

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

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1973

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 685](#)]

CONTENTS

Privilege Mr. Williams. Release of information on bills to the Press — 685

Ruling by Mr. Speaker — [686](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [686](#)

Routine proceedings

The Abandoned Refrigerator Act (Bill No. 95). Mr. Wallace.

Introduction and first reading — [687](#)

An Act to Amend the Trust Companies Act (Bill No. 96). Mr. Gardom.

Introduction and first reading — [687](#)

An Act to Provide Access to Public Buildings (Bill No. 97). Mr. Gardom.

Introduction and first reading — [687](#)

An Act to Amend the Capital Improvement District Act (Bill No. 98) Mr. Curtis.

Introduction and first reading — [687](#)

Budget debate (continued)

Mr. Schroeder — [687](#)

Mr. Fraser — [688](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [690](#)

Mr. Lea — [691](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [692](#)

Hon. Mr. King — [695](#)

Mr. Chabot — [696](#)

Mr. Lewis — [698](#)

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [700](#)

Mr. Morrison — [701](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [701](#)

Mr. Brousson — [705](#)

Mr. Williams — [709](#)

Mr. Chabot — [712](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [713](#)
Mr. Wallace — [716](#)
Mr. McGeer — [718](#)
Mr. Gabelmann — [719](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [723](#)
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [735](#)

Point of order Mr. Smith. Quotations from "blue transcript" of Hansard — 737

Mr. Speaker's ruling — [738](#)

House in Committee of supply — [742](#)

Statement Mr. Curtis. Incident in a junior secondary school — [742](#)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1973

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, I'd like the House to give a very hearty welcome to a most distinguished group of students from the University of British Columbia. They're part of the UBC Liberal Club.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain.

MS. P.F. YOUNG (Vancouver–Little Mountain): Mr. Speaker we have visiting with us today in the gallery the law class from John Oliver Secondary School in the riding of Vancouver–Little Mountain. I was very fortunate in meeting most of these young people last fall and found them very intelligent, very perceptive and very interested in the legislative process of this province. They are accompanied by their teachers Ms. Erickson and Mrs. Graham. I would ask the House to welcome them please,

MR. SPEAKER: If I may, I'd like to welcome as well, some of the finest and most intelligent students in the lower mainland from Burnaby South high school who are here with their teacher to see you on your best behaviour.

The Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, in respect of the matter of privilege upon which I rose in this House yesterday I wish to place before you the following state and facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS: At approximately 1:55 in the afternoon on February 22, 1973, I was informed by Marjorie Nichols, whom I know to be a member of the Press gallery, that some members of the Press gallery had received advance information pertaining to a bill or bills which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) was expected to present to this House later that afternoon.

In particular, Miss Nichols advised me that Mr. Malcolm Turnbull was then preparing a story concerning the anticipated legislation and that a representative of CBC and CTV, in neither case identified by name, had pre-taped a news release pertaining to the same proposed legislation.

In the light of this information I rose at the committee stage pertaining to the introduction of Bill Nos. 36 and 42, as they now are, and inquired of the Minister of Agriculture whether he intended to make any statement to the House pertaining to the purpose of the proposed legislation. I informed the committee that it had been suggested that a pre-release of information had already taken place.

At that time, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), having been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee, advised that there was some release, namely, when he had spoken in the debate on the budget motion.

Subsequently, in an interjection not recorded in *Hansard*, the Minister indicated that since he spoke in the debate on the budget motion and up to and including February 22, 1973 he had been asked questions concerning the bills which were then before the Committee.

In the light of the facts contained in the foregoing statement I claim a breach of privilege and I respectfully request your consideration of this matter and your advice concerning the acceptability of a motion were the matter to be placed before a committee on privileges.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. There is no debate on a question of this kind. It is for the Speaker to examine into the complaint and to determine, first, if it is timely — that is taken up when first it occurs, and it was in this case — and secondly, whether it constitutes what might be a prima facie case of breach of privilege which should then, if that were found by the Speaker to be so, lead to a motion to deal with the matter to determine the facts that exist in the particular case alleged or complained of.

I am indebted to the Hon. Member for having given me an advance statement of the complaint, for which I thank him, and I've examined it in the light of the authorities.

There are two cases only that I can find that deal with this, One is a case that is referred to in May's *Parliamentary Practice* in the sixteenth edition, at page 382. The other is a case that occurred in the House of Commons in Ottawa to which I will advert later.

In the case in May on page 382 it states: "Proceedings have been interrupted to allow the raising of a communication to a newspaper of a memorandum explanatory of a bill which was to be introduced the next day, after the memorandum had been presented but before it was available for Members." And then it refers to the citation: The House of Commons Debates of Westminster in the year 1909, volume 9, and found at page 2423.

I've taken the opportunity to examine the particular incident in that case, and it was somewhat

[[Page 686](#)]

different to this — a stronger case. It is where a bill was to be presented, and a memorandum was authorized by the House to give a statement to all the Members. The statement that was to be given to all the Members in fact was not distributed to the Members but was distributed to the Press.

So there you have a case where a bill and an explanation of a bill was authorized and was in the possession of the House, in effect, and authorized by the House that a memorandum be prepared.

The other case is one in the House of Commons at Ottawa, June 3, 1969; Mr. Speaker Lamoureux. The complaint was that a Member rose on a point of privilege to state that the Hon. Member claimed that the decision of the Minister of Finance to deny party representatives access to advance budgetary briefings is a breach of parliamentary privilege and he complained that the Press was given this information but that Members were not. In this case, of course, the parliamentary leader's in the finance portfolio.

The Hon. Speaker of the House of Commons, in dealing with this and the question of advance information to the Press, stated:

"The first aspect of this problem has been raised on a number of occasions, particularly in January, 1961, when Mr. Speaker Michener was called upon to make a ruling on a similar question. The Speaker then said, 'I do not find a prima facie right on the part of the House to insist that the Government, when it tables the full information, shall not give a summary of it to the Press.'"

Then the Hon. Speaker goes on:

"I would be inclined to come to the same conclusion in the present circumstances. While it may well be that the whole practice should be reviewed by the executive or by Members, I doubt very much if the way to have or conduct such a review is by way of a specific question of privilege of the type raised by the Hon. Member for Waterloo.

In the circumstances, my suggestion is that the matter be given some thought, perhaps for future consideration when budgets are presented and that a determination be made by the executive concerning whether there should be advance briefing at all in such circumstances.

For the time being however, I suggest to Hon. Members that there is no prima facie case of privilege and that the motion should not be put to the House at this time."

So what we are faced with here is a similar situation but not as strong, actually, for one reason. In the paragraph that commenced the statement by the Hon. Member, it is indicated, by what appears to be hearsay, that some advance information pertaining to a bill or bills which the Minister was expected to present to the House later that afternoon had been given to some members of the Press gallery. There is no indication that the informant was present nor that a bill was presented to the Press, but some information pertaining to it.

The evidence is not yet, in my view, even a prima facie showing that I have to deal with because it isn't factual enough to determine whether it constitutes a breach of privilege. I am reinforced in that view by the decision which was the strongest I can find, that of the House of Commons in Westminster in 1909, where the House actually had possession in property interest in a bill when it authorized a memorandum of the bill to be prepared. By some inadvertence it got to the Press before it got to the Members.

There has been a long practice that is not really the business of the Speaker or the House, for the executive or indeed other Members to make an advance disclosure to the Press under a curtain of induced secrecy. This may be quite all right where the Press and the Members are in honour bound to preserve the confidentiality of such communication. It is not really my business.

But I can only echo what the Hon. Speaker of the House of Commons in Ottawa has said: it is time that this practice was in some way modified either by this House or by the executive so that we do not find ourselves in this embarrassing contretemps that we are in today.

I can find no breach of privilege but I do urge the Members to give consideration the House, for the executive or indeed other Members to make an advance disclosure to bills are not disclosed to persons who are not of this House — in some manner that will accord with general satisfaction.

As you may know, there is no new breach of privilege that can be created and I must be bound by those that I have before me that have been of long-standing in the annals of parliament. On those grounds I must reject the complaint.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, we appreciate your ruling on the technicalities of the matter and that no breach of privilege is involved. But we would like to consider the matter at the political level and legislative level for a few more days. It may well be that this question of pre-release which has been common practice in this Legislature and others should be considered by the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills that is now looking at the question of the practice of parliament.

Without making any commitment with respect to that, I would like to say that we want to feel free to give consideration to what you have said today and to the broader implications of the matter apart from precedent and perhaps address ourselves to it shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: As you know, I have the power vested in me to refer matters of that kind from time

[[Page 687](#)]

to time. I think it would serve a useful purpose if such a matter were referred to a committee of the House.

Introduction of bills.

THE ABANDONED REFRIGERATOR ACT

Mr. Wallace moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 95 intituled *The Abandoned Refrigerator Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 95 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.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE TRUST COMPANIES ACT

Mr. Gardom moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 96 intituled *An Act to Amend the Trust Companies Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 96 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.

AN ACT TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. Gardom moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 97 intituled *An Act to Provide Access to Public Buildings*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 97 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.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT ACT

Mr. Curtis moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 98 intituled *An Act to Amend the Capital Improvement District Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 98 read a first time and ordered to be placed on order of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today, Orders of the day.

ON THE BUDGET

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Chilliwack.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to see you in the chair again today after a rather harried experience last evening to which you and I both were a party. I come today to put oil upon the troubled waters.

MR. SPEAKER: That's covered in the bill too, I think. (Laughter).

MR. SCHROEDER: I had to think a long time to find something within the confines of the bill.

We were indubitably proud of you, Sir. We think you have handled your duties extremely well. It must be difficult for you, as the Speaker, not to engage in debate when the proceedings carry on as they did last evening. We want to commend you for your gallant efforts last evening to refrain from that debate and trust that again today you will be doing that for us.

I speak to the sub-amendment. The subamendment talks about relief from the burden of provincial taxation as it relates to the Peace River Liard region in particular and in restoring the level of job activity within British Columbia generally.

I began last evening and shall continue with the illustration from my constituency in which I wish to show that the budget speech does not provide for relief from the burden of provincial taxation in a specific sense. I return to the illustration of the broiler farmers, Mr. Speaker, without wanting to suggest that the chickens have come home to roost.

I will just recap momentarily so that it will refresh your mind and you will be able to see the continuity. If in some measure, by reducing taxation for those who are involved in agriculture or the production of agricultural products — if we can reduce that provincial taxation — I believe that we can create jobs in which we can gain some benefits, which I would like to reserve to the conclusion of my remarks.

We have in the Chilliwack constituency an industry which is unique, as you heard last evening from the Hon. Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis), who very correctly observed that there are no broiler hatching-egg producers in the North Peace. This is a unique industry to my constituency. We have in my constituency 33 individual, that is private, producers of hatching eggs as well as one, and one only, corporate producer of hatching eggs.

The average gross income of these producers is \$41,966 for the year. Their expenditure — and taxation is included in this expenditure figure — is \$33,400 annually. This is not including any labour expense and does not allow for any compensation to the owner either for labour or for investment for capital investment return.

[[Page 688](#)]

The average capital investment is \$80,000 per farmer. Now speaking on the fact that the farmer needs a return for the \$80,000 investment, I would like to show that by decreasing the taxation on the land and also giving a rebate of taxation on the 5 per cent sales tax, which the farmer must pay on such items as building supplies, various repairs to farm machinery — if indeed he cannot prove that the repairs are going to be used on implements and implements alone, he is taxed — if we can reduce the taxation of the farmer, we can make the broiler hatching-egg producers' industry a viable industry in Chilliwack and we can provide jobs for family members.

As it is right now, the family grows up. They go through the mechanics of education and they graduate from high school. The minute they graduate from high school, there is no means of them caring for themselves, to be gainfully employed, either in the area or on the home farm. As a result, they migrate to the urban areas. They find themselves many times in the City of Vancouver and, I believe, contribute to the unemployment situation in the City of Vancouver.

I wish to suggest that the Government take steps immediately to lighten the tax load on the agricultural industry in general, and on the broiler hatching egg producers' association in particular, and make that a viable agricultural endeavour. It would end up with these benefits:

It would keep the family unit together, and this is other than pecuniary, Sir. It would strengthen the sense of individual worth. It would create a strong moral fibre which, by the way, I see an absence of moral fibre in the population around about us. More important than that, it would vacate the streets of thousands of demoralized youths, who are the potential bane to law and order, and who by their lawlessness quickly become an even greater burden on the taxpayer of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this subamendment because I do not find in the budget the measures that would relieve that particular kind of taxation which would create jobs. It's bad enough that I don't find it but, still worse, it appears as though these measures are absent by design; all of this in the face of a commitment to the people of B.C. that these steps would be taken.

I have a benediction for you for today.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's a little early, isn't it?

MR. SCHROEDER: And now may grace, mercy and peace rest upon you all: grace upon those who are jobless, mercy upon those who through blindness in legislation perpetrate joblessness, and peace upon both factions lest war break out between them, both now and forever more. Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Cariboo.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker and Hon. Members, I rise in support of the sub-amendment before us, which is dealing with restoring the economic viability of the northeast section of British Columbia, more particularly the Peace River Liard region.

I feel that the citizens in this area of our province are in dire need of help and it's time that we did something here in this House to help them. I would like to support this contention. I'll read a letter to you that I have been given from the mayor of Fort St. John spelling out their troubles. It's certainly at the local level. It was written to the Hon. Premier on February 16 by the mayor of Fort St. John Mr. Frankiw and it says as follows:

"I am very concerned about the economic future of this regional district and particularly Fort St. John due to the announcement last Friday by the Government to tax crude oil royalties by an accelerated rate. You probably heard the comments by the drilling association this morning.

"You and I know that farming has not been the most economic base for the last five years. It has been the oil industry. Since last Friday everyone directly or indirectly connected with the industry has noticed a slowdown by nearly 65 per cent. I hear today of one oil company moving out and cancellation of three other drilling contractors to explore in the Boundary Lake area.

"This is an oil-oriented town. The rest of the province is either uninhabitable due to mountainous terrain or has industry. Our industry is only oil and gas. This new policy hits Fort St. John and area right in the left ear. Unless the Government is prepared to negotiate a policy parallel at least to Alberta, I cannot help but foresee a decline in economic growth and an increase in social welfare.

"The farmers have had no crops. The Government has partially helped them. Is the Government going to be prepared to help many of the local service people if a slowdown is indeed experienced? These companies will start to lay off men. Others have already indicated they will move out. I cannot see that this is logical thinking on anyone's part. Further, it only affects this area, as the rest of the province really has no gas or oil resources. Even suppose there is oil or gas in the rest of the province outside this area, who is going to explore it under the present policy?

"This is a serious situation and one which, even if rectified shortly, has already created an uneasiness in the petroleum industry. Fort St. John is the fastest growing town in western Canada today. The Government has suggested they will develop

[[Page 689](#)]

the north with services, roads and assist planning of communities to entice people to live on a relatively parallel basis to the lower mainland. It has suggested provincial incentives, both for people and industry. This type of thinking is logical for development of all the north. However, when a policy hitting the oil industry directly is introduced, I feel that this somehow was not the original intent of the Government.

"The other provincial natural resources — forest products, mines and minerals — have not had the same effect. As you are aware, the local farmer has had an opportunity to go and work for the oil industry each winter, and many have done so. I might add that the petroleum service and drilling contractors have given employment to many farmers here and their policy has been an excellent one.

"I am not anxious to manage a ghost town, much less live in one. I am sure that neither would you. May I have your comments?"

That letter was written summarizing that situation to the Premier on February 16, just last week. I think that something through the industrial development, trade and commerce department should be done to help these people.

But I'm more concerned today with the silence of five northern MLA's that sit in this House and have contributed nothing nor have they shown their concern for the problems of this area. I might say that the five northern MLA's I refer to are the Hon. Members for Atlin (Mr. Calder), Skeena (Mr. Dent), Fort George (Mr. Nunweiler), Omineca (Mr. Kelly) and Prince Rupert (Mr. Lea).

They certainly are all northern Members and they espouse a lot about northern development outside of this House. I think if they're really sincere and interested, they should jump into this debate on this sub-amendment and, of course, end up by voting for this sub-amendment. You're actually double talking when you're up home, the way you operate down here.

I would like to refer to the five of you as conscience-stricken with your silence. The basic contribution to this debate has been in the budget's main motion itself by the Member for Fort George (Mr. Nunweiler) who could talk about broken contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Hon. Member. It's not acceptable to accuse another Member, by his silence or otherwise, of being conscience-stricken or double-talking. I wish you would withdraw those statements against other Hon. Members. You've specified five Members. I think it's unfair to accuse them of either double-talking or, in this case, of being conscience-stricken by their silence.

MR. FRASER: I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Hon. Member.

MR. FRASER: I would like to refer to what the Hon. Member for Fort George (Mr. Nunweiler) said the other day in this light in the budget debate regarding the British Columbia Railway. I take strong exception to the criticism implying things that are wrong with that railroad. In this debate on the sub-amendment I don't think there is anything that has contributed more to the opening up of the north than the British Columbia Railway, known previously as the Pacific Great Eastern Railway.

I've lived in the interior all my life and I know what it was at one time and I know what it is today. The Peace River country, which is the subject of this sub-amendment, certainly was divorced from the rest of this province until the B.C.R. was extended into the Peace River section.

AN HON. MEMBER: By the Social Credit government.

MR. FRASER: By the Social Credit government during the 1960's. To come out and read what I have here today — and I'm not going to read it at all — what the Member has said about the operation of this railroad, implying that the contracts were wrong that were left, let's get this on top of the table. If you want an investigation, why don't we have an investigation about it, instead of implying what's all wrong ?

I really think that this railroad has done an excellent job and is doing an excellent job. It's probably one of the greatest things that's happened in our province in the last 30 or 40 years — the upgrading of this railroad, the extensions and the operations of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Of which the Premier is the proud president.

MR. FRASER: Right. I want to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, who is the president, for his stand and the way he seems to be taking....

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member for Fort George should be ashamed of himself.

