people in the government; and the B.C. Wildlife Federation. They were in complete agreement, Mr. Speaker, with this idea.

I believe our past government was in the process of discussing this. They also had suggestions from the federal government that they would be willing to put money into this area. This is not like the Darkwood Forest situation in the Kootenays, where over 200 square miles were fenced off by alien people who came in and used it for their own use. This project would be under the control of the B.C. wildlife branch.

What kind of an area are we talking about, Mr. Speaker? I think we could talk about an area designated by the wildlife branch. It would be closed to hunting for a period of approximately 8 or 10 years. The closure would facilitate a build-up of game animals, primarily elk, mule and whitetail deer. Artificial winter feeding of the animals is the key to the whole plan. Feeding would be essentially on a continuing basis to create and sustain an abundance of game animals beyond the realm of winter kills. Multiple utilization of other resources would be practised. When the closure was lifted, hunting would be carried out strictly on a permit basis or on a lottery system. Everyone would be available to hunt in that area on a lottery system. Permits would provide control over the number of animals taken and the number of hunters participating. Permits would be available to residents only in this trial area that I'm talking about.

The probable cost, Mr. Speaker, for a permit would be in the area of \$100 or \$200 but hunters would be virtually guaranteed an animal. As I just mentioned previously, the average cost to hunters in B.C. is \$290 a year, so actually they would be getting a better deal out of this situation than they would on the way we run the fish and game situation in B.C. today.

The area would also be open to the public to view wildlife when hunting was not underway. The area and the plan would be administered by Fish and Wildlife Branch, as I said before, where university students could work and study biology and animal husbandry.

This has been discussed, Mr. Speaker, by concerned people for a number of years. The cost has been looked into and investigated and they talk in the area of one to two million dollars over a ten year period. After eight or ten years, this scheme could be carried on and sustain itself without government financial assistance.

A trial area on the European plan, Mr. Speaker, could demonstrate to all the immense possibilities for game proliferation and conservation in B.C. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Williams), the sportsmen of B.C. have been shortchanged by the past governments by their lackadaisical and haphazard approach to fish and game management in this province. I sincerely hope our government will make sure that the past approach will change. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Omineca.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a chance to congratulate you on your position of high esteem and as you were absent from the chamber the first time I spoke, may I congratulate you at this time. To other Hon. Members that were missing at that time, I also congratulate you on your elections.

I rise to support the budget. I do so because although somebody did call it a "Social Credit budget" — and I was hurt — it's as the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) said this afternoon, "It's how you spend the money."

This is the thing that I am really concerned about and I really believe that we are now in an era of spending the money sensibly.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Pay raise for MLA's?

MR. KELLY: I would like to mention this pay raise for MLA's at this time. I have resigned my job and I am now a full-time MLA. I don't know whether these ridings in the southern part of British Columbia are so small that you can run a business all day long and maybe do your job after lunch or after supper or

[[Page 545](#)]

something to that effect, but my job entails a 365-day-a-year job.

I made a little drag the other day for two thousand bucks. That's the pay from the bank or from the money I've already spent looking after my constituents.

Some of my constituents are 400 miles apart, you know that. Many of them are at least 150 miles apart. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that I will be running out of funds before my year is over. If any of these fellows have any money left over, I'll be glad to accept donations. (Laughter).

The Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) I believe mentioned this second-to-none standard of living that we have. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the people in Omineca would believe that our standard of living was so good.

When you see people packing water to their homes — and I mean hundreds of people — hundreds without electricity, hundreds driving old model cars, Mr. Speaker, it's a little bit of a hollow statement as far as I'm concerned. The fact is most of the people in the north do suffer from a substandard state of living as far as I can see.

We do have a problem in the north, Mr. Speaker, and with this in mind I would like to have our government listen as far as the social welfare department is concerned.

In my maiden speech, I referred to the fact that there was an abundance of jobs in the forest related industries in Omineca. For some reason or another, we can't seem to fill those jobs. I know that of course that lack of housing and other accommodations is one of the reasons. But it seems to me that we have a group of people in this province that are only too anxious to live on welfare rather than to come to the north and accept some of these jobs that are available.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest at this time that we really urge the Department of Labour along with Canada Manpower and any other agency that is available to force a lot of these young people — especially the young people — that are taking advantage of the welfare system into these particular jobs.

I don't say that every man has to come up there to work in the forest industry, but I do believe that out of this 90,000 supposed unemployed in this province we should be able to get a couple of thousand people up there to help fill the jobs that are available, I've started on a programme with the Department of Labour on this but it's going to take time to accommodate the people that we are talking about. I'm suggesting that it might take a year to at least get all the people that we desire if we get busy with it now.