MR. FRASER: Right. I want to thank the president of the railroad for the way he is guarding our railroad from the attacks made on it by several people — the CNR; and so on, I support you fully and I wish you luck in the proper conclusion of those discussions.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that northern people are positive people. We always were and we always

[[Page 690](#)]

will be. From the southern reaches of the Cariboo to the Yukon boundary we feel there is a future in employment for our families and our people, if we have confidence — and that can be destroyed by the silence of Members opposite. I certainly urge that these Members now stand up and say their piece in this very important sub-amendment. Then you will be able to go home to your ridings and carry on with the discussions that have taken place before but haven't taken place here. You can say you certainly did get in on this debate to help this stricken area of our province. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of participating in this debate so that we can begin to lay aside what is a matter of politics from the Opposition's point of view, and a matter of reality to what's happening in that situation. I want to tell the Member that Mayor Frankiw will be in my office on Monday morning.

First of all, on the matter of Blueberry Bridge and the investigation, if the Member felt that this was a matter of absolute necessity that he be on top of, he would have read the newspapers, where the Member for Fort George (Mr. Nunweiler) announced that the Government and the president of the railroad have ordered an investigation into the Blueberry Bridge contract and the whole structure. That's number one. We've asked an outside engineer, who is recognized in British Columbia as an outstanding railroad engineer, to give us that report as an independent report. After all, the contracts were let by the former government, not by this Government.

The next matter is the question of the oil drilling. On February 9 the legislation, which is out of order to discuss, was introduced in this House. This morning I phoned my colleague's office and I asked him if his staff would tell me the information on oil drilling in the north, since the budget, so that this House would know whether or not the Opposition was playing cheap politics or whether there were facts related to their charges that oil wells were closing in the north and oil drilling was not going on.

What are the facts? At 8 a.m. this morning, Friday, February 23, there were 31 drills operating and six more rigging up to start. All right. One week ago, on February 16, there were only 27 wells. In one week there's been an 18 per cent increase in the number of wells being drilled in the north. And you have the nerve to come into this House and attempt — unconsciously, I'm sure, because you wouldn't do it deliberately — to mislead the people that the oil drilling was stopping when, in actual fact, within one week there has been an 18 per cent increase in oil drilling in the north.

I suppose the truth does hurt, Mr. Speaker. But it's never too late to learn. I've got some more information for them since we've announced this new policy.

There is no official indication to data that a decrease in future drilling activity is imminent. The petroleum and natural gas branch has received no requests for cancellation of issued well authorizations. And, since February 12, three days after the bill was introduced, 12 new well authorizations have been approved by that department.

It should be borne in mind that operating companies are bound by drilling contracts before they apply for well authorization. We have received no official word that any well is to be phased out because of the legislation.

So I ask the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, to get up in this House and apologize for not checking out their facts.

Mr. Speaker, we got the story from them that wells were closing down, that rigs were leaving and that people

were out of work, when in fact there has been an 18 per cent increase in the number of wells exploring in the area in one week. They've got the nerve to attack the northern Members for not speaking out. The northern Members at least are in touch with their ridings and finding out the facts. While they are getting fat and lazy here in Victoria and not finding out what's going on at home, Mr. Speaker. They don't have to face the winter problems.

They want to fight against this amendment here. They want to fight against....

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, Hon. Member?

MR. PHILLIPS: I would like the Premier to withdraw the fact that I'm getting fat here in Victoria. I haven't put a pound on since I came here. I resent that statement. (Laughter).

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Member, it's absolutely true and I will withdraw it. You talk your fat off. (Laughter).

I want to tell you this, Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think it's acceptable that Members draw attention to their personal differences or characteristics in this House — although I've noted it on both sides of the House on occasion. (Laughter). One of the victims is the man who's speaking now — from Members in the Opposition. I think both sides should agree to a truce.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I accept your offer of the olive branch.

[[Page 691](#)]

I want to go on to say something about concern for the farmers. For 13 years that I've been a Member of this House I saw the former Members get up and speak back there when they used to be the "disappearing fog" Members from the north. They'd get up and they'd say, "Oh, yes, we want this Government to remove the tax from the farmers on the gasoline." It was never done. It is done this year by this budget and now they're attacking the budget. They talk about lowering the price for the farmers. They talk in the main amendment, which is in addition to this one, about consumer affairs. Who's had the guts to bring in the legislation to bring the cost of automobile insurance down, Mr. Speaker?

Not once did I hear last night, when I got the catalogue, "Oh...."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I know. I know they can't take it. But here are the facts. They don't want to deal with facts.

Last night you were in full flight, my friend. I listened to you. I watched this beautiful, grey bird, floating in from the north, sea gulling your way through this House with not one mention of anything you had anything to do with. You were talking about the food prices and labour costs and Saskatchewan — I remember we used to use Saskatchewan. Now it's your turn. (Laughter).

Now to have him come into the House and say everything's going up — but not once did he mention the price of trucks going up. Not once.

MR. PHILLIPS: I did too!

Interjection by an Hon. Member. (Laughter).

MR. PHILLIPS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What's your point of order?

MR. PHILLIPS: I stood in this Legislature last night and said the cost of parts and service and repairs and vehicles was going up. It was the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) who said the cost to the farmer wasn't going up. He said they were going down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. You've made your case and the House is bound to accept it.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, any repentance before death is welcome. (Laughter).

I am opposed to this sub-amendment because it was brought in for nothing more than frivolous politics, no relationship to facts, when there's an 18 per cent increase in oil drilling in one week.

The last thing I'm going to say to you, because I want all the people of British Columbia to hear this, is that not one oil rig is gone — there's been an 18 per cent increase. But I don't want to be threatened by any oil company. I don't want to be threatened by anybody. I have out the olive branch to all citizens of this province, but let me tell you, that no oil drill wants to leave.

There's going to be bids for exploration, but if one company feels that it's not British Columbia enough to stick around, that's O.K. with me, because I tell you this — they may leave B.C., but the oil will be still in the ground, and it belongs to the people of British Columbia.

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

MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert): Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that five northern Members can sit here and be insulted, and so I stand to speak against this sub-amendment.

I'd like to briefly examine it to see the difference between the five northern Members who belong to this party and the two northern Members who belong to that party. If we take a look at the amendment, in the last paragraph it says, "and for the purpose of restoring the level of job activity within British Columbia in general." Restoring it to what? To what it was when the Social Credit were in?

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Right on!

MR. LEA: People who are out of work don't care about percentages, I'll tell you that. This budget will put them to work, and you never did.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEA: Now let's take a look at the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Member made his speech.

MR. LEA: Let's look at the first paragraph. They say that we're not interested in northern British Columbia. Every one of our five Members stood up and asked for development for all of northern British Columbia — not just one section. They ask for north-eastern British Columbia. They don't care about all of northern British Columbia. It's right here in the book, isn't it? When we speak, it will be for all of northern British Columbia, and for all of the people who are out of work in the province, and we won't do it for cheap politics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I'm taking water, Mr. Speaker, because I don't want to get as high as the Premier does on Okanagan apple juice, because we have just been treated in this House again to another one of this Premier's characteristic habits, which we see whenever a real — and I don't choose to use his words — intestinal issue that concerns the people of this province comes before the House.

You saw it yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the gallery saw it. He stands up, he smiles, he raises his arms, and then he plugs in and he generates....

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. Member, you must be getting to me too, Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: My husband has that problem too. (Laughter).

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, we tried to stop the personalities that have been going on. Just a minute ago, you were complaining about the same offence from the other side. Now you are perpetuating the same conduct that you complain of. I ask every Member not to indulge in personalities.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I quite accept your point, with the exception of the fact that I didn't complain, and our Member was offended. I'm not talking about the Premier's personality, I'm talking about his actions on the floor of this House as we have just witnessed them.

Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about this intestinal situation, these serious problems that are facing the people in British Columbia, the Premier picks a prime time for the media and waves his arms instead of debating it. He looks in the gallery and plays to the students. Those students are intelligent students, Mr. Premier, and they're not going to fall for that sort of nonsense. Their families are affected. Their families are affected by this sub-amendment that we're moving, because their families and those young people are going to pay the tax increases you've brought into this province and are trying to blame on the big "they."

Mr. Speaker, in relation to this sub-amendment, and to the Premier's statements, we and the people of British Columbia are tired of this type of tirade in this House and out of this House.

The Premier and this Government and his Ministers are insistent on shock treatments to the business community of this province, who are the job creators in large in this province. They made wild statements, they bring in legislation without understanding, and it's because they don't understand the effects of this legislation that we have moved this amendment to try and clarify for them what the situation is.

But when they make these statements, that cause these job losses, when they bring in the legislation that causes these job losses, and when they bring in bills that affect the whole life style and income potential of the people in an area of this province, specifically the Peace River, and then jump up in here and say, "Well, we didn't understand what we're doing, we'll call the mayor down," this is band-aid treatment, and this is not good enough for British Columbia.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I didn't say that.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Premier, you said you're on the phone here and there, and then you brought out and paraded before this House a lot of figures which we will refute. You took the figures as presented by the Members of this side of the House, and twisted them and distorted them in your usual manner. This is what we're complaining about, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier and Minister of Finance.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Is it not true that there are 31 wells today?

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier got up and, again in a play to the gallery and the Press, said that we bring auto insurance rates down as it relates to this sub-amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are the rates?

MRS. JORDAN: He makes great statements like this. He brings in legislation like this. He is losing jobs in

British Columbia through this action, but he will not give the facts. I challenge the Premier on the past statements he made on the floor of this House, one minute ago, through you, Mr. Speaker, to give us those rates. To say to the people of British Columbia that you will meet your election commitment of \$25. There's not one....

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was always informed that when there were bills on the order paper for dealing with different subjects, such as has been discussed in the last half hour, it's out of order in a debate such as this,

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is out of order. You can merely advert to some bill, but you can't debate the terms of a bill, or anything in argument in favour or against a bill, when it's on the order paper. I said you could advert to a bill, but you can't debate the

[[Page 693](#)]

particulars of a bill. And you can't argue for or against a bill, or the substance of a bill,

MRS. JORDAN: You're quite right, Mr. Speaker, and I bow to your ruling. I would ask you to apply the same regulations to the Premier,

MR. SPEAKER: I certainly shall.

MRS. JORDAN: Referring to the broad generalities that the Premier made, we say, when will you present those facts? When will we have a chance as legislators to deal with those facts? When will the public know those facts? You claim, Mr. Premier, that you yourself used Saskatchewan in the past, and we suggest now, Mr. Premier, in relation to what you said, that Saskatchewan is using you, at the taxpayers' of British Columbia expense.

Mr. Speaker, what is quite obvious from the debate on this sub-amendment last night, and from the Premier's reactions this afternoon, is that the Premier simply does not understand. We are trying in this amendment to tell you, and our amendment is about the mayors crying for help around the Province of British Columbia as a result of this Government's action. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that counts. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that warrants discussion. Our amendment, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, is about the whole shock treatment and the concern of the business districts large and small in British Columbia. The people who are shocked, who are faced with this increased taxation, which must be put on the public — individual consumer and shopper and worker, want an explanation, and surely that concern counts. Surely that concern warrants discussion.

If you doubt my terms I would like to read an editorial, or parts of it, from the *Vancouver Province* of February 7, 1973, at a time when they were running an editorial about the Premier and the Minister of Finance, and all his mixed up, millions:

"The business community of British Columbia certainly prepared itself for an increase in provincial corporate income taxes in Premier Barrett's first budget. Mr. Barrett has promised to raise the current 10 points of corporate income tax to 13 points. He hasn't said whether it will be done in one jump or in stages."

This is a prime example of the shock treatment, and then the budget comes in, after they've had their ulcers titillated, at 12 per cent — a 2 per cent increase. It is an irresponsible shock treatment initially on the part of the Minister of Finance.

It says in the editorial, "The Premier should avoid spouting such nonsense. He should be prepared to explain to the ordinary people " — the ordinary people, Mr. Speaker, the men and women and children who sit in this gallery, who we all represent, who those northern Members represent in this debate.

These are the people who want to know. He should be prepared to explain to the ordinary people that it is they, not the fat cats of British Columbia, as he so aptly likes to label them, or glibly likes to call them, who will suffer more from a corporate tax increase.

It goes on to say,

"But of wider importance in British Columbia is the effect of heavier taxes on companies that live mainly on exporting. In those cases the competitive position of exports is reduced with the tax increase added to all the other cost pressures that have sent Canadian export prices rising at a faster rate than have the prices of imports."

Mr. Speaker, I'll have more to say on that in a future debate. But why I use these examples is to try to help the Premier and Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) to understand what this sub-amendment is all about. To try to help those Members who sit silently in the backbenches to understand what it is all about, and what the actions of this Government have done.

Our amendment is about the concern by councils who are faced with a rising cost through the actions of this Government. Our amendment is about the small businessman in the small community. These councils and these businesses are concerned because their very tax base is being torn to shreds by this Government. These small businesses and home owners in these communities will face an unprecedented one year tax increase.

Who will pay this tax increase? Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, your father was a small businessman and a highly respected one. He's not in business now, but other people have followed on all over this province. They just have a limited market potential — they don't all work in Vancouver where you can fight and compete for volume. They are people in places like Cherryville — people in places like Nakusp, Pouce Coupe and Campbell River where there is only a limited volume of business. The people in those areas are dependent on the jobs and the income that is created by the private sector of the economy, and in a small measure the Government bureaucracy.

But these small businesses can only achieve a reasonable mark-up from these people because people can only afford to pay so much. Mr. Speaker, what are they to do? How is a small grocery store, a vegetable market — the small businessman as the Premier's father was — in these parts of the province to meet this added tax burden. His choice as I said, is to pass it on to the consumer in that area who has a limited income, Or he's to compete for a greater volume, and that volume of people just is not there. Who is to pay, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker?

The other problem independent businesses face is that the Premier has called, and rightly so, for the private

[[Page 694](#)]

sector to help to create jobs in this time of acute unemployment. How can a small grocery store, or a small auto body shop, a shoe repair shop, a record sales shop, a small boat manufacturing company — and I have two in the area I represent; they're not big — how can they possibly meet a rising minimum wage, meet the problems of tax increases that we're debating now. How can they make some justification for their business and their efforts through a profit and provide more jobs? The Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) sits there laughing and rolling his hands round and round. And we say that Minister of Labour better get off the pot. Because you, Mr. Minister of Labour, through you, Mr. Speaker, are part of this problem. Mr. Minister of Labour, we expect better, through you Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, Hon. Member a point of order has been raised.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): A word to the Speaker I think it's unfair on Hansard to have her speak in a low voice, and then all of a sudden raise her voice saw those poor girls jump there. I think for medical reasons she should be cautioned about that.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre is more entertaining in his concern for Hansard or his sense of humour. I don't think this is a laughing matter, Mr. Member. And a lot of people out in British Columbia don't think it's a laughing matter either. That's why we moved the sub-amendment.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: I don't want to call him a "fat cat," I don't want to get into that sort of thing. But what I would say to that Member is — get off what you're sitting on and enter this debate and come up with some

constructive suggestions to help these people. And you have the background, through you, Mr. Speaker, to do that. You, as a Member, through you Mr. Speaker, should be very, very concerned about the rights of people in British Columbia to have the opportunity of a job and to have a fair return for that job, and not have that money taxed out of their hands for the benefit of the ill-managed state which this is becoming.

MR. LAUK: 20 years of ill-management.

MRS. JORDAN: That Member seems to have done well on the 20 years of mis-management he claims was here.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to simplify for the Premier this complex problem that he has created, as it related to people; as it relates to councils; as it relates to small businesses and large businesses and the jobs — we are asking on their behalf who is going to pick up this tab? It isn't in the budget that we're debating and it certainly isn't in his statements.

We question seriously the role of the Members in the Government benches when warnings such as we are giving them now go unheralded and unheeded. We would like to see when this sub-amendment comes up for vote, which ones of them are going to vote for it. We are trying to tell them, through you, Mr. Speaker, what the problem is. We are trying to sound the warning and ask you to go back to your caucus and to your cabinet and ask that Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) to re-evaluate the programmes he's trying to bring into the province. That's what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. And if you want to put it in modern terms as they like to do, "that's where it's at."

I'd like to speak on this area of unemployment, about the jobs that were lost in the highway department. When this was brought to the Premier's attention, that 100 people had been fired from the highway department at a time of high, high and unprecedented unemployment, the Premier said, "It's because there wasn't enough money in the budget allotted by the Social Credit administration."

Yet, almost on that very day, and proceeding that day, and after that day, that Minister of Finance released through his cabinet special warrants for an excess of \$17 million of spending in that department. Other than employment, nothing out of that \$17 million by special warrant for highway spendings went to the workingmen in that department, and the men who were laid off — 100 men. He waves his arms in that instance again and raises his voice as he did just a few minutes ago. He says, "It's O.K. boys, it's O.K. Don't worry about your grocery bills now. Don't worry about your gas bills. Don't worry about being unemployed, we'll employ you again April L" What a phony excuse....

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Why wait till spring, do it now.

MRS. JORDAN: Right, Why wait till spring? I'd like you to meet my ghost-writer, Mr. Speaker. But he's right. Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Finance, do it now. Pass a special warrant. It wouldn't take more than about \$50,000 to put those men back to work — to put food on the table in those families, give them their right to their right to their job, and their right to work. But, what does the Minister of Finance do? Nothing., Nothing for those men, nothing for the consumers of British Columbia, nothing for the taxpayers of British Columbia.

For all the tirade that he gave us this afternoon — and other Members will gladly pick up the pieces after the Minister of Finance hung himself this afternoon. There's nothing that the Premier did in

[[Page 695](#)]

those tirades for the jobs that are being lost in the oil fields of the Peace River and Liard country. The Premier again, and the Minister of Finance again, doesn't seem to understand that that can't wait for spring. I'm sure many of the Members know, and those that don't know, without going into detail, you must understand the geography of the north country — and the climatic conditions. You must understand that drilling must take place in winter because of the muskeg.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there are other Members who want to speak on this sub-amendment. But I would again

ask those silent benches on the other side of this House, with their massive majority, to get up and enter this debate. Don't follow your leader's example and wave your arms in the air. Get up and face what the real issue is. Nobody blames anyone for making a mistake. And the NDP Government have made a mistake and we'll accept that. We don't even ask for an apology. All we ask is for correction of that mistake and the returning of the jobs to people.