Concerning the tax on petroleum that's been mentioned, I like the way a few of the Members from the opposite ranks add the tax on. If you were to raise the tax on a gallon — a barrel in this particular case — two cents and then you raised it two cents more, that would be a 100 per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, I think that people are being misled by this particular way of presenting this alleged increase in taxes.

I'd like to speak to the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan). I see he isn't in the House, but he'll read it in *Hansard*. It has been said that in Omineca there is the highest number of miles of gravel in all of British Columbia — in any constituency.

They talk about gravel roads and then they talk about dirt roads which are also maintained by the Department of Highways. We have at least 1,000 miles of gravel road. We have at least 500 miles of dirt roads. We have at least 319 miles of roads that come under the mining Act but are maintained by the Department of Highways. These gravel roads that I refer to are roads that were graveled many years ago, and in most cases, the gravel has just disappeared into the clay. Other Members from the north will recognize that this is a problem of that part of the country.

I'm urging the Minister of Highways in his budget to set aside sufficient money to have a real gravelling programme for our roads in that particular part of the country — in fact all the north as far as I'm concerned.

Gravel is very important to us. A graderman can't grade a road that has no gravel on it, that's all there is to it. Grading the boulders and clay is not a job at all, especially two or three days after a heavy rain storm. All you have is a soup on the road. The first few vehicles splash down what loose soil there is and splash it off the road, I would urge the Minister of Highways to make sure that we get sufficient money for this particular programme.

And, of course, to spread this gravel you need graders. We're noted for having all the left-over junk that was ever purchased in this province, as far as the Highways Department is concerned. Graders 20 years old — they repair them and they get down the road and they don't even get out of sight and something that they welded on falls off, or some other part of it breaks. They wait for weeks to have it repaired. If that's the only grader assigned to that particular district, you have to wait until that grader is repaired before you get any grading done.

If you live in an area where there's a high number of dirt road miles, then you do suffer. Our cars up in that country — most of them either have no shocks in them or there's one spring broken or they're all battered and dented in. That's the kind of country we live in.

There's no such thing as a ditching machine in the whole constituency. Yet the highway engineers will

tell you you can't build dirt roads unless you have a good ditch down each side of this road. They have to hire the machinery from private contractors. Normally there's only one in your whole community and he has many miles

more road available than he can work when he is working at the job.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also urge the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) to give special consideration this year to a single-lane bridge just west of Fraser Lake. This bridge is donkey's years old, it's one-way, and it's a bridge that shifts a lot. One day you go across it and the planks are fairly level. The very next day the planks are rough as can be. Because it's only one-way and on a downhill grade, when the road is icy vehicles that are attempting to stop aren't able to stop.

I would suggest to you, in the seven years that I have lived there, that several hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage have been created, plus one near loss of life.

Within a quarter of a mile of this bridge there is also an overpass that was built seven years ago. The road that goes between the overpass is quite crooked and in the past seven years two people have been killed in this particular area — and also more thousands of dollars of damage.

If this job had been completed when it was started that many years ago, of course none of these accidents would have taken place and the insurance companies that were called upon to pay the different claims that came up would have been many thousands of dollars richer. I'm awed in this respect, that if these underwriters had pressured the then government, I can't understand why that bridge wasn't completed.

It's very hazardous. It's on a main highway. Being a one-lane bridge it's just intolerable. We can't afford to have that too much longer.

Also referring to the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker, and to his estimates, I'm a little perturbed about the expropriations that go on under the Highways department and the amount of money that they pay to the people who are affected. I've had quite a few complaints of late where the Highways department which has this agency that settles all their expropriation claims are very tight-fisted.

They go through sort of a programme where they price the local land through the real estate firms to find the prices of what they're paying for similar land. On an overall basis I find that they'll take from a fair-to-poor average and then offer that in return for the land that's been expropriated. Whereas, in many cases, this land is actually good land. They offer paltry prices and I'm quite sure that the Government should be prepared to pay more. Land is valuable anywhere — and especially after the remarks that have been made from the Opposition side.

I'm also anxious, Mr. Speaker, to have the Department of Highways consider in conjunction with the Attorney General's department that we do have portions of our highways in British Columbia that are in excellent condition — straight, very safe roads. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that these roads could have the speed limits increased. Cars are built nowadays where you rarely see a person with a blowout. The stability of the cars is much better. The braking of the cars is much better. I'm of the opinion that it wouldn't be too expensive to post speed limits where, if the road is fit for 75 miles an hour, it should be posted as such.

For tourists, I don't think this is so important. But when you look at the professional drivers who are driving throughout our province, making their living on these roads and when you are travelling long distances, an extra 10 or 15 miles an hour would make a lot of difference. I am anxious to see the speed limits increased in certain areas only.