If you don't Mr. Members, then I must caution you that it will be our obligation to advise the people of the north that all the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) can do when he has an unemployment problem and a firing problem in his own department, is get up in this House in a serious debate and raise a lot of irrelevant points of order about bills which are not even in the order book.

Mr. Speaker, through this debate, with the exception of the Minister of Highways I just mentioned and the Premier who flapped around a little earlier this afternoon and one Member from the north who I think is trying to understand the problem, the NDP Members have sat quiet, frozen. The cabinet sit quiet, frozen. There's a cold freeze will make those cabinet Members more silent in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Labour, followed by the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been looking over the sub-amendment that the Social Credit Party moved and it occurs to me that due to the wide-ranging discussion which has taken place that they have boxed themselves in to such a degree that they lost track of their own amendment. They spend more time analyzing the political performance and the particular style of the Premier than they do discussing the issues of the amendment.

I haven't heard one solid suggestion put forward from the Opposition ranks on a mechanism that the government might employ to generate employment in the north.

The Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) has spent time questioning my facial expressions and the style of the Premier. I just don't know what the point is; she doesn't seem to be able to find anything valid in the sub-amendment to discuss and recommend to the government.

When we are talking of political styles, Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Member for North Okanagan and paid close attention to what she has said. I have come to the conclusion that there is a lot less to that Member than meets the eye, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't analyse it any other way.

Some of our people have discussed and indicated the impact that government policies are going to have in the north. Certainly the removal of gasoline taxation has been a boon to the farmers in that area and it is a very direct help to them. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, until we can see some reasonable suggestions coming forward from the Opposition benches on specific programmes that might be considered by the Government — serious programmes offered in a genuine way — then I think this whole debate becomes a bit of a charade. I think the Members across the way are playing games.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Yes, I would like, on a point of order, to draw the Minister of Labour's attention to six concrete suggestions that I made in the House last night. He is saying that the....

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Hon. Member. Order! That isn't a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: I consider it a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I know you do.

HON. MR. KING: I just wanted to make a few observations on this. I think the debate has become rather shallow, rather hollow, and I don't intend to spend any more time on it.

I just wanted to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Opposition Members seem to be spending

more time talking about the Premier's style and whether or not I am smiling — and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, my facial expression was in response to a Member behind the Member for North Okanagan, one of her colleagues. If he was smiling you had better question his motives first; I was simply responding.

I wouldn't argue whether or not he was a little bit amused by what the front bench was coming up with and I wouldn't blame him for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Columbia River, followed by the Hon Member for Shuswap.

[[Page 696](#)]

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing what I consider to be a very serious sub-amendment at this time and for anyone to reflect on the sub-amendment being shallow and hollow is most unreasonable in my opinion.

Just a few moments ago the Premier was speaking on this sub-amendment in which he attempted to convey that the sub-amendment was one of a political nature. He got into a great arm-waving exhibition here and tried to make as much political gymnastics as he possibly could, possibly to convince those northern Members of his that they should not support what we consider to be a very relevant and timely and important sub-amendment in this House.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver-Centre): Nonsense!

MR. CHABOT: The Second Member for Vancouver-Centre has just indicated, Mr. Speaker, very clearly that the sub-amendment which we have placed on the Votes and Proceedings is nonsense.

MR. LAUK: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not what I said. I said...

MR. CHABOT: ...that the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair....

MR. LAUK: That Member is deliberately trying to twist what I said as cross comment on the floor and I won't permit it. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Let me explain to you what he was mistaken about. I said, "Nonsense" to his comment about his previous comment, not that the sub-amendment wasn't a valid sub-amendment at all.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHABOT: I have to, in some instances, relate it to what has been said, Mr. Speaker, despite your suggestion, because I think that is what we are doing here at this particular time.

The thing we are really talking about is increase and restoration of job activity in the province. We have heard from a great variety of people. We have heard from the Premier as I have said a few moments ago, and he did indicate that he is going to have someone in his office on Monday morning — the mayor of the town of Fort St. John. He indicated very clearly when he spoke in this assembly that job activity had increased in the oil patch in the northeastern part of this province. Just a few moments ago the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) read a letter from the mayor of Fort St. John, and I think the Premier quite obviously did not attach any significance to what the mayor of the town of Fort St. John had to say. He went on to say that there had been an increase in activity in that part of this province. This is what the mayor of Fort St. John said:

"I am very concerned about the economic future of this regional district and particularly Fort St. John due to the announcement last Friday by the government to tax crude oil royalties by an accelerated rate.

"You probably heard the comments by the drilling association this morning. You and I know that farming has not been the economic base for the last five years here. It has been the oil industry.

Did you want to challenge me on the point or something, Mr. Minister?

"Since last Friday, everyone directly or in-directly connected with the industry has noticed a slowdown by nearly 65 per cent."

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's wrong.

MR. CHABOT: In other words you are calling the mayor of Fort St. John a liar; you and the Premier are calling the mayor of Fort St. John a liar.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, but you tempt me.

MR. CHABOT: "I hear today of one oil company moving out and cancellation of three other drilling contractors to explore in the Boundary Lake area."

Well, the Premier said there is increased activity in exploration in the northeastern part of this province, yet the mayor says it has decreased by 65 per cent. I wonder what the people of Fort St. John and Dawson Creek think? Who is right? I will tell you. They will give you the answer as to who is right.

We have listened to the two Members here speak on the oil industry and I think they have related some pretty accurate figures on the decrease in employment in that particular area by the policies enunciated by that very Government. Then for the Member for Prince Rupert (Mr. Lea) to stand in this House for about two or three minutes and to accuse those Members from the Peace River of being parochial is irresponsible in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. If these Members from North Peace River and South Peace River are not speaking on behalf of those people in their constituencies, who will speak on their behalf.

It is quite clear to me that those five Members for the north will not speak on behalf of the people of the Peace River who are losing their jobs every day. Where are those Members from the north?

We are talking about job activity and the increase of jobs in British Columbia and I think it is a timely subject. It is one that needs thorough debate on the floor of this House. When we find that in British

[[Page 697](#)]

Columbia we have 95,000 people unemployed, it is time that us legislators be concerned because that is the highest degree, the highest number of unemployed, we've ever seen in the Province of British Columbia.

Never before in the history of this province have we seen such numbers unemployed — in a "have" province. There are two other "have" provinces, Ontario and Alberta, and they are experiencing roughly half the amount of unemployment that is being experienced in the Province of British Columbia.

It's quite obvious to me what is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It's the philosophy of that Government that is so foreign to the job-creating process. Your policies are foreign to job stimulation. It's rather hard to believe that the Province of British Columbia, that is rich in resources, rich in capital wealth, would have the lack of job activity, the lack of job stimulus that we're experiencing at this particular time.

It's the tax policies of that Government that has created the uncertainty within the business community of this province. It's time that you looked at the direction in which you're leading this province. Take a second look and realize that your policies and your statements have directly contributed to the inactivity of job creation in the Province of British Columbia.

We've listened to policy statements from the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick), who constantly runs between the Speaker and his desk. I've watched him here on several occasions, probably looking for some reason to correct me or to sit me down because I'm probably dealing with some legislation on the order paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: Aw, come on.

MR. CHABOT: But I want to assure you, Mr. Minister, you have been responsible for the creation of unemployment in this province by the lack of action on the part of your department, by the removal of incentives for the creation of jobs in the further refining of our raw materials in this province. Yes, Mr. Minister, you are directly responsible for the uncertainty which permeates the mining industry in this province today. Yes, you are.

Where are your plans? You are a Minister of the Crown. You have a direct responsibility, in the job creation at least, within the realm of your department. What are you doing, Mr. Minister, for job activities? Absolutely nothing. I'll tell you what you're doing. You're decreasing job activity with the kind of statements you have made.

I'm not going to blame entirely the provincial government for the lack of job activity in the Province of British Columbia. Certainly the economic policies of the national government have a great bearing on job creation. The uncertainty which they have created in the country as well has contributed.

However, the economic policies of your Government also have a direct bearing on job creation. I want to tell you, you're not doing very much for creating jobs. British Columbia has been accustomed to a rather fantastic growth of job creation — an average of 4.6 per cent over the last 10 years. No other province...and I'm not going to go into a whole series of comparative statistics which I have here on the question of job creation that has taken place in this province.

It's really the pall that you've put over industry, the uncertainty of the direction in which your Government is going, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure you'll agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that there's a tremendous uncertainty in the business community as to the direction in which this Government is going. The budget failed to tell us what the economic policies of this Government will be for 1973-74.

They've indicated very clearly that most of the budgetary measures are contained in the legislation and not in the budget. No wonder there's uncertainty in the business community. No wonder jobs are not being created at this time in this province. We read in the newspaper...not only in the mining industry, in the drilling industry — diamond drilling. Government taxes....

HON. MR. NIMSICK: Why didn't you give that speech last year?

MR. CHABOT: Because unemployment was not as serious as it is today, my friend. I've always spoken on unemployment. I've always been concerned. Don't you sit there and smirk and insinuate that I was never concerned about unemployment.

MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert): You fooled us.

MR. CHABOT: The drilling industry has been hurt too. This is what an article relative to diamond drilling has had to say. It says:

"British Columbia's diamond drilling industry has fallen on hard times. The drillers say the pinch is brought about by the election of a socialist Government, new federal tax laws . .

MR. LAUK: What newspaper?

MR. CHABOT: It's in the Vancouver *Sun*: "...new federal tax laws, metal prices and a dearth of major new ore bodies in the past. The situation has reached..."

MR. LAUK: What date — 1952?

MR. CHABOT: 1952? There was no socialist Government. Don't be so stupid. (Laughter).

"...The situation has reached the point where some local drilling companies are looking to the United States and offshore in an effort

to offset the slowdown in business being experienced in B.C., Last week the severity of the situation was brought to the attention of mines Minister, Leo Nimsick. The Canadian Diamond Drilling Association warned the Minister that higher mining taxes and mineral royalties would only further aggravate an already serious situation...

"Indications from many of the companies would suggest that this trend has continued into 1972, and it would appear that there has been a shift of exploration emphasis away from British Columbia. The Association also said indications are that as B.C. is no longer considered as competitively attractive a mining area as it once was, the imposition of a royalty could have further deterrent effects upon the future development of the industry in the province. 'It does not look very good this year,' he said. 'I think it is fair to say that the new provincial Government has had a harmful effect on mining exploration. Last year we saw the first sign of coming out of a recession. This year things were looking pretty good until the political developments took shape.'"

That's what the diamond drilling industry has to say about your policies relative to job creation and relative to job activity in the mining industry. We're talking about the jobs that are on line up in the Peace River today; jobs that are lost; jobs that might never return.

Certainly, you have put some emphasis in your budget as a stimulus for jobs, because you've indicated in the excerpts of the budget that you're interested in job creation. You have allocated \$5 million to an accelerated park development fund for job creation. You've also allocated \$5 million to the accelerated reforestation fund for jobs. That kind of money, Mr. Speaker, would create approximately 4,000 jobs for a period of six months.

But the tax policies being initiated by that Government are going to eliminate thousands of permanent jobs in the Peace River. Yet you say you're concerned about creating temporary jobs, that with the money that you're allocated for those temporary jobs you'll create employment for about 4,000 people on a six-month basis. Yet 2,000 people could be directly affected in the oil fields in the Peace River, as well as about 3,000 people indirectly.

If you're really interested in jobs — really interested in helping the unemployed in this province — where are your winter works projects? Where are they? No, they seem to want to sit on their surplus. You have surplus funds. Why don't you employ a portion of these 95,000 people who are seeking employment in this province? No, you can use all your pious statements in the excerpts and in the budget about your concern for job creation. I want to assure you that the people who are unemployed and looking for jobs certainly can't eat the budget or the excerpts from the budget.

Where are the plans for the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce for job creation for secondary industry? Where are they? Where are the low-interest loans to activate development, to activate jobs in the secondary industry field? Where are the plans of the Department of Industrial Development.

Where are the plans, Mr. Minister (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) through you, Mr. Speaker, for these new jobs? Where is the full-time Minister for this particular department? Do you think, Mr. Speaker, we should adjourn this House at this time to send the Premier and someone from the backbench to the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint a full-time Minister of Industrial Development, so someone can get on with plans for creating jobs in British Columbia? It's not good enough to have a part-time Minister that does not have sufficient time to create jobs in his particular department.

I have to admit that certainly a few jobs have been created. There have been a few executive assistants appointed. But that's not good enough. That only has helped 10 or 12 friends. But what about the 95,000 people that are seeking jobs in British Columbia today? Are you going to appoint them all executive assistants?

Where are the new jobs in the civil service? You talk about 1,000 new jobs — a cut-back of 473 from the previous year. No, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if that Government is seriously interested in creating jobs in this province, they'll withdraw that punitive legislation which is destroying jobs in the Peace River day by day. I call upon the Minister to withdraw the legislation so that the Peace River will have an opportunity of enjoying not necessarily full employment, but better employment than what their prospects appear to be at this time.

I think that if the backbench is serious in their statements on health and aid for the northern part of British Columbia, that they'll stand up and support what I consider is a most important and timely amendment. Thank you,

Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard the old saying that, "It's an ill wind that does no one any good." But I'm beginning to wonder. It kind of makes one stop and wonder when you see the official Opposition stand up and attack the Government on things that they can't implement in five months when they've had 20 years to work at it.

[[Page 699](#)]

I'd like to give you a little example of the types of things that they've done for the Peace River in the past. I think the best one that they've done was name a dam and a lake. That the biggest thing that they had in the whole of the Peace River for Social Credit.

You know what happened in the farming industry in that area? They had a poultry specialist come into that area and hold meetings. Then he had courses and he was going to teach the Peace River farmer how to be a professional egg producer. But you know, all the time they were doing this they knew that there was no way that an egg producer could produce eggs in the Peace River country. There was a law under the marketing board that wouldn't allow it.

I'd like to give you a little example of what went on under their rule through this egg marketing board. They had a regulation that stipulated that no eggs could be produced in the entire Peace River country. The few farmers that were trying to raise a few eggs in that area from 400 to 500 chickens were having eggs shipped in from the lower mainland at prices of 23 and 24 cents a dozen to put them out of business. I've heard about chickens with their heads cut off, but that government had heads on their shoulders but they never used them.

Producers from the entire interior spent two years fighting the rulings and regulations imposed by this egg marketing board. They had several hearings before the Minister of Agriculture. When he finally said, "I'm sorry, we can't do anything for you," we took it to the Opposition. They brought it on the floor of the House about one year from now....

AN HON. MEMBER: One year from now? (Laughter).

MR. LEWIS: In the past, that is.

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEWIS: Well they act a lot faster than you do. (Laughter).

They brought it to the floor of the House and requested that it be taken before the agricultural committee. After a little harassment it finally was agreed to go before the agricultural committee. We had hearings before the agricultural committee, all costing interior farmers — in the Peace River too; there were several came down from the Peace River — a considerable amount of money to fight a regulation installed by that Government that completely tied the hands of farmers in the Peace River.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order!

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member, the subamendment under consideration by the House deals with the matter of taxation and the restoration of the economic viability of the northeastern section of the province, namely the Peace River-Liard region. I would ask the Member if he would direct his remarks in this debate....

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to point out that we're going to bring some economic justice to that area.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well then please do so, Mr. Member.

MR. LEWIS: The egg producers in this area were finally able to get a hearing held underneath the government that allowed a commission to travel throughout the province and hear the story of the farmers in the interior. This commission was appointed by the past government. A lot of people said, "Oh, well, it's going to be a political appointment and there won't be anything come of it anyway." But I'll have to give them credit. They looked on it in an unbiased manner and insisted that there be changes made to the marketing board structure within this province.

The same type of thing in the Peace River country has happened in the past and it's still in effect at the present time, in regard to broiler production, turkey boards and in several other areas of farming. How do you expect the Peace River country to thrive when they've had regulations like this that froze the whole area into nothing else but grain production?

The type of thing that's happened is: Lucerne Milk, through Canada Safeway, insists on shipping their product into the northern part of the province; Foremost has now set up a dairy and they ship their milk into the northern part of the province as well. This completely ties the agriculturalist in that area, the farmer that wants to be involved in agriculture. He's told, "It's too bad. It's going to come from the lower mainland."

This happened underneath the past government and you can rest assured that I'll be doing everything that I can to see that this is changed.

What did that past government do in regard to machinery parts and to seeing that there was proper service applied to the farmers in the area from machinery companies? Nothing. Not a thing.

This government is working towards it now. Maybe there isn't legislation on the books, but it won't take us 20 years.

I suggest we had a good Minister of Agriculture in Mr. Shelford. But one out of the many that they had, he wasn't enough to carry the force.

We also lost a real good farmer in that area. I would suggest if the farmers in that area want something for the farmers, to again return a farmer into their area as an MLA.

I'll tell you one thing that's happened in five

[[Page 700](#)]

months that the farmer has waited for 20 years. It's already been mentioned — the coloured gas. I would say that even the Opposition will have to take their hats off to that.

They scream and holler and stand up and say, "Well how come you haven't taken the school tax off farmland already? You've been in there five months." Well they were in there for 20 years. Did they ever take any move toward removing the farm tax? Not once.

I'll tell you the type of thing that I'll be working toward trying to get implemented in this government in the near future. It will be a moratorium on all farm debts within the Peace River country for the community — not just for the farmer. I think if we'd had the Social Credit government in there now they would have been out digging the plots for the farmers and burying them and saying, "Good riddance."

I think there's lots of room in the Peace River country for the implementation of a programme that would benefit the farmers in cooperation with the government in setting up processing plants, as our friend, Mr. Marshall, promoted in the past. I don't think I'll be walking across the floor because it didn't happen, I'm sure it's going to.

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

MR. LEWIS: I'm afraid that I'm not supporting them.

They also say it's a dangerous thing for the government to become involved in cooperation with the private sector in investing in the economy of any one area. They say it'll fail. Well I want to give you some figures of what's happened to free enterprise in the past year.

Just this year, in the week of January 5, there were 76 companies in Canada that went broke. Now you can look through Saskatchewan and Manitoba and you'd have a hard time finding five or six.

MR. PHILLIPS: Most of them are from Manitoba or Saskatchewan.

MR. LEWIS: A year ago there were 33 in the same week. I intend to support this sub-amendment...I mean....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Laughter).

MR. LEWIS: I mean oppose — vote against this sub-amendment.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEWIS: I think I'm entitled to a slip of the tongue, because for 20 years we've had slips of the tongue.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. LEWIS: I know you're trying to excite me, but for 20 years you weren't able to get excited. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): Mr. Speaker, it's not without a great deal of reluctance that I stand today. I've sat here and I've listened to wanton nonsense come across the floor from the Opposition. I've listened to what are some of the most frivolous statements that I've ever heard. The Members who made those statements know perfectly well how frivolous they are.

Many of us have sat in this House for some years and we've all listened to those silent Members in those days — silence over jobs, silence over the north, silence over every issue that this want of confidence motion is all about. This want of confidence motion is a want of confidence in the Social Credit government that created this climate — that created this situation in the north, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name names.

HON. MR. COCKE: Name names? I can name 38 names, Mr. Speaker, that for three years....

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. COCKE: You would have been here too and you were part of it.

Mr. Speaker, they're screeching about the close down of the oil industry in the north. You know, Mr. Speaker, we all heard that. We all heard those squawks and those howls from Alberta when Premier Lougheed said, "We have to have a bigger piece of this action." That's precisely what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is these people don't represent ordinary people. They represent the oil companies; they represent the big interests. Then one of their Members gets up in this House and indicates, "We represent the guy selling washing machines," or "We represent the refrigerator dealer at the corner," or some other corner situation. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they're talking about big interests.

We are interested, Mr. Speaker, in people — in jobs. The fact is, as the Premier pointed out a little while ago,

things are going along in that oil industry up there and, but for the kind of ill winds that blow from that side of the House, will probably keep on doing very well.

Mr. Speaker, what about this whole business of taxation of corporations? If you ask that we follow

[[Page 701](#)]

that through, we should then take all taxes off corporations, following the kind of reasoning that these people propose. Mr. Speaker, it's just pure, unadulterated utter nonsense. The corporations, and particularly the big corporations, are in there for what they can get out of it and they're doing very well, thank you.

When the Hon. Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) talks about those 75 companies a week that go broke in this country, we all know what it's all about. The poor little guy in this country is squeezed to death. It's the little businessman who voted for the NDP and will go on voting for the NDP, Mr. Speaker, because we're his only friends.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there's a great deal of guilt over there. I know that they're feeling badly and that's the reason for the sub-amendment. Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation, we'll vote against that sub-amendment and let's get on with it.

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

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give the House some facts this afternoon. Our Premier this afternoon has suggested that this whole debate is a sham. He has suggested that the recorded views of the heads of government are to be ignored in this Legislature. He says we're going to ignore them because we're engaged in a political and hypocritical game in this sub-amendment.

As a Member from a faraway place here in Victoria — far away from the area we've been talking about — I find it difficult to believe that the warnings of the mayors of Fort St. John and Dawson Creek — that you say they are simply crying wolf. If the Members opposite can't hear their concern, I certainly can.

Mr. Speaker, I'm kind of happy that you're back. There are a couple of facts that I'd like to explain to the House and to yourself. I think that the Member who was sitting in your chair previously understood them and I wouldn't have needed to explain them to him.

In a petroleum exploration, as I understand it, first of all there's a lease of the Crown land for the purpose of exploring for gas and oil. Secondly, the seismic contractors move crews in and they do seismic evaluations. If the company finds those evaluations and their findings worthwhile from those reports, then a drilling contract is entered into. Once that drilling contract is entered into, if the drilling is successful and gas or oil ends up as the result, then we have a producing well.

Our Premier this afternoon made the statement that there were 31 companies in that area drilling as of this morning, I don't doubt for a minute that those facts are correct. I don't propose to quarrel with him understand, quarreled with that fact. Our issue, and the whole programme, is that the ones that are being cancelled haven't started.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name those that have been cancelled.

MR. MORRISON: I'm just proposing to do that right now. Thank you very much. I'm glad you're a good straight man.

As of right now, our information is that there are 22 intended drilling programmes either cancelled or suspended. The companies' names are Dome Petroleum, Union Oil, Endaco Petroleum....

MR. LAUK: Slower.

MR. MORRISON: You can read it in *Hansard* tomorrow. Houston Petroleum, Hudson's Bay Gas and Oil,

Tenaco Petroleum. Twenty-two intended programmes have been cancelled or suspended as of this afternoon.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): That's not so.

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, if he's got something to say, let him say it. Just recently our office, while this has been going on, has been talking to the people in that district. That mayor, who was referred to earlier in this House as being here on Monday morning, has said that he is coming down on Monday morning and that's true — with four elected officials. If anyone wants to see him, he'll be in the Empress Hotel and he'll be happy to see you.

He says, "I've got lots of problems." He says that he has the support of all the municipalities in the Peace River and the Liard region district. He is bringing with him stacks of letters. He says, and I quote, "If the Premier reads each of these letters, he won't be able to finish them from Monday until Friday."

The whole exercise, as I understand it, is we are referring to the jobs which are lost and the opportunities which are being by-passed right now in that district. We talk about raising \$9 million from this extra tax which you propose to put on right away. But the economy in that district will lose a great deal more than the \$9 million you propose to raise.

Without any difficulty, I intend to support this sub-amendment. Thank you.

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

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The sub-amendment — at times I wondered whether it had been lost — but I'd like to go over it so

[[Page 702](#)]

the House knows precisely what we are talking of. It's that: "the Speaker do leave the chair for the purpose of going into committee, but this House regrets that the budget neglects the general good of the citizens of this province by failing to provide for relief from the burden of provincial taxation for the purpose of restoring economic viability of the entire northeast section of the province," et cetera, and, the second point; "for the purpose of restoring the level of job activity within B.C."

It's not a resolution that's impossible to understand, I think it's a fairly straightforward one. Yet today we have had a great deal of comment, in particular from Government Ministers, which simply failed to be relevant, in my opinion, to the actual sub-amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it's perfectly clear that there is a relationship between taxation and the level of employment in any particular province or territory. It's also, I think, demonstrable, and fairly quickly so, that if you have the taxes set in a certain way, you will discourage employment, in particular if you're competing with other jurisdictions.

The Economic Council of Canada has come out with their ninth annual review. It came out in 1972 and it's entitled *The Years to 1980*. I had a close look at it, as close as I could. I'm no economist but I have studied some economics. I looked at it from the point of view of trying to find out, in their opinion, where this country is going and where the parts of this country are going with respect to taxation and employment. There are some interesting statements.

On page 101 they say, "In our opinion, a reasonable stance over the next few years would be to keep direct and indirect taxation rates at their present levels, if not reduce them." It talks about the progressive nature of taxation.

A point that we have already tried to make is that the claim that taxes are being kept level and that there is no increase in taxation is of course wrong, when you realize that with inflation and, indeed, with increasing incomes, the amount of money taken from the citizen in the form of taxation is increased. In addition, when you realize that the municipalities, the creatures of the province, are being forced by this budget to substantially raise their tax rates,

you realize that the claim of the Premier on this is at the best a half-truth, and probably less than that.

There is a direct relation between the economy and taxation and between employment and taxation. There is quote here from Maurice Western, in a *Victoria Times* article. He's an Ottawa writer, talking about the federal budget. But of course the question of taxation and budgets is the same in both instances. We talk in general principles.

He talks about the anticipated budget, et cetera: "By freeing a great volume of purchasing power hopes to boost production and increase jobs." We in this province, by contrast, are essentially increasing taxation and, in my view, are probably cutting down on employment. Where are the new jobs then to come from? If there is a need for keeping taxes low and keeping taxes selective, where can we expect new jobs to come from? — a point that simply hasn't been considered by the Ministers who spoke in this debate. It is to my considerable regret that I find this to be the case.

Again, the Economic Council of Canada's ninth report, p. 63, suggests that "agricultural employment will decline in absolute terms, while manufacturing will increase but at a very low rate...", and it suggests that the new jobs are going to be in other areas, such as finance, insurance — community, business and personal services and public administration. Those are areas which, it is suggested to us by the Economic Council of Canada, we should encourage as job-creation areas.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: It's curious that this budget of this particular NDP Government flies in the face of everything I've heard said by your party, the NDP, in the House of Commons. You can't have your cake and eat it too. You had better make up your mind either to support your Premier or to support the leader of the national NDP.

The Economic Council goes on: "To be consistent with the overall pattern," I am quoting from p. 95, "the current government expenditures in goods and services should not increase in real terms more than 5 per cent per year."

There's a very clear suggestion there in the Economic Council of Canada's report that governments, should at this stage not be increasing taxation. They should be encouraging employment in other ways. Because employment is undoubtedly not only a major problem now but will be for some years to come.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): You know where the problem is. It's there in Ottawa.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The calls that come across the floor from the backbench are typical of the stupidity of some of the other remarks we've had.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. The answer is not to engage in across-the-floor discussion. If you would, please kindly address the Chair.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Very good, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I wouldn't use that term in addressing the Chair. I accept your criticism.

The point is this, Mr. Speaker, that in mid-

[[Page 703](#)]

September we had the unemployment in this province slightly over 60,000; I believe the figure is 61,000. It has gone up half again since then; yet there's not been a word from the Ministers of the Crown of this province as to what the cause might be or how they are really going to go about dealing with it.

They have consistently attempted to blame the official Opposition — and we in this party have blamed them enough over the years for what they were doing when they were the government. But I think the time has come for the Government itself to start facing up to a few facts as to what it is doing and what the increase has been since they took over.

We cannot continue in this Legislature and in this province simply throwing verbal bricks across the floor at one another and ignoring the real needs of people. It's a government elected on a platform of assisting people. Yet, in debates on employment, when we have getting on for 100,000 people unemployed — the highest unemployment since the Depression in this province — we have Government Ministers quite willing to ignore the problem, to ignore what effects there can be on taxation which could improve the situation.

We're heard from four Ministers this afternoon, including the Premier, none of whom has really dealt with the issues of this sub-amendment which, as I read earlier, Mr. Speaker, is the effect of provincial taxation on employment.

It's fine to talk about all these people who have come from the north or written from the north or phoned from the north. They have spoken to Social Credit Members; they've no doubt spoken to the NDP Members; they've certainly spoken to us. They have told us that there is a problem there. There is uncertainty. There is need.

The quotes from the newspapers have all indicated this. All the papers of the province. And yet this government has apparently decided that here in Victoria, in this House, certain statistics will be quoted and only those statistics — I refer to those quoted by the Premier — none other will be used, and certainly not the other statistics put forward by my Hon. friend the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison). It's a case of dealing with a real problem for people. The Government should attempt to put on the record and into debate on the basis of factual information the whole situation and not simply a few things dragged out at random for political purposes for berating the former administration for some sins of omission or of commission of 20, 10, five, two or one year ago.

We are dealing with unemployed people here in British Columbia today. We are not dealing with what's happened in the past.

The comment's been made, "Well, where are our Members from the north?" I trust that when the Liberal Party forms the Government of this province, and we put in our budget a map of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, we won't leave off the name of Prince Rupert, nor will we leave off the name of Trail. When we put a map of the Province of British Columbia into the budget, perhaps we won't just use the B.C. Rail map of the province. We'll try to indicate the interior with its cities, and the northern cities, which have been left off. We'll try to indicate to them that even though they don't live along the rail tracks of B.C.R., at least they're part of the province too.

I trust that even though we don't at the moment have Members in the north, we will be able at least to indicate to them more concern than this budget, in the very printing of that map, indicates for northern British Columbia.

We have a situation in B.C. where we have taxes going up. There are the municipal taxes I talked about yesterday. The effect of inflation and of course progressive taxation means that the tax bite will be larger for the regular citizen. This, of course, indicates to us that we're no doubt going to have to have supplementary estimates or even a supplementary budget at some later time when this Government realizes that its budget, its efforts to create large surpluses — which may have made sense in the days of our former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett), in the days of rapid expansion but simply don't make sense today in terms of our unemployment — will have to be adjusted and there'll have to be a change.

We are not having enough money, we feel, put in the hands of the consumer. We're not having enough money put in his hands by way of tax reduction. There naturally have been many articles to this effect in recent days, because of the measures in the federal budget which, as they affect the economy as a whole, are designed to increase employment.

There is an article by a man by the name of Downey, a C.A. in the *Vancouver Province*, February 14, 1973, where he talks about the tax cuts. He talks about the actions of the Province of Ontario in matching, in meshing their budget with the federal budget so that the Ontario tax rate will go down and the overall affect will be beneficial. He talks about the need for co-ordination, something that we haven't seen in this province and something that I trust we'll see in the future.

Why have we not seen this? Why do we apparently have a budget so out of date with the needs of the

100,000 unemployed in this province? Why do we have Ministers getting to their feet and ignoring the basic questions that are facing us right at this moment?

There are a number of reasons. Perhaps one of the most basic is that of course we have a Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) who hasn't got the time to devote himself really and truly to the job to the degree that it requires. Now it's simple to say, "Oh,

[[Page 704](#)]

I have to hold onto Finance, to keep control of what's happening among the other Ministers." That's nonsense. Because the Premier can hire and fire Ministers very quickly — and I note a smile from the faces of some of the backbench when I say "fire." He can change them.

The need is for a man to take a hold of that portfolio, understand what is going on, co-ordinate the efforts of this province with others and, of course, the federal government, and see what can be done to deal with the substantial increase in unemployment in British Columbia since the NDP Government took office.

Again I quote from the Economic Council of Canada, p. 97, It says:

"Yet major gaps" — that's between federal and provincial — "cannot be allowed to emerge between the effect of these decisions and the overall behavior we have attributed to governments, or the realization of the objectives we have set forth will be jeopardized."

We recommend that each year one of the federal-provincial meetings of the Prime Ministers of Ministers of Finance be devoted to the medium-term performance indicators developed by the Economic Council of Canada and to an examination of their implications for the federal and provincial governments, Mr. Speaker, few of us here, especially the Hon. Member for Coquitlam (Hon. Mr. Barrett) really have the time to go into, or to receive all the economic material we would like. Yet we all, undoubtedly have more time available for examining this, analyzing this material, considering what can be done. All of us, no doubt, have more time than he has, because of the fact that he has the Premiership of this Province, and has many other responsibilities, not the least of which is the presidency of B.C. Rail.

Now it's simple to follow an old budget plan put forward by previous governments. It's simple to do that, adding in a little more money here, and a little more money there. It's simple to do that, but it doesn't do a thing for the present situation of 100,000 unemployed.

If taxation can affect employment and unemployment, and let's face it, it can, I think it's time that we faced up to the fact in British Columbia, that we have switched from an economy which was pretty much a boom economy, which was pretty much capable of employing large numbers of people, a very large increase in the labour force each year, to something else.

It's time that this portfolio was given to a specific person with ability. Perhaps the Premier will have to look outside the House, suggest to one of his backbenchers or even a Minister that he step down, so that another person knowledgeable in the area can be brought in to handle this.

But our present situation, where we go simply on a day-to-day basis in this House, on the strength of a budget which does nothing for one of these critical problems, is simply not forgivable in this day and age. We need someone dealing with this problem; considering it from the British Columbia point of view; co-ordinating with the federal and other provincial governments; taking care to make sure that the budget is not simply a list of the way things are going to be spent, but a vital document that indicates what objectives can be reached by spending in certain ways.

We haven't had this at all from this Government, nor will we have it, when we have a Minister of Finance who simply hasn't the time nor probably the training to do that type of job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: The time has come for the Premier to realize that he cannot continue to consider transportation questions only in terms of the PGE. He cannot continue to consider budget questions only in terms on money in and money out. He's got to consider effect. And the effect of much of what has happened in the last six months has been an increase of 50 per cent in our unemployment rate.

So the time has come for him to suggest that some Member of his cabinet or backbench step down and he go out and get someone with the ability to handle this matter — handle this portfolio, Bring him into the Government so the people of British Columbia can at least get what they're paying for.

Now I can suggest plenty of Members who would be happy to step down. Perhaps I can suggest the jobs to which they could go, if it's necessary to buy them out. But the thing is that the unemployed in this province cannot continue to be treated in this negligent, casual way that they have been treated by this Government up to now.

It's simply not good enough to ignore their problems, to bring in statistics which undoubtedly do not reflect the whole picture in the north of B.C., and claim that that's all that has to be done.

It's been suggested on my right by the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) that 22 operations have been curtailed because of the effect of the budget. Well, we've had plenty of phone calls from there. I can't guarantee that his figures are right, but I do know that there's plenty of suspicions, plenty of worry.

I can suggest that if the mayor of Fort St. John, or the mayor of Dawson Creek, or the mayor of any other community in the north thought things were so great, perhaps he wouldn't be coming down here with a great pile of mail on Monday, to discuss these things with the Premier.

The impression given by the Premier was that this

[[Page 705](#)]

guy's coming down to tell us how great things are, how things are booming, increases here and there in drilling. Well, that isn't the impression we've got. I trust that at the end of that meeting on Monday, a true and more factual appreciation of what is happening in northern B.C. will be given to this House by the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, this sub-amendment to our amendment is one that we support. We support it with regret because we wish the Government had done enough so we didn't have to have it debated on the floor of this House at this time. But when we have a Government which is callous and indifferent to the problems of these people, a Government which has refused point-blank to deal with this, well then we have no choice but to support this sub-amendment.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS-14

Richter	Chabot	Jordan
Smith	Fraser	Phillips
Morrison	Schroeder	McGeer
Anderson, D.A.	Williams, L.A.	Brousson
Wallace	Curtis	

NAYS-33

Hall	Barrett	Dailly
Strachan	Nimsick	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford

Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Calder	Skelly	Gabelmann
Lauk	Lea	Young
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves
Webster	Lewis	Liden

PAIRS

Gardom Macdonald
Kelly McClelland

MR. SPEAKER: There is some debate on the amendment. The Hon. Member for North Vancouver—Capilano.

MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver—Capilano): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refer to the wording of the amendment as it was originally moved — "that the budget neglects the general good of the citizens of this province by failing to provide...adequate consumer protection."

I would like to make some remarks on this subject. I started early this year in a campaign on a particular area of this subject. As far as I am concerned, I propose to continue this campaign regardless of comments from some Members of the Government such as, "Well, yes, we're going to do something about this sometime. The legislation is coming," or "the department is working on it."