I went to Ucluelet over the weekend on a very twisty, turny road where all corners were posted. If it said 25 miles an hour, I believe that 25 is all you should drive. But when you see a piece of road that might be six miles long, that is very wide, with good verges on it, and has no crossroads and what have you, I think that portion of road could be posted at a higher speed, especially in some parts of the province where you can go 50 to 100 miles on comparatively good roads. If that were the case and there was one bad corner in it, well then that corner could be posted at a slower rate of speed.

Also, concerning these straight stretches of road I was referring to, I notice that the police, for example, if they're out with their radar trap, they don't use a bad corner or a built-up area or a dangerous piece of highway. They use the straightest and safest piece of highway and probably the fellow is going his 10 miles an hour over — which is common practice in the province anyway. So naturally, he gets knocked off on that good, straight

stretch of road where he's actually as safe as in a church.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Not too much straight on Highway 16.

MR. KELLY: You never followed me, Mr. Attorney General. But the fact is yes, I've been caught lots of times. But that isn't the thing that I was referring to, Mr. Speaker. I think that when you wind the clock back 25 years, tires were really junk and automobiles weren't too safe. But the actual automobile — although a lot of them are still junk, I'm referring to the actual four wheels on the road and the drivability of that automobile — is pretty safe nowadays, especially with the braking systems they have and what have you. So I would urge that as far as the police are concerned if they

[[Page 547](#)]

want to get out and nail people I think they should do it where it's dangerous driving and where they have hairpin bends and what have you, and where people have been known to get killed or where serious accidents have occurred.

I'd like to go over to the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) now, and I only have a couple of things to mention about him, because in his department I'd hoped that there would be expenditures, and for the main reason in his department that I asked in my maiden speech that there would be complete investigation in the forestry department. I really believe that a lot of input could be put in there by the employees and by other departments in the Government and by the general public, people that have been affected by the forestry department.

Ask somebody that has had problems with the forestry department. There have been thousands of them in British Columbia. I really believe that they haven't been brought up to date.

For example, we have a large, multi-national corporation that is anxious to become established in Omineca. In setting up their proposition, as to the reason that they would like to establish there, they have told me that they are able to get \$19 a cunit for chips at Prince Rupert — now this is for export and we don't want to export any chips because we can use all that we've got. But I know that the pulp mills in British Columbia pay nowhere near that and I have always been under the belief that chips are worth a lot more money than what the pulp mills are paying for them. They get them too cheap. In fact, a lot of wood is wasted that could be utilized for chips and they don't use it. I think it's just sheer neglect as far as the forestry branch is concerned.

Neglect? It's more than that. If they really want to get down to telling the truth about all the facets of running their operation, I'm sure that a lot of money could be brought into the public coffers through ending manipulating by the sawmills and these pulp mills. So I believe an investigation should be held in the forestry branch.

Local loggers are getting gypped as far as I am concerned. One cubic foot of wood is the basis they set up to pay loggers for hauling wood — or 100 cunits, as the term goes. There are 5,300 pounds to a cunit or, in other words, one cubic foot of waste wood weighs 53 pounds. That's in the middle of summer.

I witnessed a block of wood picked at random off a pile in the middle of winter — as close to a cubic foot as we could get — and weighed it. It weighed 35 lbs, The sawmill pays stumpage at this rate and so the logger gets paid at this rate. In other words, the logger has to produce another 15 or 18 per cent more wood to get the same money as he would in the summertime because in the wintertime he gets better production working on the ground under frozen conditions, which is easier to work on. I think the logger gets gypped and the government is being short-changed through this procedure.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. KELLY: Absolutely, everything is weighed.

There are many things that I am sure the forestry department could make changes in and I think it would be of benefit to everybody: the big sawmilling firms and the little ones too; those that are in existence plus the pulp mills. I think they would have to pay their fair share.

Also under the forestry department, a man, after he has finished logging off his ground, is required to leave that ground in a certain condition.

I happened to do a little logging myself. If there are any creeks running through this particular ground, even if there aren't too many big fish in there, they run tractors up and down these creeks to clean the logs out because the forestry says so — clean the creeks out at the cost of running tractors up and down and killing practically everything that is in the creek.

I also would urge the forestry branch not to allow any more logs or log booms in lakes or streams. I think the cost is too high.

Did you ever go to where there is a large booming ground in a lake? There is more sludge and much bark and debris on the shores and especially on the bottom of the lake. In the north where we have a lot of lodgepole pine, all the bark sinks right to the bottom and it just lays there in a mass — a huge mass.

In fact tests have been made by the B.C. Research Council where this bark has actually gone into the gravel three feet by the tumbling action of the gravel. It in turn sets up a toxic action and gives off gases and robs the minute life from the spawning fish who require it when they are first hatching in the rivers.

I am urging that the forestry would do something about that through the Department of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

I am urging also, as one of the other Hon. Members mentioned, that if they do have a Department of Fisheries that we renegotiate a new agreement with the International Salmon Commission because it is a known fact that if we were to put our rivers and streams to work we could double the production of salmon in British Columbia, worth many tens of millions of dollars.