Until we actually see it and until we see the concrete evidence that these things are happening, I am going to continue my campaign on consumer protection in British Columbia in general and on the subject of mortgages in particular.

I'm not going to go through all the gory details again today, but I do want to clarify the problem a little bit, clarify one or two special points and underline, perhaps, some of the human misery. I want to show just how little the Government has been doing so far.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, when I was discussing this in the main debate on the budget, I mentioned the address, 430 Columbia Avenue, in New Westminster. I said that I would refer to it again and explain why I was particularly mentioning that address. I would like to tell you today the names of some of the firms that work out of that address and the names of some of the people who are directors and shareholders of those firms. For instance, at 430 Columbia there is a firm called Western Organ Sales. Its directors are Stanley Wright, Robert Keenan and Gordon Grondahl. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that that firm shows up over and over again as purchasing and dealing in mortgages, it is not registered as a mortgage broker by the Securities Commission. Yet the Attorney General tells us that he is investigating and his people are busy pursuing this field.

Also at the same address, Mr. Speaker, 430 Columbia in New Westminster, is Safeco Mortgage and Loan. Its shareholders are Herbert Lawrence McCallum and Margaret Elaine Cameron. Now Herbert McCallum I have mentioned a number of times in previous speeches on this subject. Herbert McCallum is the principal in a firm called Modern Finance, now called Modern Mortgage and Loan, whose registration was renewed on January 12, 1973, for another year — as recently as that.

The secretary of Safeco Mortgage and Loan is also Stan Wright whom I just mentioned and who is the president of Western Organ Sales. So there is obviously some connection here between Mr. Wright and Mr. McCallum. Then of course, we mentioned the other day, Midtown Mortgage and Loan of Calgary, and Mr.

McCallum is principal of that firm and he was selling his mortgages from Calgary to the Safeco Mortgage and Loan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that Safeco Mortgage and Loan is not registered as a mortgage broker by the Provincial Securities Commission and the registrar of the Mortgage Brokers Act. Not registered.

Another one from 430 Columbia Avenue, New

[[Page 706](#)]

Westminster is Jackstan Securities. The shareholders are Stan Wright, Robert Keenan and Harry Ritchie of Montreal. It is not registered, Mr. Speaker, under the *Mortgage Brokers Act*. Not registered.

Another one, called Penney Holdings, 430 Columbia, is not registered and there is not even any record of it at the Companies Office.

Another one from 430 Columbia is Stratford Estates Limited. The shareholders are Stan Wright, Mr. Grondahl and also Jim Wolstoncroft, who is a director. It is not registered as a mortgage broker, but the name has appeared a number of times on mortgage documents that I have seen.

Mid City Acceptance Corporation, 430 Columbia — president, Stan Wright; secretary, Robert Keenan. Tremar Holdings Limited, 430 Columbia, is not registered as a mortgage broker. Stan Wright, Robert Keenan and Harry Ritchie are the shareholders.

One other from 430 Columbia is called Sunridge Homes — Stan Wright, John Wright, Gordon Grondahl and Hubert Zobrist of Seattle — widely connected these firms of 430 Columbia — not registered as a mortgage broker. Three other firms I heard of this morning, all of them dealing in mortgages and not one of them registered under the Securities Commission. Victory Finance Company of Canada Limited, Campbell Associates Finance Corporation and Campbell and Associates Properties Management Limited — none of these three are registered. Apparently a John and Freda Campbell are the main shareholders of those three companies. So it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the people responsible for the administration of the Mortgage Brokers Act have not been fulfilling their responsibilities.

When I was speaking the other day, I told some stories of some sad situations in northern British Columbia or central British Columbia, including one from One Hundred Mile House. I mentioned particularly that the man who had been in trouble at One Hundred Mile House had recently been able to obtain a satisfactory first mortgage at, I think, 12 per cent, with no bonus and he was very pleased with the arrangement. I mentioned the name of that firm. Unfortunately none of the Press carried the name of that firm as an example of a small mortgage broker who was doing his job and was giving fair and honest mortgages and doing it in the country.

The very next morning at 7 o'clock in my room, my phone rang. It was the gentleman who owned this company and he was very upset and said, "Look, it is time you mentioned some of the good guys in this business, not only the bad ones." I said, "Well, I did mention it, but unfortunately the Press didn't pick up your name." So I am repeating it now in fairness to this gentleman because he told me that he had placed in the past year over \$15 million worth of business in central and northern British Columbia and he gave me the guidelines under which he worked and I certainly would respect him. This was Alpha Mortgage of Kamloops — David McNair was the principal in that firm. Let's hear it for Mr. McNair.

The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) tried to indicate that under the present *Mortgage Brokers Act* his department couldn't move very far. I certainly agree, Mr. Speaker, that this Act needs amendments but there are things that could be done right now. For instance, under section 4 of the Act it says,

"The Registrar shall grant registration or re-newal of registration where in his opinion the applicant is suitable for registration and the proposed registration is not objectionable. The registrar shall not refuse to grant or refuse to renew without giving the applicant an opportunity to be heard. He may in his discretion attach to the registration or renewal such terms, conditions or restrictions as he may consider necessary."

In other words he can attach any restrictions that he may consider necessary.

However, in section 8 it says, "The registrar shall suspend or cancel any registration where, in his opinion, that person would be disentitled to registration if he were an applicant." — an applicant under section 4. So, "the registrar shall suspend or cancel where in his opinion that person would be disentitled to registration."

I think there has been ample evidence of a number of the firms I have mentioned which, if applying for the first time, would not be acceptable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the penalties that are available in this Act, because they are substantial and the registrar could be, perhaps, considering the use of them right today:

"Every person who violates any provision of this Act is liable, on summary conviction, to a fine of not more than \$5,000 on first offence or to a fine of not more than \$5,000 and to imprisonment for a term of not more than six months for any subsequent offence or, being a corporation, is liable to a fine of not more than \$ 10,000 for any subsequent offence."

These are substantial penalties. I have detailed a number of infractions of the Act and I think the Attorney General should be moving in these areas now, without waiting for the amendments and the changes that I'm sure he's bringing.

I want to mention another point, Mr. Speaker, that came to my attention yesterday afternoon, perhaps more strongly than before. I have had a number of hints about this particular thing. It's a point I cannot prove but I have had a number of hints, suggestions, comments about it and I think it needs to be said in public.

The indications that I have are that mortgage brokers are on many occasions referred to people in

[[Page 707](#)]

trouble by the officers of other lending institutions who are not prepared to extend credit under their terms of reference, or by officers and personnel of credit bureaus, or various kinds of collection agencies. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that it is not uncommon for the mortgage broker, if he is referred to one of these people in trouble and is able to write a mortgage under the kinds of terms I have described, to slip the referring gentleman or person perhaps a \$100 under the table or a small percentage or whatever the bonus was.

Now as I say, Mr. Speaker, I cannot prove that, I have no specifics, but this has been mentioned to me by a number of people on a number of occasions and I think there is a little fire behind that kind of smoke. I think that is a pretty unsavoury kind of mess.

I would like to give you one or two quotes from some of the letters I have received. You may remember that I told you the story of a 76 year old senior citizen here in Victoria who had some problems with a mortgage written for him by National Trust. I didn't suggest in any way that National Trust was doing something illegal, that it was not in strict terms with what is normally done on the conventional mortgages. I did suggest that National Trust might have shown a little more of the milk of human kindness for this gentleman of 76. The gentleman about whom I was talking has written me a letter since my speech in the House and I would like to share it with you:

"I read the report in today's Press of your speech in the House yesterday and the least I can do is to thank you for the trouble you took in looking into the case I presented, which I still think represents usury of the worst kind. I see no justification for the National Trust charges. I went there and I told them so.

I also told them that I could accept a reasonable charge for disruption of documents and I said that the maximum I would listen to would be three months penalty. I have been there repeatedly to try and find a way to beat their rules without success.

However, for the sake of many people besides myself, I hope your work there is fruitful."

"Anyway," and, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will listen closely to this line — "anyway you can look forward to a reward for your humanitarian effort by a front seat in heaven in all good time."

MRS. JORDAN: Is that guaranteed?

MR. BROUSSON: Mr. Speaker, finally, finally I am going to get a front bench seat on the Government side. (Laughter). This letter, Mr. Speaker, came from Valemount. What I want to do now is not go into details — you have heard the details — but I want you to hear the human misery that is crying out:

"Living as I do in an out of the way corner of British Columbia, information and protective services are hard to come by to say the least. It was with a sense of relief I heard that you were investigating, or at least interested, in rip-off mortgage companies and their practices."

And he finishes up his letter, "Can your office advise or help?" Can your office advise or help?

Another letter from north central British Columbia: "Do you think there is any way that we can get a return of this money or who could see to look into it."

This letter — I read you the story, I will read you the ending of the letter now. It said, "So in summary, because they needed \$2200, they paid a \$500 bonus; they paid \$684 in 12 monthly payments; they paid \$2600 for the pay-off, or \$3800 just in 12 months and still haven't been taken off Penney Holdings' hook. Go get 'em! "

The last letter I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, comes from the case that I used as my last case in my speech the other afternoon:

"Once I realized that I was trapped, I put my house up for sale, and it still is. I realize I will have to pay a penalty but I would rather lose my house than support a bunch of bloodsuckers for the rest of my life.

I want you to understand that I am not feeling sorry for myself or that I am trying to wriggle out of a bad deal. With the proceeds from my house I can square away my debts. As I earn over \$12,000 per year, I can buy another one.

The main reason that I am writing this letter is that I am declaring war on AVCO Finance and I need help to be effective. Whether I get help or not doesn't matter, I will fight them anyway."

Mr. Speaker, who is going to answer these cries for help. Who is going to prosecute? Who is going to reform the offenders? Who is going to throw the usurers out of the temple? Is it going to be the lawyers in the Attorney General's office? Or is it going to be the social workers in the Minister of Rehabilitation's Department? Let us find out what can be done, Mr. Speaker, or what is being done, if anything.

I talked at length about the storefront at 430 Columbia Street in New Westminster, That storefront is actually the store where Wright's Furniture is. But behind that storefront are all of the mortgage companies that I told the House about. I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I said the other afternoon. We need another kind of storefront. We need storefront consumer affairs offices across British Columbia.

We want these to provide a place where young lawyers, young financial people, bright young people can work and get a tremendous experience in legal matters, in financial matters, in human affairs;

[[Page 708](#)]

advising, dealing and helping in an impartial way the people that are faced with the kinds of problems that I have been outlining.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General and other Members of the cabinet keep repeating that they can't do everything at once. They have only been in office five or six months. "Give us a little more time." Well, Mr. Speaker, to do what I am suggesting wouldn't require any kind of a takeover — wouldn't even require taking over the mortgage business, as one Member suggested the other day — wouldn't require the takeover of the insurance business, auto insurance or life insurance; wouldn't require takeover of the natural gas business. Nothing complicated. at all. Very simple.

I would think that in five or six months we could have made some progress in this direction. Let's take a look at the Consumer Affairs Office that exists today under this Government and as it is provided for in this budget.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General has been down to visit his Consumer Affairs Office. I wonder if the Minister of Finance has been down to visit the Consumer Affairs Office. I should tell you, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Finance, that office is in the basement of the Law Courts building just a few blocks away from here. I think the Premier and the Minister of Finance, the Attorney General, and some of the other Members of the cabinet should go and visit it because I don't think they have been there. I rather suspect they haven't.

I wonder how many Members from the backbench of the Government have been to visit that office. I know the First Member for Vancouver–Little Mountain (Ms. Young) spoke about this the other day and I was delighted to hear the approach she was taking on this subject. I hope more Members of the backbench of the Government will take this matter up because I think very few people in this House really know what goes on in that little office.

Well, it's a big office — it's empty of people, that's the problem. It is a great big office. There is room for a lot more people in that particular office.

The Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) spoke earlier in this debate and outlined the staff that they have there. Really it is 1% senior people and one lady — 2 3/4 people is really all the staff that office has. These are people that I must say are dedicated and have a sense of mission, but they are facing an impossible task, Mr. Speaker.

I have visited their offices and I made recent enquiries as to the kind of correspondence that is coming into them. The First Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain mentioned this the other day, the kind of correspondence she had had on the basis of one public appearance, on television. Well, in November and December, that's two months very recently, this office had something of the order of 170 letters of complaint — that is in two months.

In January, last month — one month — they had over 150 letters of complaint. Mr. Speaker, roughly halfway through February, this month, they have had over 100. Now I don't know the exact figures — I am not privy to them, but those are approximations and you will find them reasonably accurate, at the very least — they are higher than that actually I believe. So that indicates the kind of mail that is coming in and the kind of welled-up demand there is for this kind of service, and we have 2 3/4 people over there to do something about it.

I wonder what that office is going to do when I take my files, as I am going to next week, and hand the whole set of files in there — suggesting that this is the office that should be providing some help to these people.

I want to say publicly at this point — out there, there are people with consumer problems in British Columbia right now. I hope they'll flood the Consumer Affairs Officer in the Law Courts building with their letters to explain their problems and ask for help. I hope they'll pour those letters in.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you just how little help this budget is in this area. The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has talked about the \$8 million extra he's got in his budget compared to last year. On the surface that sounds like something is going to happen, doesn't it? It sounds great. But where are the increases?

General administration. General administration is where the Consumer Affairs Office is listed today. In there, there's a total increase for all the areas of general administration of the Attorney General's office of \$300,000. For the Law Courts, \$2.7 million increase; the registrar of lands and things of that sort, \$1.4 million; trustees office, \$100,000 — these are the increases for next year over this present year.

Insurance and real estate, for instance, has no increase. The Securities Commission, \$100,000 more; the R.C.M.P., \$2.6 million; corrections, \$1.2 million. Mr. Speaker, there's your total of \$8 million. There's nothing in there that can provide any assistance in the area of consumer affairs and protection of the public in British Columbia.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this takes us through to March, 1974. In other words, if the Government says:

"Well, give us a little time. We're going to do something quickly later on in the session, or next month or the spring or something," the budget is to March 31, 1974 and there is nothing in it yet to help in the area of consumer affairs.

If we're going to have some more help in consumer affairs before very late in 1974 — that's a long way off — we've got to start now. You can't all of a sudden leap into action in these areas. It will take a while to do it; we have to start now.

[[Page 709](#)]

As I said before, from now on I want everyone to write their letters of complaint, to write their stories about good mortgages, bad mortgages and all the other problems of consumer affairs — and there are many of them — to the Consumer Affairs Officer in care of the parliament buildings here in Victoria. I hope those 2 3/4 people get flooded with letters and I hope they'll appeal to the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) for more help.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize my point again: apart from the legislation and the enforcement I've asked for, apart from the programmes of education, apart from the programmes of bringing in other members of the industry to an advisory council, the key thing here — and I hope the Government will listen — is consumer advisory offices in storefronts across the province.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to vote against the budget. I want to make that very clear; I was going to support this amendment. But I am prepared now to make a deal.

No, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to make an offer the Government cannot refuse.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us what it is.

MR. BROUSSON: I think it's a pretty sporting offer. If they'll agree to three things, I'm prepared to support their budget.

First of all, Mr. Speaker....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. BROUSSON: I hadn't thought of that one. I'd better up the ante a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, for the first thing, I want to go back to two items I mentioned earlier and I want to repeat them to you; both of these are taxation matters. I suggested that the senior citizens of this province badly need help on their taxes and that if the Government would agree immediately to increase the homeowner grant to senior citizens to cover the school taxes as item one, it would cost very, very little.

We would remove a tremendous amount of misery. These senior citizens would be able to keep their homes instead of being faced with the problem of their increasing taxes and increasing cost of living. We'd be improving the job situation. We'd be improving the inflation and cost of living situation throughout the province.

That's point one: remove the school taxes from the senior citizens' homes right now — not next year when the cabinet figures out how to do it; do it for the senior citizens this year.

Second, I mentioned the other day the problems of tax reform needed particularly in the 5 per cent taxes. I suggested that if we want to encourage residential construction in B.C. — we say we're going to do all these expensive things about landbanks and many other things — it would be very easy for the Government to remove the 5 per cent tax from the cost of residential construction materials.

I want to tell you specifically what a difference this could make. I spoke earlier this week with a firm that manufactures a large number of low-cost, prefabricated modular homes in the Fraser Valley. Many of these homes are sold to people that are do-it-yourselfers; they finish the home themselves. This firm sells a three bedroom home of about 1,100 square feet prefabricated. In other words, all the parts are ready to put together. The framing is all cut

to size ready for the do-it-yourselfer to put together and build his home.

They sell this for \$10,000, Mr. Speaker, plus 5 per cent or \$500. So the man who's trying to cut every corner and get his home as economically as possible has to add \$500 on because of the provincial government tax.

Alternatively, the same firm, if you buy this home in what's called a modular form, completely assembled but cut in half to be assembled on a basement foundation or something of that sort, it sells then for \$16,000 plus 5 per cent or \$800 more that has to come from the little guy building his own home.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. BROUSSON: Don't talk about the federal government tax on this; I have for years supported removing the federal taxes from construction and building materials. Instead of always waiting for the other guy to do it, this Government could do it right now in British Columbia.

Between \$400 and \$800 or \$900 could be saved directly in the cost of every home, including \$500 on the parts, if you like, for a prefab home. This is a kind of house that many, many people buy and put together themselves. That \$500 would be very, very important to them.

So that's my second point, Mr. Speaker: I suggest the Government remove the 5 per cent taxes from residential construction materials.

My third point, Mr. Speaker, is if the Government will commit themselves this year in the current estimates to spend at least \$250,000 to start the storefront consumer advisory programme across the province — it's an offer I am sure the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) can't refuse — if we get those three points I will vote for the budget.

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

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe

[[Page 710](#)]

Sound): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this amendment.

I wish to draw to your attention and to the attention of the Members of the House some strange anomalies which have arisen as a result of the budget which is under consideration, anomalies which arise because of the burden of provincial tax that is thrust upon the people of this province against their general benefit.

It's noteworthy that on page 14 of the budget the Hon. Minister of Finance said:

"The promising 1973 economic outlook for the Province offers encouragement for resulting buoyant revenues to entirely support the greatly enlarged Provincial budget for fiscal year 1973/74 without the need to borrow or resort to the use of surplus funds."

This large budget which is under consideration now — \$1.7 billion-odd, the whole thing — can be supported without any resort to the surplus funds which the previous administration left to this Government on August 30, and without the obligation to borrow. Yet we have in this budget clear indication from the Minister of Finance that he intends to raise taxes in certain areas of the business community of this province.

To do so, he makes it clear that he does not recognize that the increase of those taxes will reflect directly upon all the people of the province who are consumers. The suggestion that royalties will be increased on petroleum products, that royalties are to be increased on natural gas, is taxation which can only affect the eventual consumer of those products.

Therefore, the burden of the provincial tax falls heavily upon all of our citizens and is against the general good; taxes which are not needed in accordance with the words of the Minister of Finance when he introduced the

budget two weeks ago.

The Government failed to understand that its actions in this budget and the activities of the other departments have a multiplying effect, all of which come home to rest on the consumer of this province. I wish to deal with one specific area of consumer who appears to have been forgotten — a group of consumers who were forgotten by the previous government and they've been forgotten by this government.

I speak of those people who occupy rented accommodation. The policies of the government, as enunciated in this budget, and the programmes of the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) can only foretell increased expenditures required at the local level throughout this entire province. Those policies will reflect in ever-increasing local taxes. This is a burden from provincial programmes and from provincial tax. Education tax is one which is levied under provincial legislation.

The increase in school taxes is one which will be felt by every homeowner, but also be felt by every tenant. There is no Member of this House who, after all these years, needs to have it explained to him or her that the taxes the owner of rented accommodation must pay are reflected in the rents that the tenant must pay. As those taxes increase, so the rents increase.

The previous government, as an afterthought a year ago, saw fit to grant a special allowance to the senior citizens to apply against their rental costs. The previous government, however, refused to provide any relief for tenants similar to that which the homeowner grant provides for home owners.

It is a matter of dismay for me to see that this Government has fallen into the identical trap. They have increased the homeowner grant. They have indicated that the increase will also apply to senior citizens in respect of their rental grant. But there is nothing for the tenant who is not a senior citizen.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is causing serious hardship throughout the length and breadth of this province. There are many tenants, working people, who cannot afford the rents that they are paying now and will not be able to afford the rents that they will need to pay when the rental increases come through following the next municipal tax bill. Certainly this applies to those tenants living on fixed incomes — the older citizens who have not yet reached the age when they qualify for the special renter's grant.

This is the direct burden and it's one which the Government itself has recognized in special circumstances. Indeed, last October when we dealt with the increases in the moneys that would be made available to senior citizens — the Mincome provisions — the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) appointed a special committee of three people, a special group of investigators.

They were never named but these investigators were sent about the province to inquire whether or not, as a result of the increased allowances to certain senior citizens, there was improper increase in rents.

Finally in January of this year the Minister reported to the Press, but has never reported to the House, that unfair rent hikes were only minimal. They found as a result of their investigation that there had been rent increases between 5 and 6 per cent. The Minister's words are: "These are not unfair increases."

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in many, many cases an increase of 5 or 6 per cent is unfair. It is a serious burden to these tenants. Yet we have no indication that the Minister or any of the Government are prepared to make similar inquiries in respect of those people who do not receive the additional allowances under Mincome. This is a shortfall which is not only creating serious difficulties for tenants who are continuing to be tenants, but is

[[Page 711](#)]

also creating another serious and tragic situation.

I refer to the increasing incidence by which rental accommodation is being converted under the strata titles legislation of this province into condominium accommodation — the situation where tenants are suddenly faced with

the most difficult choice that many of them have ever faced in their lives.

That choice is: find other rental accommodation or buy your apartment. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a direct result of the policies of the Government opposite and of their lack of action in respect of measures which would significantly reduce the burden of provincial tax as it falls upon renters.

Let me give you an example. There is in West Vancouver an apartment building known as Esquimalt Towers at 1750 Esquimalt Avenue. In October last the tenants of this apartment building were advised that the ownership of the property had changed and that rental cheques should be made payable to Vanguard Properties Ltd. That was last October.

On February 12 of this year the tenants of the building received a letter advising that they had to purchase their suites. The very next day sales agents for the owners visited each of the tenants with their sale sheets at the ready and were prepared to sit down and discuss the basis upon which purchases could be made.

On February 17, five days after the first letter, each of the tenants received a formal notice to vacate. They are now left without any opportunity except to buy or find other accommodation.

You might say, Mr. Speaker, well — find other accommodation. The fact of the matter is, and statistics will show, that in metropolitan Vancouver, the vacancy rate for apartment buildings is about one-half of 1 per cent. If the Members do not appreciate the significance of that, let me explain.

A decade ago, in the normal operation of apartment construction in the City of Vancouver, a vacancy rate of 6 to 8 per cent was deemed normal. A vacancy rate of 6 to 8 per cent provides in total market sufficient accommodation so that a tenant unable to pay his rent, dissatisfied with his accommodation, can easily change that accommodation.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the vacancy rate drops to one-half of 1 per cent, it means that in the City of Vancouver there is no alternative accommodation available for rent. Apartments come vacant one day and are filled the next.

Therefore, when you receive a notice to vacate and you set out to search for other accommodation, you are unlikely to find accommodation of equal calibre or at equal rent. As a matter of fact, you are most likely to find accommodation of lower calibre at higher rent. So that's what faces these people.

Oh, there's the other alternative — purchase. Let me tell you the terms of purchase. I'm reading from a letter which comes from an elderly citizen who is retired and living in this apartment building mainly occupied by elderly retired citizens. The letter goes on:

"Some of the elderly tenants, in sheer desperation at the thought of losing what they thought was security, are considering purchasing their suites. At ages of 70 to 80, who wants a mortgage of \$25,000 or more at 9 3/4 per cent payable over 30 years? That's the deal that's being offered. They can buy their suites. They don't have to pay cash but they can assume or undertake a \$25,000 mortgage at 9 3/4 per cent payable over 30 years."

In the first few years these purchasers of these suites would hardly make any impression on the principal of that mortgage at all. Moreover, the resale market for such accommodation is extremely limited. These people are faced with a deadline of April 30.

That's the kind of choice that the Government and its taxation policies leaves for this group of citizens. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is a sufficient indictment of that Government and this budget to encourage any responsible Member to support the amendment.

I suggest, also, that the only way of providing any relief from situations such as I have described, is for the Government to move and move quickly to do two things. First of all, prohibit the conversion of rented apartment accommodation to self-owned condominiums, and to freeze such moves for a period of 12 months — until such time

as the Government can conduct investigations and satisfy itself that the availability of rental accommodation in all areas of the province where these practices are occurring is sufficient to meet the need.

I suggest as well, that in those cases where the conversion of rental accommodations to condominiums ownership is permitted, that at least six months notice be given to the tenants in which they can find alternative accommodations. This at least would be some relief from the burden that is being felt by these people.

Also appreciate this, Mr. Speaker, that if this kind of move is not taken, if these tenants are forced out of the apartment because they cannot buy, then they too form part of the ever-increasing market demand for rental accommodation. They make it increasingly difficult for other people to acquire rental accommodation. If these people have money and can pay high rents, then they're in the position to go out into the market and force up the rents on other apartment accommodation if the Government does nothing, if the Government makes no move.

We have had requests for rental accommodation grievance boards. We have had requests for amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act to ensure that rental increases can properly be reviewed. Yet the Government in this budget, and in none of its pronouncements so far in this House, has indicated

[[Page 712](#)]

their willingness to deal quickly and responsibly with this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, in the budget, in the third paragraph, as the Hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) spoke a week ago, he said, "This budget heralds a new era for the people of our province. An era where the rights of the individual are supreme. We are committed to making this a just and open era in the governing of this province." Mr. Speaker, this budget and the taxing policies of this government make these words untrue.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Speaker, we have listened this afternoon, and on other occasions as well, to the Premier of this province selectively release information that has been conveyed to him, either by telephone, or letter, or telegram. I really do mean selectively. Because he does get communications which he certainly wouldn't want to publicly reveal.

I have, Mr. Speaker, such a telegram right here. It will tell what the taxation policies very clearly are going to do to the economics of the northeastern part of British Columbia.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Order. This would be concerning a sub-amendment which has already been disposed of by the House.

MR. CHABOT: This is concerning taxation — on the main amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must speak in general terms concerning the main amendment.

MR. CHABOT: There is no bill on the order paper.

This telegram is addressed to:

"THE HON. DAVID BARRETT, MLA, PREMIER OF THE PROVINCE :

"PREMIER BARRETT, OVER THE PAST QUARTER CENTURY AMOCO CANADA HAS INVESTED MORE THAN \$86 MILLION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA CREATING MANY JOBS FOR RESIDENTS. A LARGE PORTION OF THIS MONEY WAS FOR EXPLORATION IN REMOTE AREAS. AS A RESULT OF THESE EXPENDITURES AND PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF ONE SUCCESSFUL EXPLORATION VENTURE, WE NOW PRODUCE ABOUT 17 PER CENT OF THE PROVINCE'S GAS PLUS A MODEST AMOUNT OF CRUDE OIL.

THESE INVESTMENTS ARE JUST BEGINNING TO RETURN SOME REVENUE. AT THE END OF 1972 OUR GROSS REVENUE RECOVERED WAS ONLY \$9 MILLION, LEAVING A DEFICIT OF OVER \$77 MILLION. THESE

INVESTMENTS WERE MADE IN WHAT WE CONSIDERED A STABLE ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND WITH THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAD FIXED ROYALTY RATES THROUGH 1975.

MOST INVESTMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH OUR CURRENT GAS PRODUCTION WERE MADE DURING THE PAST THREE YEARS WITH A DEFINITE PROSPECT OF HIGHER PRODUCT PRICES. YOUR ANNOUNCED OIL ROYALTY INCREASE TO 40 PER CENT IS CLEARLY EXCESSIVE BY MOST ANY COMPARISON.

THE SUBSEQUENT ANNOUNCEMENT ON TELEVISION..."

It's an announcement relative to gas prices, the taxation of gas, made by the Premier on television one night. I listened to him in fact. And it reads:

"THE SUBSEQUENT ANNOUNCEMENT ON TELEVISION THAT ANY INCREASE IN GAS PRICES WILL GO EXCLUSIVELY TO THE GOVERNMENT IS SHOCKING AND IGNORES ECONOMIC LOGIC FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

"1. THE FREQUENTLY HEARD CLAIM THAT THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY PROFITS ARE EXCESSIVE DOES NOT BEAR CLOSE ANALYSIS. STATISTICS CANADA, FOR EXAMPLE, REPORTED THAT IN 1969 THE CANADIAN OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY EARNED AN 8.8 PER CENT RETURN ON EQUITY. IN THE SAME YEAR CONSTRUCTION EARNED AN AVERAGE OF 12 PER CENT, MANUFACTURING 9.9 PER CENT AND MINING AND RETAIL TRADE 9.1 PER CENT FOR THE HIGH RISK INDUSTRIES THESE RETURNS STRIKE US AS MODEST.

2. AS THE CANADIAN PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED WITH YOU, THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY HAS INVESTED \$1.27 BILLION IN THE PROVINCE FOR EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION AND HAS RECOVERED ONLY \$694 MILLION BEFORE PAYMENT OF TAXES THROUGH 1971. AMCO CANADA'S GAS FACILITIES AT BEAVER RIVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, AND THE ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT AT POINTED MOUNTAIN, NORTHWEST TERRITORY, PROVIDES A RELEVANT CASE HISTORY FOR OUR COMPANY. TO DATE WE HAVE COMMITTED \$64 MILLION TO THE PROJECTS WITH BEAVER RIVER REPRESENTING \$35 MILLION OF THE TOTAL.

TO MAINTAIN OUR CONTRACT COMMITMENTS WE WILL BE REQUIRED TO INVEST AN ADDITIONAL \$30 MILLION-PLUS ON FUTURE WELLS AND COMPRESSION TO MAINTAIN DELIVERABILITY OVER THE LIFE OF THESE RESERVES. THE PAYOUT OF THIS SUM IS EXPECTED TO TAKE 21 YEARS FROM THE START OF EXPLORATION AT THE PRESENT ROYALTY IN EXISTING CONTRACT PRICES. JUST THE CURRENT LEVEL OF INFLATION RAISES DOUBT ABOUT THE ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION FOR SOME OF THESE INVESTMENTS WITH EXISTING LOW GAS PRICES WITHOUT ANY IN-

[[Page 713](#)]

CREASE IN ROYALTY.

3. AS PREVIOUSLY POINTED OUT BY THE CANADIAN PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES, THE AVERAGE INDUSTRY PRICE FOR GAS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA IS 11 CENTS PER MCF COMPARED TO AN AVERAGE PRICE IN ALBERTA OF 16 CENTS PER MCF.

CONSIDERING THE DISADVANTAGE OF OPERATING IN REMOTE LOCATIONS, IT WOULD APPEAR TO EARN AN EQUAL PROFIT, BRITISH COLUMBIA GAS SHOULD BE PRICED HIGHER THAN ALBERTA GAS. WHILE THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY IS GETTING A SUBSTANDARD 11 CENTS PER MCF, FIELD PRICE FOR ITS GAS, A RECENT FOSTER ASSOCIATES REPORT INDICATES THAT B.C. HYDRO CURRENTLY HAS A MARKUP OF 54 CENTS MCF. THIS DISTRIBUTION COST IS THE HIGHEST OF SEVEN MAJOR AREAS SURVEYED IN CANADA. IF THE GOVERNMENT'S STATED INTENT IS TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER, PERHAPS REDUCTION IN B.C. HYDRO'S MARKUP SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED.

4. MANAGEMENT'S PRIME RESPONSIBILITY IS TO ENSURE THAT INVESTMENTS STAND A CHANCE OF RETURNING THE STOCKHOLDER A REASONABLE PROFIT. THE FUNDS AVAILABLE TO US FOR EXPLORATION ARE HIGHLY MOBILE AND WILL BE INVESTED IN AREAS WITH THE GREATEST ECONOMIC POTENTIAL AND STABLE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT.

THE PROSPECTS OF UNILATERAL CANCELLATION OF ROYALTY AGREEMENTS SEVERELY WEAKENS

OUR CONFIDENCE IN THE INVESTMENTS WE HAVE MADE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA. IF THE PROPOSED 40 PER CENT MAXIMUM OIL ROYALTY IS IMPLEMENTED AND IF FUTURE GAS POLICIES ARE WHAT YOU RECENTLY ADVOCATED, WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO CURTAIL OUR EXPLORATION OPERATIONS IN THE PROVINCE.

PENDING CLARIFICATION OF THIS MATTER IT HAS BEEN NECESSARY TO CANCEL THE PROGRAMME OF TWO SEISMIC CREWS AND A THIRD CREW WILL BE WITHDRAWN BY THE END OF THE MONTH. THIS ELIMINATES 150 JOBS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA. 150 DIRECT JOBS FROM ONE COMPANY ALONE. OUR FUTURE ACTIVITY WILL BE DEPENDENT ON YOUR GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS ON OUR CONCERNS AS EXPRESSED HEREIN.

OTHER JURISDICTIONS HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO FORMULATE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES THAT MEET THE LEGITIMATE NEEDS OF BOTH GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY. WE WOULD WELCOME THE CHANCE TO DISCUSS OUR AREAS OF CONCERN BEFORE ANY LEGISLATION IS ENACTED. WE URGE YOU TO RECONSIDER YOUR PROPOSALS IN VIEW OF THEIR DETRIMENTAL RESULTS ON THE PEOPLE .

(SIGNED) JOHN C. MEEKER, AMOCO CANADA PETROLEUM CO., LTD.

This is a telegram which is in the possession of the Premier, which he has not seen fit to release to this legislature. A copy has been made available to the Member in the area in which this company has a direct financial interest, which in turn, creates direct jobs for British Columbians.

Yet we heard on the floor of this House, the Premier state, "It's a figment of your imagination, it's political sham from you people to indicate that jobs are being lost in the Peace River because of our taxation policies."

There is a complete vindication here, very direct vindication, of what the Premier said in this assembly this afternoon, in which he misled this House....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Withdraw the statement that he misled the House.

MR. CHABOT: Well, all right. I won't say that he misled the House. I'll withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. However, he certainly clearly implanted in the minds of the people who were here, and the minds of the people who are going to distribute this information as well, that jobs are not being lost in the Peace River. We have conclusive evidence that jobs are being lost in the Peace River.

He went on to disagree with a statement which had been made by the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser), supported by information conveyed to our caucus, by the mayor of Fort St. John. He directly refuted the statements made by the mayor of Fort St. John.

We've also had a phone call to the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) from the mayor of Dawson Creek, who expressed concern as well. He's most concerned with what is happening in the petroleum and the mining industry in the southern Peace River riding.

He's concerned. He intends coming to Victoria to discuss the economic plight of his region. He is concerned by what's being said, what the Government is saying, relative to job creation and relative to the diminishing jobs in that region of this province. I want to assure you that I consider this motion a timely and a responsible motion, and I shall support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I find it necessary to stand in my place and review material that I've already brought to the attention of the House. I regret that one of the leaders of the official Opposition chooses words that the Premier is attempting to mislead this House

because...that the Premier is attempting to mislead this House,

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Point of order. State your point of order.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Speaker, I did use that word but, incidentally, I withdrew it. I wish you wouldn't allow the Premier to repeat words that I've withdrawn.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The words are not on the record.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, make sure that the words are withdrawn from the tape, because it's very interesting that one can use a technique of saying something and then withdrawing it....

MR. CHABOT: It's an attempt on *Hansard*.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Not at all. If the Member will sit quietly and listen to the facts as they are presented; whether he wishes to accept the facts or not is entirely a matter for himself and his conscience. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about two different and distinct items when we talk about royalties or prices on natural gas production and on petroleum production.

Now let us examine what the facts are. It is indeed a fact, that a new scale of royalties has been suggested in a bill that's been discussed, although it's out of order I understand, to discuss it.

But certainly — as you discuss bills outside the House once they've been introduced too.

The bill that's in the House deals with petroleum. There is no legislation before this House on natural gas. There cannot be any change in natural gas prices under the existing legislation because those prices must go to arbitration.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, there is no bill in front of the House on natural gas. An opportunity arrived where I could state the position of this Government on pricing natural gas. It must be clearly understood that natural gas has been artificially under priced in this country for many years — a fact recognized by the now Premier of the Province of Alberta.