I come from salmon country myself and we see the salmon spawning right outside our doors. We know that this could be multiplied many times over on the stream that I live on and other streams nearby could be fixed. I would suggest man-made spawning beds have turned out to be very productive, and we could increase the fish in many of the spawning

[[Page 548](#)]

streams throughout the province. But there would be no use going to increase all of this if we don't have the benefit from it; if we have to give half of all that we create under this plan, to give half of it to the Americans, because they don't want to take part in this new creation of these new spawning beds and what have you.

So I think that we should renegotiate this agreement if the chance comes available. I don't know if any of the Hon. Members know the Stellako River but I would urge, because of the beauty of that river and other facets of it, that it is practically a wild land as it originally was. There is nothing in it to disfigure it, and it is coming back and could even be made much more beautiful by building up the spawning beds. I think it should be created a park reserve.

There is some private land on it but there has been no building. It's all rough, very rough land, that comes down to the shoreline, but there is a possibility within a short time now because of the influx of people from across the line and even our own people to come and build on any water that is available — I am frightened that people will build on this river and it would be a shame, because to take a boat trip down that river, is just like going down one of these real famous wild rivers. I think it should be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, as far as health is concerned, and I speak to the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), in Omineca, especially in my own home town where we have about 1200 people, we have been out of a doctor now for over six months. Yes, we can drive — there are doctors 40 miles away but did you ever try driving 40 miles on sheer ice, especially if it is an emergency? I talked to the last doctor that was there and he said, "Well, I am moving away because I can't make a living here." I didn't know that his living meant that he had to have \$50,000 a year to stay there.

Now I am not suggesting for one second that he wasn't worth that much because out of the \$50,000 he had to pay his expenses — something like an MLA. But at the same time I really believe that the people of this

province everywhere are entitled to medical care.

We have another town by the name of Granisle which not many of you have heard of, but there's almost 2,000 people there now. They finally hired a nurse about two weeks ago to look after those 2,000 people. Oh yes, 40 miles down the road there is a doctor but for everyday living where there are families with little children living in more or less a frontier environment of this province we do need doctors, and I think it is about time doctors decided that they should take the challenge up.

Young doctors should go on up there. Even if they only stay a couple of years, we would be so happy.

Also I would like to speak in support — I don't care who the person was that was the first one to ask for this — of the air ambulance because we do need an air ambulance in our area. We had a man seriously injured not so long ago. We started off to drive him to Burns Lake to the hospital. Head injury — the man's eye was out and the side of his face crushed in. They drove him to Burns Lake and they couldn't handle him there, so they sedated him, and they put him in an ambulance. That's 45 miles away from the mine. They said, "Well take him to Prince George."

They started down the road about 10 miles, and the motor burned out in the ambulance. So they finally stopped a passing car — no phones handy up in that part of the country — and asked for another ambulance to come and take the man away. I originally said they said take him to Prince George — I should have said "take him to Vanderhoof" which is about 45 miles the other way from where the accident actually happened. Because they have about five doctors there and I think one of them was much more experienced.

Anyway about 2½ hours later they got him down to this other hospital. Of course they looked at him and said, "Well, there's no use leaving him here." So they continued on into Prince George and immediately put him in a plane and flew him into Vancouver. But it took about eight or nine hours before that man was admitted to a large hospital in Vancouver to look after those very serious head injuries. This goes on all the time up there.

My wife was seriously injured in 1967. We were only 10 miles from Vanderhoof. It was ice and snow when it happened; it was freezing; it was zero — and my wife with a serious back injury. As I say, it takes more time than you can believe. It took almost two hours before my wife was entered into a hospital. People stopped and put their coats and car rugs over her to keep her from freezing. You just cannot believe how needed an air ambulance is.

There's one other thing I'd like to urge the Attorney General's department to consider — I'm sorry I'm wandering back and forth. In our part of the country there are several large firms that do the sawmilling or are the pulp mills. They in turn have contractors. Those contractors have subcontractors to do their logging for them.

Small loggers usually go out and buy a Cat, a couple of skidders, one loader and maybe another piece of machinery. Some of the machines are \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000 — some are even over \$100,000. Yet a lot of this equipment was so designed that two or three days of extreme weather — I'm talking about 30 or 40 below zero — or if it's working in swamp country, the equipment breaks down. Apparently no thought was put in the design. No thought was put into the manufacturing of that machine, and it was actually going out to be tested on

[[Page 549](#)]

a proving ground, In many cases, when the contractor would then go back to the company that sold that piece of equipment to get them to repair it — although it even might be guaranteed — so much time expired between the time that machine broke down and the time the company came to repair it or they finally got a part, that the man would have to go two or three pay periods. Each month he had to make a payment on this machine. In lots of cases these people went broke.