Taking over from a Social Credit administration he found on examination on the pricing of natural gas, that in his opinion the returns to the people of Alberta were insufficient. He imposed what is now known in the debate around natural gas, a policy of a two-pricing system. The concept is one that is worthy of study.

When I had the opportunity of commenting on it I said, "The Premier of Alberta has indeed attempted to grapple with the problem within the framework of his Province of Alberta." But substantial investigation of the Premier of Alberta's course, in terms of altering the price of natural gas, led one quickly to the conclusion that the gas companies were walking away with the share of the increase of that natural gas at a ratio that was over \$4.00 to \$1.00 for the people of Alberta.

Now the Province of British Columbia, regardless of who is Government, will be faced with making a decision about an approach to those arbitration hearings. That is by law, not by NDP or Social Credit, by law. These contracts, some of which are being reviewed now, some of which are in 1975, as my friend refers.

It is the position, after examining closely the position of the Province of Alberta, that when we have the opportunity to state our position on those arbitration hearings, we will not be taking the position of the Government of Alberta, that permitted the Government of Alberta to collect, after the negotiations, \$40 million to their general revenue, but allowed the gas companies to walk away with a windfall profit of \$160 million.

I said on television and I say to all the Members of this House, and I say to all the people of British Columbia as I discuss natural gas, that as long as I'm Premier of this Province, and as long as the people of this Province have mandated us to govern their affairs, there is no way that any natural gas company will walk away with windfall profits such as they did in Alberta.

I stated my position clearly, publicly on television, and I state it again now; that if anyone else wants to oppose us on that basis, that is certainly their right. But let it be clearly understood that by reading that telegram to the House, I hope the Member is not leaving the impression that the official Opposition is taking the position — and I'm sure he isn't — that they speak for the companies in this argument that is going on natural gas prices.

I will make this comment on natural gas, Mr. Speaker, and the matter will rest as far as the Government is concerned on natural gas, until a more appropriate time when we get into the arbitration.

MR. CHABOT: Oh, backing off, eh?

HON. MR. BARRETT: No, no. This is the position and I say it again. We will enter the negotiations on the increases that must come on natural gas, with this position: if there are any windfall profits to be made, those windfall profits will come to the people of British Columbia.

MR. PHILLIPS: Socialist philosophy.

[[Page 715](#)]

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, because I have made this statement, I am now being called a socialist. If that is an epithet that is meant to be derisive in terms of my position on behalf of the people of British Columbia on this issue, then I say that anywhere you want to go in British Columbia and stand up and say we would rather the gas company get the windfall than the people, then I will defend my socialist position any time, anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, God put that natural gas in the ground, not socialists, not free enterprisers, not the Leader of the official Opposition, nor the Premier of this province. By fate we are residents in a very, very wealthy province and we are indeed fatefully in a very fortunate position.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that there has been an era of over 100 years in this province where because we have been so wealthy, because there is wealth in this province, that we have been misled by outside entrepreneurs who can be catalogued in that library in volume after volume going back to such former premiers as Sir Richard McBride and others — the empire barons who came to this province. The last, greatest empire baron was McMahon and, the west coast pipeline deal.

Mr. Speaker, the last time we saw natural gas tied in with jobs in this province was the first time I ran in for office in British Columbia. In 1960 a banner headline ran in the *Vancouver Province*, and it attempted to tie jobs in with natural gas and pricing. The banner headline ran, when I was in my first campaign, three days before voting day, and the banner headline said, "10,000 jobs will go if CCF elected, says Frank McMahon." There was an attempt at that time to threaten the people of British Columbia that private enterprise knew best and the profit would go to Miami to protect British Columbians, rather than B.C. having a stake for itself.

There's a rare opportunity for Members of this House to clearly define themselves in terms of philosophy and that is one of those rare opportunities, so I want to say clearly why in this particular aspect we will not accept the amendment. It has been confused by my friend, but nonetheless let's stay with it.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. BARRETT: In the area of natural gas no windfall profits will go to the gas companies, as I said on television, and if you want to fight for the gas companies, you go right ahead.

Now, number two. Now we will deal with the whole question of drilling for oil and employment and the consequences of our stated policy in terms of legislation dealing with oil. It is indeed a fact, Mr. Speaker, that at this very moment in this province there are only six years left — six years left of oil if we continue our daily rate of production.

Six years of proven reserves left. That is a fact. Some say, "Oh, that's wrong, it's 10." All right, Mr. Speaker, I

will accept the more optimistic version and say there are 10 years left. All that is left are 10 years.

MR. PHILLIPS: There'll be less than that....

HON. MR. BARRETT: My friend, oil doesn't go rotten in the ground, and you had better learn that right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: You get a fat raise and forget about everyone else.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Let us say that 10 years are left. No matter how the oil is developed, there is a limited supply in this province. We find that the previous administration made no effort to get a decent return out of a non-renewable resource. The stood in this House and said, "Oh, we don't sell that oil, we lease it." Well, after you lease it, Mr. Speaker, what do you do with the hole in the ground?

We were confronted with this situation and we decided immediately to move in a position less than Venezuela, less than the Middle East, less than some of those South American countries...

MR. CHABOT: How about Chile?

HON. MR. BARRETT: ...and said that the people of British Columbia deserve a fair return for petroleum and there will be a sliding scale introduced to raise those petroleum rates. What are the consequences of those oil rates? What are the consequences?

I go back again, because that Member inadvertently is trying to leave the impression that through some phone calls something is happening. Twenty years is a fact, and I go back to the fact. From our Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources these are the facts. At 8 o'clock this morning, Mr. Speaker, on February 23 there were 31 wells drilling and 6 more rigged up to spud — one week ago there were only 27 wells drilling. They are attempting to leave the impression in this House that wells are closing down, when in actual fact in one week there has been an 18 per cent increase in the number of wells and the number of jobs.

If you wish to yell from the Opposition benches, if you wish to quote from phone calls, if you wish to allude to jobs....

MR. CHABOT: Call the mayor a liar!

HON. MR. BARRETT: No one is calling the mayor a liar, but I notice you have not named one

[[Page 716](#)]

well that has closed down, Mr. Member.

My friend the Member announces that two seismic crews have pulled out. Now that is a fact stated by the company that's pulled them out, but it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that not one well has pulled out. As a matter of fact they are increasing.

MR. PHILLIPS: The fact is that the leases that were going to be built aren't going to be built!

HON. MR. BARRETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm coming to the next argument about the leases. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that as of this morning, after I received the telegram, there is no official indication to date that a decrease in future drilling activity is imminent. The petroleum and natural gas branch has received no requests for cancellations of issued well authorizations and, since February 12, 12 new well authorizations have been approved.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to put it to you that they can argue all they want that our policies, in their opinion, are affecting the drilling for petroleum. Perhaps they would have if different circumstances had prevailed, but at the present time, in terms of North America's demands on crude oil, there has been no cutback in oil drilling in British Columbia, and since the legislation has been introduced there has been an increase in terms of 12 new authorizations

and four new wells.

Mr. Speaker, not for one moment do I presume that that telegram is by any way meant to be a threat by that company. Not for a moment. I think it would be tragic if the Member would allow to leave the impression that he was threatening through that telegram that that company should be frightened out of British Columbia.

I want to say again very clearly that the resources in the ground belong to the people of British Columbia.

The natural gas pricing must be handled through arbitration at a later date. I had an opportunity to state clearly our policy and I stated it. In the petroleum area there is, in fact, an increase of activity.

Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition intention is to somehow get across the story that capital is fleeing because of the new ground rules that we put on petroleum, let me tell you that we met with this petroleum association group. After the third meeting with them they said, "Thank you, Mr. Premier, for letting us meet with you. We never got into the executive chamber when the last administration was around."

Mr. Speaker, further meetings are planned with these same groups. Meetings are planned with the natural gas groups. Decisions are not made in a vacuum, and I want to planned with the natural gas groups. Decisions are not made in a vacuum, and I want to the persons concerned. It may not be to their satisfaction that we are unable to arrive at a decision that they favour but nonetheless we took their research in and we'll be judged.

We also know this in terms of natural gas — and this is the last point that I want to make before I sit down. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the potential for natural gas in the United States, the ratio of potential area that has been explored by natural gas hunters, which are extensions of the major oil companies, is ~one to eight in the United States.

There is one place in North America that has one of the highest ratios on the same scale for the possibilities of production of natural gas and energy greatly in demand. That place happens to be British Columbia.

While the ratio in the United States is one to eight in terms of potentially good exploratory areas, the ratio in British Columbia is 1 to 116. The potential for natural gas in British Columbia is fantastic. That is a word that I wish I could add even greater superlatives to.

The bidding on those natural gas exploratory sites is very, very high. In April of this year there will be the next round of bidding under the old and still-existing system. I suggest to this House that the high-water mark will come when those bids come in to our department.

So I say that this debate on natural gas rests on the result of those bids in April. Let me tell you, as the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Phillips) knows the system well, that that bidding system is a reflection of the interests. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when the bids are opened you will find that the old argument will still prevail: a dollar goes where it can make a buck. And it can still make a buck here in British Columbia, but it will be doing it on our terms. Time will tell, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened carefully to the Premier and with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think he was very far from the amendment. I hope you'll allow me the same latitude to respond to some of the points he has challenged the Opposition to answer.

First of all, in discussing the whole question of the general good, which I think we can use as the starting point in the amendment, the general good in the eyes of our party lies greatly in the fact that everybody should have gainful employment in this province. But that does not have the corollary that people should have the jobs at any expense, or that we should rape the landscape, or that we should give away our resources.

As far as I am concerned as a citizen of British Columbia, I respect these basic philosophical prin-

ciples which the Premier outlines and which his party has outlined. It comes back to this unfortunate repetition of the image that this side of the House just wants money for resources, regardless of the mechanisms involved in harvesting them or retailing them, and that the socialist side of the House is the only side of the House with a conscience about our resources.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier through you, I am just as concerned as you are about the judicious use of our resources.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we feel that you have to equate certain things in our modern society. One of the most important things to equate is your concern for people with the manner in which you can raise the finances to give them jobs and social well-being, whether it be in terms of schools or hospitals or the environment.

The party that I represent is simply expressing a concern that any rapid or unreasonable increase in the cost of production of oil or any other natural resource does several things. It may discourage exploration.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I don't propose to get into the argument as to who is right and who is wrong in the interchanges about the information from the Peace River country. I think that's been fully covered. But what I am saying is that this party is concerned that actions of the Government might discourage further exploration of our natural resources at a time when, as the Premier has stated, we have six years' proven reserves of oil. I would think under these circumstances never was there a more demonstrable need for continuing exploration and incentives to industry to go and find more oil.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: Well, the three years' exemption, I suppose, is what the Premier is referring to. That is an incentive of a type.

But furthermore we feel that if the cost of production of oil is increased, inevitably the consumer will also be paying more at a time when surely one of the main objectives of this Government or any other government is to control the rising costs of living.

We also feel that if exploration is discouraged and if there is any decrease in risk capital, obviously there will be fewer people employed. We feel that inflation and unemployment — as we've said ad nauseum in this House at the special session, and I say it again now — have to be the two prime challenges to provincial and federal governments — to find jobs and to control the cost of living.

If we take the stand we do, I really feel, Mr. Speaker, it should not be interpreted as the Premier has chosen to interpret it, that we are in favour of making bigger profits for oil companies.

Now I missed part of the Member for Columbia River's (Mr. Chabot) speech. The Premier points as though this is what he said and I'm not commenting on that. Since the Premier asked for a clear identification of the philosophies of the parties on this side of the House, I am trying to spell out our philosophy in terms of the general good of the people of this province.

I am saying that because we are concerned about the possible effects of your legislation, the corollary to that is not that we are in favour of inflating further and further either the cost of living or profit to oil companies, I resent the fact that because we are challenging the Government policies in the way we are that this other interpretation, that we are simply interested in further financial gain for the oil companies, is put upon it.

We believe very strongly in many of the principles which the Premier has outlined, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the general good of the people in this province. But I think that we are sounding a note of caution that there may well be effects of unemployment or, if not unemployment, no improvement in solving the unemployment we already have. Furthermore, we are concerned about any increase in any form of taxation which is likely to result in increased

costs to the consumer.

In general terms, I'll just finish by repeating some of the specifics to bolster our concern regarding the budget.

It fails to provide relief from the burden of provincial taxation. I'll try and be very quick. We feel that you cannot increase corporation tax without inevitably increasing the cost of products to the consumer. I'll quote the figure. Unfortunately, this takes the form of sales tax without exemptions, inasmuch as any corporation, whether they are producing food or clothing or furniture or soft hats — it doesn't really matter — the fact is that even the lowest income earner is paying an increased tax because of the increase in the corporation tax.

We feel as a party that has frequently espoused the cause of the little man — and that is a fair purpose and one that we would also try to alleviate — that there was a tremendous opportunity, Mr. Minister of Finance, through you, Mr. Speaker, to introduce exemptions of one kind or another in the sales tax because, certainly, sales tax weighs most heavily against the lowest earning incomes of society.

I just looked through some of what I think could easily be removed. For example, a diabetic patient who has to use various tests to control his condition, all these materials are sales taxable. We're talking about the general good of treating people in the home, Just let me mention, Mr. Speaker, for example,

[[Page 718](#)]

that such articles as air cushions and bedpans and hot water bottles and ice bags and catheters and so on are given no consideration as being exempt from sales tax.

We also feel that, co-ordinated with an attempt to increase jobs and to give the taxpayer a better break, we should consider introducing such ideas as allowing a part of the interest on mortgages for homes against tax, giving employers increased tax allowances for new employees who are employed for at least one year, and perhaps even look at the British system where people who look after their own interests by buying life insurance might have some taxable allowance against part of the premium. These are just ideas that I think are worth considering.

I have to return, as the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) did very well and very clearly, to the question of municipal taxation. I think it's very interesting and I appreciate and respect the fact that the Government is listening to the Vancouver backbenchers on this subject.

The facts are very plain, Mr. Speaker, that in relation to the personal per capita income tax derived by the province, the fraction which is going to municipalities is steadily declining, while the cost of living problem and inflation and rising wages and all the costs that are rising in the municipality have to be met by the council. I would seriously ask, in terms of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, for the general good of the province, that the Premier at this late stage would still take another look at the decision to increase the per capita grant to only \$32.

I know it's becoming dull and repetitious to his ears, but we do know that there is a substantial amount, in the order of \$24 million, which we were likely to have had to put out under the Mincome plan which now the federal government....

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't give that away.

MR. WALLACE: I'm not giving it away, Mr. Member; I'm just suggesting that he should give an equitable distribution of the surplus funds available. I don't think the municipalities are getting a fair break. You find a mayor in the whole of the province who thinks that this suggested increase is adequate in relation to the total picture of the budget.

This is the point that I'll just finish since we're close to 6 o'clock. As the Member on my right says, maybe some of that \$24 million should go to a further increase.

All I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have undoubted evidence that the cautious approach of the

Government in terms of the total budget will result in a surplus of very considerable sum, likely in excess of \$100 million, plus the \$24 million I've mentioned. On that basis, I think that there could be a fairer and a more equitable distribution of the moneys available. The municipalities in particular and the senior citizens should be given first place in any reconsideration by the Minister.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Could I have some instruction from the House in terms of continuing the debate or coming back late.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, we can summarize our position for a vote on the amendment before the dinner hour, if that's agreeable.

HON. MR. BARRETT: All I'm asking is what the House wishes to do: go past 6:00 to finish the debate on this and come back at 8:00 to finish off the budget. Or finish off the budget all the way through — whichever you care. Could the Whips get together while the Member is speaking?

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

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, I wish just to summarize the position of our party with regard to this sub-amendment ...

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, we're on the amendment.

MR. McGEER:...the amendment, which deals with the developing and critical problem in British Columbia. It seems as though every day those who are without jobs grow in numbers. People in this debate aren't pleading for the oil and gas companies; they're pleading for British Columbians who are losing their jobs.

It's all very well for the Premier to have made that slashing attack on Frank McMahon. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the story about the junior lawyer who was asking his senior how to conduct a trial.

The senior lawyer said, "If the evidence is against you, you talk about the law. If the law is against you, you talk about the evidence."

The junior lawyer said, "What do you do if both the law and the evidence are against you?"

"You make a lot of noise and give someone hell."

It may be — and whoever would have thought this, Mr. Speaker — that that infamous headline which appeared in one of our major newspapers in British Columbia might yet come true. Just last night the figures were suggested, not by Frank McMahon. but by the president of the Chamber of Commerce in Fort Nelson that that city alone would experience 5,000 to 6,000 unemployed unless the policies of the Government were changed.

We had earlier today a telegram read by one of the principals who would be involved in withdrawing jobs from British Columbia. I'm not at this hour going to

[[Page 719](#)]

read another telegram, but this one is to the leader of the Liberal Party from the Union Oil Company. I'll read only one sentence: "Union Oil will honour all existing obligations, but the imposition of unrealistic royalties on crude oil and the uncertainty as to future changes in royalty on natural gas will not permit the present level of capital investment in new exploratory prospects."

How much plainer can the companies place the problem before the Government than that? How blind we are as legislators not to realize that it's the jobs of British Columbians that are being laid on the line.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party speaks with a forked tongue. On the one hand their federal colleagues are appearing on television, taking credit for changes in the national budget which bring about tax cuts to

Canadians and attempt to provide more purchasing power for those in need by pension increases.

Then what do we have here in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker? We have the New Democratic Party pocketing that increase. It didn't go to the pensioners of British Columbia; it went to this little NDP government.

What do we have as well? We have tax increases coming in such a way in British Columbia that jobs of people, particularly in the northern part of the province, will be taken away.

I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, after all of what's been said to the Premier — the interpretations that have been placed on his statements — that he would begin to be just a little more careful. But this afternoon we had another example. I venture to say that hundreds of more jobs will disappear in British Columbia as a result of his speech this afternoon.

I know the Government will ignore the warnings that come from the Opposition. But the facts are coming in every day. The statements that are being made by Opposition Members aren't hollow statements. They're being substantiated every day, every week, by statistics. Unemployment higher and higher and higher.