Some of the stuff that's brought up into that country is junk and is worth tens of thousands of dollars. It's made by reputable firms. But just because it's the name of a big firm doesn't mean to say that their guarantee is any better than anybody else's. In many cases you're stuck. I'm one of those guys who got stuck. My machine needs all kinds of modification. It should be the company's responsibility. It wouldn't work in the first place. Many other loggers are in the same position. In fact, I know of a couple that did go broke because of inadequate equipment.

I am of the belief that our Attorney General's department should see that there is a proving ground set up in this province for logging equipment so that, in conjunction with those logging firms, the Government could make sure that this equipment works; that these logging contractors wouldn't go broke or be forced to lose a lot of money through breakdown periods and what have you. I'm anxious to see that something like that would be set up to protect the small loggers.

In the farming department, I would support the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) in his bid for a slaughterhouse or some form of slaughtering that could go on in this province. In my nearest town which is Vanderhoof, they do considerable farming. A friend of mine there is an auctioneer. Last year he handled over 7,000 head of cattle and every one of those animals had to be shipped out of this province for processing. Mind you, they weren't ready for the slaughterhouse. They had to be put into yards for feeding and fattening up. Considerable time would be spent in fattening them up. But I think that in this province, especially in the northern regions, we should be able to have a slaughterhouse. It just seems ridiculous to me that we're shipping all our cattle into Alberta or further east to the markets that are available.

I don't know whether 7,000 head sounds like very much, but it's increasing every year. To me, that sounds like a tremendous amount of cattle to ship out of this province to let someone else work on them. We're talking about creating jobs. Certainly beef is high enough, You can't tell me that it wouldn't be cheaper to do it in this country, although sometimes some people do caution me that it's cheaper to send them to the Prairies. I can't understand that. The farmer has to take a licking in the first place to sell his head of stock, whatever it might be or how many they might be, to have them taken away to be fattened up somewhere else. I think that if the feed was brought in and we had feeding pens in this country in big stockyards, we could certainly do a lot better by keeping cattle in British Columbia.

MR. PHILLIPS: Support our bill on the order paper.

MR. KELLY: There's one other thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is the B.C. Hydro. I'm anxious to see power go in to people who are having trouble being able to afford it under the present system. Apparently, if there are sufficient people per mile, they are able to get money to support their application — that is \$1,000 per unit if there's one unit per mile. For example, if it costs more than \$1,000, there's also an additional \$1,000 but under a very special permit. Then the consumer has to pay whatever charge it is on top of that.

What I suggest is that if this power is going 10 miles down a road, but if there's a lot of rocky road on the way down and they're having a lot of trouble installing these poles, it might cost another \$1,000 on top of that. So, each one of these consumers would be forced to pay \$1,000. In fact, when I mentioned that amount, I didn't know how I came so close. A friend of mine had to pay \$942, or close to that, Christmas time to be hooked up to power. This is the case of many people in our area.

I have one particular application that's in right now. The road is about 15 miles long and there are 17 applicants. I feel that at least half of these 17 applicants couldn't afford \$100, never mind \$1,000. Yet they're to be denied power because of the regulations that exist, I know that there are many people living in very remote areas and that it isn't possible just to hook everybody up overnight or even in a year. But I do urge that the Government really look at good strong cases where there are sufficient people who really do need the power and that this power be installed as soon as possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Shuswap.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me to rise to speak in this first-ever NDP budget debate. Mr. Speaker, I for one haven't had the chance to congratulate you on your manner of conducting business in this House. I'd like to do so now and I'd also like to ask you to be a little lenient with the farm boys that make the odd mistake.

After listening to the Hon. Member for South

[[Page 550](#)]

Peace River (Mr. Phillips) carry on for almost two hours, I almost feel inadequate.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEWIS: I'd like to assure you that car salesmen always haven't had it over the farmer. I'd like to tell you a little story about a car salesman that had been trying to sell this farmer an old car for many years. One day he came down the road in this old Model A. The farmer was by the fence doing a little work. He stopped. The car salesman got out and said to the farmer, "Boy, that's a good old Model A. That car was coming down the road there at 90 miles an hour." The farmer looked at the salesman and he said, "Aw, that's not very fast. You see that bull over there?" He said, "Yes." He said, "Do you see that haystack?" He said "Yes." He said, "Well, that bull ran around that haystack so fast that he kicked mud in his own face," So I think we can still keep up with this car salesman. (Laughter). I would also like the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) to know that things are quite good on the flood plains today. The Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston) was just there today on a two-hour broadcast on a phone-in show. Not once did he get a phone call in regard to the so-called land freeze.

MR. SCHROEDER: Have they called in at all?

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Member was trying to cause a tidal wave on the flood plains and he only got a ripple. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a very good budget, with increases in expenditures directed to areas where they are badly needed.

I am sure that everyone in British Columbia appreciates the extra money allotted to education. I for one certainly hope that there will be an increasing emphasis placed on vocational facilities in the province.

Almost every day I receive letters from people that are unable to enrol in our vocational schools. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the vocational institutes will be in a position that they will be able to broaden the, programmes available to the public.

I've had a large number of letters from people trying to get into practical nursing training. There just isn't enough available space for the applicants. The extra funds for health services are certainly needed, and I have every confidence that the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) will be upgrading many of our inadequate services in this province.

I certainly welcome his plan of working towards decentralizing mental health services in this province. Many people in outlying areas suffer untold hardships when a member of their family is hospitalized and they must travel hundreds of miles to visit that patient. Not only the family suffers but the patient suffers due to lack of attention from the family. I think this is a time when it's badly needed.

I am also sure that everyone in British Columbia will welcome the news that home services for the chronically ill are to be expanded. This programme will partially pay its own way due to the freeing of expensive, much-needed beds for acute care in our overcrowded hospitals.

I am certainly pleased to see the \$33 million that's been allocated to the Highways department...

MR. G.H. ANDERSON (Kamloops): Do you want some too?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, I certainly do. I'm sure that the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is going to do a good job in distributing it throughout the province. I am confident that this will create many more jobs in outlying areas, Mr. Minister, I'd like to make a request that a large portion of this extra money be utilized in upgrading country roads throughout the province. Most of these backroads are a disgrace to our public road systems.

Mr. Minister, the number of accidents which occur on country roads is unbelievable. The cause of most of these accidents is twisty, narrow roads with many blind corners.

Mr. Minister, now that you have announced that B.C. will have a government-operated car insurance, it would certainly be an added benefit to the public to have these roads upgraded by providing better roads and decreasing the pay-out in insurance claims.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of car insurance I would like to make the request that all government vehicles and equipment be insured under the new government plan. The system that was

used in the past by the Socreds was an abuse of the government employees' rights. They should hang their heads in shame.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many people in B.C. are aware of the tactics they used. If an employee of the government became involved in an accident with a government vehicle, that person was often assessed a portion of the cost for the repairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. LEWIS: I say that the government was acting illegally by assessing an employee financially for an accident that probably was a mistake in judgment.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Send Waldo the bill.

MR. LEWIS: The employee was put in the position of not being able to contest the decision for fear of being fired.

[[Page 551](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Minister, if this policy is to continue and an employee is to be assessed for bad judgment while driving, then everyone from the Minister or Deputy Minister down must pay part of the cost on mistakes which they make.

I can assure you that some of the mistakes made by civil servants in top positions cost the taxpayer far more than a crumpled fender.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Send Waldo the bill. (Laughter).

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I'm also very happy to see the increase in money for the Fish and Wildlife Branch, and I'd like to congratulate the First Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Radford) in the fine job of research that he's done into this field.

The lack of staffing in this department in the past has been deplorable, with the enforcement of game laws literally impossible due to the lack of adequate game wardens.

Mr. Speaker, the decrease in numbers of game animals in this province has become evident to everyone that hunts. The people that have noticed the decline the most are the ones that live in areas where the game was abundant at one time.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the open season on female species throughout the past years is the largest factor in the decline of our game animals. Mr. Speaker, our game biologists will continually deny that this is the reason. But when you question hunters and ranchers that have been watching the decline in game numbers, you begin to wonder if the biologists have all the answers.

Often when a doe is shot with a young fawn still depending on its mother, the fawn will also die if a severe winter follows. Sometimes the hunter will shoot the doe and the fawn as well, and often both of these are from the female species. Mr. Speaker, I say that this type of hunting can't go on for year after year, regardless of what the biologist says. We're killing off the doe that we depend on for our next year's stock.

Mr. Minister, I would like to request that open season on female game animals be discontinued until it can be proven that it is necessary again. I would also like to request that the season be drastically curtailed until the stock of game animals warrants it, and that the hunter be allowed no more than one animal in one year.

I don't think it's been proven that the biologist, or the man sitting in Victoria has been totally capable of making the decisions that he's made in regard to the shooting of female animals.

I'd like to tell you another little story at this point in regards to hunters, just to show you that the country kid still knows what's going on up there. This story is about the young boy that had a group of hunters come from

a big city and hired him to take them out on a hunting trip. When they got to the cabin the hunter said, "Oh, well, boy, you're not of much use to us. You'd better stay behind and light the fire."

So the young kid stayed behind and the five hunters went around the corner. In about 10 minutes they came running back on the dead tear.

The young boy ran to the door and met them and said, "What's wrong?"

"Oh," they said, "we shot and wounded a bear and it's right behind us."

The kid said, "You can't leave it out there like that. I'll have to go finish it."

So he picked up a .22 and walked around the corner and, by golly, here comes the bear on the dead run. He up and takes a shot at the bear but it didn't slow down.

He turned and ran back to the cabin. The hunters saw him coming and opened the door. Just before the boy reached the door he tripped and fell and the bear went right on over him and into the cabin.

The boy leaped up and slammed the door and said, "You skin that one. I'll go back and get another."
(Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, there is one more subject I would like to deal with under Fish and Wildlife. In the community of Armstrong we have a fish and game club that has taken on a very large project in regard to raising of wild turkeys. This is a game bird that has been extinct for many years. In the past they've been requesting assistance from the game department in restocking this valuable bird but until this time there has been no success with the game department.

I would like to ask the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) to take a look at this and see that this club gets some assistance in establishing this bird.

Mr. Speaker, the extra money allotted to rehabilitation and social improvement is also welcome, in a field that has been sadly lacking in direction in the past. Almost every area of social services for rehabilitation in this province is inadequate. They've had little effect in the correction and rehabilitation of the juvenile offenders.

Mr. Minister, I hope that your department will be taking a step towards decentralizing many of these facilities and moving them throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, I also realize that the drug and alcohol problem and many other social problems that fall with it, are under the authority of several Ministers. It's certainly encouraging to see cooperation to bring much needed improvements to this field.

Mr. Speaker, I've stated that I felt this was a good budget and have pointed out the different areas

[[Page 552](#)]

where I feel increased expenditures will be of particular benefit to the people of B.C. Now, Mr. Speaker, I also feel that I must express my views on deficiencies in the budget in two different areas.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEWIS: Not as many as there is in Ottawa.

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): We're waiting here.

MR. LEWIS: I was in hopes of a fund being established that would have provided low interest loans to municipalities for the upgrading of sewage facilities throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this fund should be set up through co-operation between the federal and provincial governments and repayable over a long term.

Mr. Speaker, many cities, towns and municipalities are the worst offenders in contributing to pollution of

our waterways but they are unable to install adequate systems due to the high cost of money — and often are in the position where they can't obtain the money.

Mr. Speaker, many municipalities already have an extremely high mill rate and, if no help is forthcoming from the federal or provincial governments in the form of low interest loans or outright grants, then our waterways will continue slowly to become cesspools.

Mr. Speaker, my last subject deals with agriculture and I feel it came in last in terms of importance in the budget too. I have heard this budget referred to as a Social Credit budget — well as far as I'm concerned, the only part of this budget that resembles a Social Credit budget is in agriculture.

During the past 20 years agriculture received the same type of treatment. I have had assurances from the Members of the cabinet that they are going to be studying this and that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) will be in a position next year to really upgrade many of the things that are needed within agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if anyone else took the time to do a little arithmetic to see how well agriculture fared in terms of sharing in the budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did and agriculture industry is the one mainly responsible for seeing that your bellies are full. I did a little more arithmetic and found that when you work out the share it receives of the increase in this year's budget, you find it's even worse with agriculture only receiving two-tenths of 1 per cent of the increase.

Mr. Speaker, if something isn't done soon to bolster the farmer's position in society and something done to assure him that he will receive a fair return on his labour investment, we will have to be prepared for a further decline in competent farmers who are prepared to stay on the land. We will have an increase in the immigration of farm families to the cities and our welfare costs will continue to rise. The farmer cannot afford to absorb increased costs which are being heaped upon him daily. If one takes time to relate the increases in costs to the farmer to the increases that he has received for his product, it looks pretty grim.

I would just like to refer to a few statistics that I dug up in regard to the prices that the farmer was receiving. One in eggs, in which I have been very vitally interested. In the years of 1953 to 1957 the farmer received for grade A large eggs, in 1953 — 57 cents a dozen; 1954 — 48 cents a dozen; 1955 — 49 cents a dozen; 1956 — 53 cents a dozen; 1957 — 35 cents. Averaging those five years, you come up with a figure of 46.2 cents a dozen. During the years of 1971-1972 for the same grade of eggs the farmer received 40 cents a dozen; 1972 he received 43.7 cents. Now that's 20 years later and the farmer is receiving less for his product.

MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South): And the eggs cost more.

MR. LEWIS: I think the farmer is being capable of becoming efficient. He has cut down on the man hours and he has absorbed a lot of the slack in the past this way, but he can't continue. Something has to give sometime.

Also, I have some figures here on milk, smoked hams and bacon. 1954 and 1956 the cost of milk — that cost to the wholesaler from the farmer was \$5.48 for 100 pounds. 1972 we received \$8.15. It's a long way out in regard to the costs that he has had to bear during those years. Smoked hams — the farmer received in 1954 and 1965, 79 cents a pound. Today he receives \$1.15. Bacon sides — he received 81 cents and today he receives 89 cents.

During the past five months livestock producers have faced increases in prices of prepared feed rations which run close to 35 per cent. With prices increasing from \$73 a ton to \$100 a ton in the last five months. An increase of 35 per cent. Yet the consumer is led to believe that the farmer is the one that is getting the rake-off. I would suggest that it is time that we had a department that takes a look into the wholesale and retail ends to see if there is any exorbitant rates being charged by them.

Machinery prices have been rising by 20 per cent per year on most implements, with some repair costs increasing by 50 per cent in one year. The farmer is also facing increased costs in building supplies, taxes, power, medication for livestock, and fertilizer — costs for servicemen have become almost prohibitive. Yet the farmer is expected to produce food products without passing the costs on. Well, Mr. Speaker, it

doesn't work.

I have a few points here which I feel the Government should be working towards and I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture is taking a good look at them.

One; the lowering of land taxes on agricultural land.

Two; entering into the field of food processing in partnership with farmers. At this point I would also like to urge the provincial government to take a good look at entering into the wholesale business as well. I would also like them to take steps to see that the wholesalers and the retailers are not receiving an unrealistic mark-up on agricultural products.

Number three; immediate action to see that retailers don't use agricultural products as loss-leader items to entice customers into their stores. I don't know how many people realize that this happens — but they will often pick out an agricultural product that sells well and they will reduce the price on the product thus the wholesaler takes a cut off the farmer, and nobody suffers but the farmer.

Number four; I would like to see them embark on a programme of establishing export markets for agricultural products. Mr. Speaker, if government will face up to the challenge presented by agriculture and working towards assuring proper market practices, B.C. could benefit in many ways. Not just the farmer. Agriculture is one industry that is ever-lasting with proper care. It's not like coal, oil, minerals — once they are removed, the industry is dead. But with proper farming practices, agriculture will last as long as man.

Mr. Speaker, when the next budget is presented, I hope to see agriculture receiving the attention that it deserves. I know that farmers have been slow to change but I think governments have too, and with our new Minister of Agriculture I'm looking for some great changes in this field.

I would like to show you just how slow farmers are to change. There is the story about the farm daughter who was talking to her mother and she said, "Well, tonight John is coming out from Vancouver to see me and I sure wish you would have a talk with Dad. He no sooner gets talking that he starts talking about spreading fertilizer or something or spreading manure or something." The mother turned to the daughter and she says, "You just leave your Dad alone. I've been 20 years getting him to say 'manure'." (Laughter.)

The Minister of Agriculture spoke on marketing boards and said that he was totally in favour of them and thought that they were a form of a farm union. This is one area where the Minister of Agriculture and myself differ. I think marketing boards are essential, but in the past I think that they have been working to the detriment of the interior. I'm certainly looking forward to the Minister taking a real good look at this.

Last year I went to a seminar in Vancouver to do with the disposal of animal waste. At the end of the meeting the chairman said, "Well, I've got a good idea of how to get rid of the animal waste. Those empty coal cars that are returning to the Kootenays — let's fill them up with the manure and send it back to the Kootenays." I stood up and I said to the chairman. "That's the end of the stick that we have been receiving for 20 years and we're not going to take it any longer."

I hope that the Government will take a real good look at the property tax and do everything they can to take it off the farmland. There is no way that 1,000 acres of land that's being used for a beef ranch should pay a hospital tax or a school tax. There is no way that that land is receiving a service for it.

The Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) spoke on the booming of logs in inland lakes. I for one endorse his thoughts that they should be done away with. Shuswap Lake is one of the most beautiful lakes in the province and they still continue to boom logs on the lake even though there are roads that the logging companies could use to transport the logs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your forbearance and look forward to the debates later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): Mr. Speaker, in adjourning the debate I'd like to, as Health Minister, announce to the House that there's a new potential member

of the Press gallery in the person of Jason Bernard Davey. Jason was born to Jeff Davey, a member from B.C. Radio News up there in the gallery. Jason was 7 pounds, 1 ounce. We want to all congratulate him. Well, they are producing something, aren't they?

Hon. Mr. Cocke moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Hartley files answers to questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Attorney General.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) resolution No. 17 standing in my name on the order paper. (See appendix)

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Levi files answers to questions.

[[Page 554](#)]

Hon. Mr. Lorimer files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

APPENDIX

The following motion is referred to on page 553 of the daily Hansard:

That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Social Welfare and Education to inquire into the question of the advertising of alcohol and tobacco products in the Province and legislation and regulations with respect thereto, and the effects of such advertising on the consumption of alcohol and tobacco products:

The Committee shall have the power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to hear representations from such organizations and individuals as may, in their discretion, appear necessary, and shall report its findings and recommendations to the House from time to time.

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