Mr. Speaker, we can only plead once again, this isn't a social workers' hall. Our responsibility is to the real world. These careless statements, these careless policies are hurting the little people of British Columbia this Government was dedicated to help.

There must be a partnership between government and industry and the workers. But there is no partnership in British Columbia today, Mr. Speaker. The New Democratic Party is ruining that partnership. The economy of British Columbia is sliding backward every single day. Unless and until the policies that have been set forward by the Opposition parties on this side of the House are respected for being constructive, as they are, we're going to continue to make mistakes in this province. It will be the little people who are at fault.

Mr. Speaker, that is why our party will be supporting the amendment that we have put forward.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 14

Richter	Chabot	Jordan
Smith	Fraser	Phillips
Morrison	Schroeder	McGeer
Anderson, D.A.	Williams, L.A.	Gardom
Wallace	Curtis	

NAYS — 33

Hall	Barrett	Dailly
Strachan	Nimsick	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Calder	Skelly	Gabelmann
Lauk	Lea	Young
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves

PAIR

McClelland Kelly

Brousson Macdonald

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Seymour.

MR. C.S. GABELMANN (North Vancouver–Seymour): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I feel a bit like the fourth player on base in a baseball game at the moment. I intend to speak only for a few minutes and cut out most of the remarks that I had intended to make.

I wanted first of all, Mr. Speaker, to make a few further remarks to the comments I made on February 2 in this House relating to some problems in my constituency. Those problems particularly relating to Indian Arm I want to spend just a minute on, and I want also to spend a couple of minutes on land policies — particularly in the North Vancouver district, but generally in the lower mainland.

The first thing I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to tell you and the House that I have had a great many letters, phone calls and responses to my comments about Indian Arm. I think they are summarized by one of the letters I received and part of it goes as follows:

"Even after reading your accounts of the logging in Indian Arm I was still shocked when I flew up the inlet yesterday. Any logging at all up that beautiful inlet is a crime, but Indian Arm is rapidly turning into another Cypress Bowl disaster. "I am very pleased that you are taking a firm

[[Page 720](#)]

stand in regard to what is happening there and to what is planned and I hope you will continue fighting to make Indian Arm a recreation area before it is ruined completely."

Mr. Speaker, I do intend to continue that fight. I have a great many ideas of what we can do in terms of public recreation and multiple park use for that area, I will save those comments, Mr. Speaker, for the estimates of the recreation and conservation department.

I wanted, while I am on the whole topic of recreation though, to spend just a moment on skiing in British Columbia. I think it is a topic that is not properly understood by Members on all sides of this House. Skiing has been a middle-class and an affluent recreation. Only those people with the financial wherewithal have been really able to participate in that sport.

I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Government must make some effort to allow skiing to become a sport that is available to all of our citizens, particularly the working class kids who now cannot afford it.

In order to do that, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary I believe for our Parks Branch to get involved in community ski facilities in each and every one of the towns around this province so that we can get low-cost skiing.

We probably need also, Mr. Speaker, to get involved in the business of equipment rentals and equipment sales, because the costs of that are a little bit exorbitant at the moment.

Again, I think I will expand on that topic during the recreation and conservation estimates. I wanted just to say one word, though, about Powder Mountain because there has been some public discussion about the development of that area.

It is my feeling that it needs to be developed and needs to be developed very quickly because we need those kind of ski resources in British Columbia. If the Government is going to get involved in putting Toads in and putting

power lines in and putting water into the area, then I think we should own or we should have an equity in that mountain, based at least on the dollar value that we provide.

There has been a pattern in North America, all over this continent, that governments put the roads in, governments put the power in, governments put many of the facilities in and the private developers put in the uphill lifts and take all the profits. I think that mentality or that approach has to change.

However, as I say I will develop that later on, next month sometime, whenever we get to it.

I wanted to deal with two other issues. One is the housing and land question. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a bit of time going through the "Real estate trends in metropolitan Vancouver for 1972-73" — which is the current edition of the annual report of the Real Estate Board.

It is interesting to note what happened in the period between 1971 and 1972 in terms of real estate costs, in terms of land costs in the lower mainland. In my view that is the major problem in terms of housing costs at the moment.

To quote the report from the Real Estate Board, to quote a sentence or two from it: "The North Shore, and particularly the eastern portion of North Vancouver district, has probably shown the largest increase in sales and prices of building sites."

Mr. Speaker, that is an area that isn't owned by private developers where we might expect private corporations or private companies to be making as much money from it as they can. That is an area that is publicly owned — owned by the citizens of the District of North Vancouver.

Let me give you a bit of an idea of what is happened to land prices in that area in a one year period, from 1971 to 1972.

In the Deep Cove area, prices have increased from 18 to 33 per cent. In the Lynn Valley area, which as many of you know is a rapidly increasing area in North Vancouver, prices of undeveloped lots, 60-foot frontage lots, have increased from 45 to 57 per cent in one year. They have increased by an average of 50 per cent, going from in the area of \$7,000 to \$11,000 per lot to the area of \$11,000 to \$16,000 per lot in one year, Mr. Speaker. We talk about the problems of housing in British Columbia and in North America. I think that's where we have to look for the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I've belonged for the last few years to a sub-committee of the UCS, the United Community Services of Vancouver, called the Social Policy and Research Committee. That committee has done a lot of work in a lot of areas. The Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston) talked about what they have been doing with family life education, birth control and that kind of thing. They've done a number of reports. They've done one on housing that I think is quite important.

I think this needs to be read, to be put on the record, Mr. Speaker:

"Present landbanking policy by the provincial government is a great step forward, but additional measures are required. Possible limitations of landbanking in greater Vancouver are suggested in a recent paper by the GVRD planning department. Public ownership of land, however, does not necessarily mean an increased supply of residential building lots.

"In the Greater Vancouver Regional District, 10,000 acres of vacant land are at present owned by municipalities. The present system of revenue collection, however, encourages municipalities to minimize residential taxes by maximizing revenue from the sale of land. This is obviously counter productive to achieving a continuing supply of

[[Page 721](#)]

moderately priced lots. It is necessary that alternative sources of revenue for municipalities be provided."

That's the end of that quote, Mr. Speaker.

Just to take a couple of other chunks out of this report:

"The sale of publicly owned lands at below market price has been opposed on the grounds that it confers benefit on a few. This objection can be overcome by sale to par value cooperatives in which the purchaser has the advantages of homeownership except the right to sell the property for large capital gain."

Another point, Mr. Speaker:

"Except for luxury residences, housing is subsidized by municipal treasurers under present tax arrangements. Municipalities, therefore, guard their borders by zoning and building bylaws which often act to exclude moderate-cost housing. Incentives can be provided to reserve this land. Direct grants tied to non-restrictive practices or removal of education costs are two possible carrots."

Let me suggest a couple of solutions to try and cut this down, Mr. Speaker. The SPAR Report, the Social Policy and Research Committee, suggests five basic steps that need to be implemented at this point.

The first is that there needs to be a wide range of alternatives: rental, co-op, subsidized sale, townhouses, detached and semi-detached and mobile homes. We need to get into all of these kinds of housing instead of limiting it to the kind of limitations we've put on in the past. That's the first point. Secondly, that we provide opportunity for tenant owners to take part in purchase, design and management — so that people can get involved in the kind of housing they're going to be living in. cooperative ownership is of particular value in combining pride of ownership with mutual rule-setting.

Third, we should pay actual shelter costs for those on welfare.

Number four, we should change the image of housing initiated by governments. To do that, we can focus publicity on meeting housing needs of all British Columbians, and particularly by omitting reference to public, social or low-income housing.

The final point that this committee has made, Mr. Speaker, is that we should spend a bit of time and a bit of energy on the rehabilitation of existing housing. In the greater Vancouver area less than 1 per cent of the total housing stock is added yearly by new construction. Rehabilitation is therefore a key to improved housing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to cut this short. I just wanted to make those comments about the housing and land question. I will expand on this point during the municipal affairs estimates. I want now to turn to the final issue that I'll deal with this evening. That is the area of the handicapped people in our society.

I think it's an area on which, Mr. Speaker, I think we can spend a few more minutes here this evening. It's one that hasn't, to my knowledge, been discussed in the four weeks that we've been here and it's an issue that doesn't have enough public attention focused on it.

I want first of all to recognize one individual who has been working for a number of years to try and focus public attention on the problems of the handicapped — Mr. Alex Clark from Vancouver. He's done a great service to the people who have been handicapped for whatever reason.

Alex Clark said, last fall when he was in Ottawa attending a federal conference on the topic, "Canada just isn't facing up to the problems of the disabled person." Mr. Clark estimates there are 42,000 persons in wheelchairs in Canada and says that one in five persons over 65 years of age is physically disabled.

Those are pretty powerful statistics, Mr. Speaker. We forget sometimes. There are 42,000 people in wheelchairs in Canada. I presume there are somewhere around 4,000 people here in British Columbia.

I want to talk about some of the problems that people in wheelchairs face. First of all, let me try to describe which category of people are affected by it. There are semi-ambulatory disabilities — amputees, cerebral palsy, arthritis, pulmonary and cardiac disabilities. Many of those people are able to be mobile because of the wheelchairs.

There are other people who fit into this classification of "disabled." Let me say in parentheses that this is one out of seven of our population. People with sight disabilities — people who are totally blind or so blind that they would find it hazardous to be in the public; people who have faulty co-ordination due to brain injury, spinal injury and peripheral nerve injury; people who, because of old age, have significantly reduced mobility and impaired co-ordination; people who do not have a permanent disability but through injury or disease may be temporarily handicapped; and people who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Those categories, Mr. Speaker, comprise one out of seven individuals. That's a lot of people and we should be spending a bit of time thinking about what we can be doing to alleviate their problems.

The National Research Council, Mr. Speaker, estimates that there are approximately 300,000 people in Canada who are restricted in their mobility because of architectural barriers, I want to describe some of the kinds of architectural barriers that there are. We forget about them. We walk into this building and climb a few stairs and go up to the restaurant and climb a few more stairs. We forget about the kind of problems that so many of our citizens face.

Steps; curbs; sidewalks; doors that are too narrow,, doors that revolve; elevators that are inaccessible because of their size; lack of accessibility for wheelchairs into restaurants, theatres, stadiums, apartment

[[Page 722](#)]

buildings, many public buildings; too narrow aisles in cafeterias, restaurants, libraries, auditoriums, et cetera; too narrow public toilet stalls and telephone booths; too high telephones, drinking fountains, light switches, fire alarms; lack of parking spaces for the handicapped; lack of grab bars where necessary — these are problems that we never think about, Mr. Speaker. We go on in our lives and don't ever really understand that people are affected.

I've had some discussion with people who have been involved in these kinds of situations, Mr. Speaker, and because I think it graphically demonstrates the problem, I want to read to you some direct quotes from people who are involved.

One gentleman says, "The attitude of the public is still in the Dark Ages, when crippled people were thought to be demons, or at least the result of the sins of the father being visited on the son. In ancient Greece a crippled baby would be left to die, perhaps a preferable situation than today, when they face a slow and rotting death at the hand of a society that cannot accept or understand them"

That's a direct quote from a gentleman who is forced to live a life in a wheelchair. These quotes — there are two or three of them — are from several different individuals about building standards. This is a direct quote.

"A person who wants to do things should be able to do them. All we want is an opportunity to compete with ordinary people. Any place of business should be available to all people. Building barriers lead to segregation, et cetera, socialization, lack of employment opportunities and educational barriers."

On hotels: "We don't need a lot — 10 rooms in a 200-room hotel that could be saved until all the other rooms are filled."

On theatres: "I used to go to the theatre but got tired of being picked up and put in a seat. I just stay home now and watch TV. A space for five or six chairs would be enough."

Transportation: "Car insurance costs over \$200 per year. We can't use the bus and we can't afford taxis."

Housing: "A new apartment was built in Richmond specifically for handicapped people." Incidentally, this housing development received federal aid. "It provided entry ramps, but...."

Here we had a federal government involved in the C.M.H.C. and trying to provide a situation that would be satisfactory to people in wheelchairs. But this particular development in Richmond has an electric stove with the

controls at the back, so that if you want to shut the switch off you have to put your arm over the heated element. Secondly, counters were too high. Thirdly, cupboards were above the counters. How do you reach them from the wheelchair? In order to get things out of these cupboards you have to knock them out and catch them. Four, sundecks were a step lower than the access floor. And this was in a building that the federal government participated in, in order to provide facilities for the handicapped.

Another comment about shopping: "Downtown it is impossible. Parking in parkades is impossible. Most malls are inaccessible except those with ramps for shopping carts. Washrooms are unusable."

Employment. Again a quote:

"In addition to building barriers, the attitude barrier of employers and employees prevents handicapped people from obtaining many jobs that they are physically and mentally able to perform. Due to accompanying problems, spasms, et cetera, special workshops or in-home jobs are necessary for people who cannot compete in industry."

Voting. "Many paraplegics were unable to vote due to inaccessibility of polling stations and size and style of booths." This individual made this added comment in this case: "You should really push these, because most paraplegics are NDP supporters and we should make an extra effort to get them to the polls."

I could go on. We could say that the major need that we have in a society is to change building designs, to allow people to be able to park and enter the building. Usable ramps, washrooms and the size of doors — those kinds of facilities are absolutely essential in any new construction.

We built the Pacific Centre in Vancouver just in the last few years and paraplegics, if they are going in their cars, cannot park in that parking lot. They have to take a taxi to the Pacific Centre in order to get into that building. That kind of construction shouldn't be allowed to be continued.

My notes are disorganized because I'm leaving quite a few things out, but there are a number of things that we can do, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to touch on a couple of them.

The first thing is that we can as a province, and municipalities can through their councils, implement the supplement number five of the Building Standards for the Handicapped. This is the federal code that has been worked out, and it should be accepted by all jurisdictions, in my view. The basic points of supplement number five are that it would provide accessibility for wheelchairs in all public buildings at all three levels of government. Secondly, in all buildings designed, intended or adapted for use as a place of public assembly — schools, recreation facilities, theatres, sports complexes, et cetera. Thirdly, in hotels, motels and dormitories. Fourthly, in buildings designed or adapted for a use which includes business, commercial and manufacturing purposes. Fifthly, in transportation terminals. That's the first recommendation.

If we as a government were to implement that building standard, supplement number 5, we would go a long way towards a solution. The second area

[[Page 723](#)]

where we can begin to get some solutions to this problem, Mr. Speaker, is in the question of transportation. There is a symbol — and I have it somewhere in my notes here — which depicts a wheelchair situation which can be put onto the person's car. It can be put onto buildings that have access for wheelchair people. Maybe we should just say in British Columbia that anybody who has one of these stickers on their car properly placed should have free parking and should be able to park parallel to the curb, Mr. Speaker, and not at an angle. Because if you park at an angle you can't open the door widely. We should allow for little problems like this. We should certainly be providing free transportation for people in these situations, unless we're going to pay them a decent pension.

Thirdly, public housing. We're going to have to change our attitude. Hopefully it doesn't have to be by legislation, but I expect it will have to be, but we must provide a certain number of units in each area that are properly designed for people with these kinds of handicap problems.

The fourth item I've already mentioned. It's the use of this symbol. It should be as widely used as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken too much time as it is this evening. But I will come back to these issues. I have wanted very much to make some of these points in this budget debate and I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to do that tonight. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I rather now know how the lions felt when they went into the den and found there were no Christians there, Because it's rather remarkable that we are debating this budget and winding it up and we find only 15 Members of the government in their seats.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: I agree. There are not many Members of the Opposition and I think that you're quite right, Mr. Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick), in that it points out the fallacy of the Premier's desire to carry on an important debate. The fact that he isn't here, and so many of his Members are not here, I think also....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall), you're bouncing up and down like a yo-yo. I should tell you that our side made it very clear...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. JORDAN: ...that we would cooperate in every way but that we did not wish to debate to an empty House.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): You'd break any agreement any time of the week.

MRS. JORDAN: Oh, Mr. Provincial Secretary, why don't you calm down and become a Canadian.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. JORDAN: Addressing myself to the budget debate....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order. The Hon. Provincial Secretary.

HON. MR. HALL: I think that kind of insulting personal reference has no place in this House and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would consider your comments a violation of section 40, standing order number 40, part II, and would ask you to withdraw the statement in reference to his nationality. I think he's as Canadian as any of us is.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll bow to Your request. If I offended the Hon. Provincial Secretary I apologize to him personally. But the other day when the Hon. Provincial Secretary was extolling his personal connections to the Labour Party in Britain, and the same connections of many of his colleagues, we who were born in Canada and in British Columbia suddenly had a terrible feeling that we'd been colonized and not realized it. However, there was nothing unkind intended.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you confine your comments to the general discussion of the budget?

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I have, in looking back over the last two weeks of the budget debate, certainly enjoyed the comments made by all Members of the House. I think that we are all very clear in our understanding that we don't always agree. I think that we are also very clear that our ultimate objective is very common — a better life for British Columbians and a strong position for British Columbia within Confederation.

[[Page 724](#)]

I enjoyed a good deal the aspect of rebuttal that came from the Government side in their penchant to take over everything as being a quick solution. The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Lauk) has an ability to do this without a smile, but we know he has an excellent sense of humour. We were almost prepared to dub him the "Minister of Laugh-in."

The Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom), who I am sorry is also not here at this time, provided a great input into the debate in many ways. I was particularly taken with his description of how his party's position would be in this debate. He had a bright, smiling, cherubic face, he waved his arms, and he said that they were going to support this budget, that it was a brilliant budget, they felt warmth in the budget and tenderness in the budget. He soared this way and that way and then he dove under the covers with the NDP. I would only remind that Hon. Member about the comments made, and it's a caution, of the young mother who wailed to the MLA, "But you told me we were only playing politics."

We were impressed with the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams), who became very excited about his solution to some complex problems in taking them over. He nearly fell over in his excitement, Mr. Speaker. We think probably that there are many people who think that he may fall over again and possibly lie still.

I liked the Hon. Member for Prince Rupert's (Mr. Lea) comments. I understand he has a few takeover ideas too, but most of them are not debatable in this House.

I'd like, before discussing much more, to hold this Valentine up which I received from the hordes. I appreciate it very much and I mentioned it at the time. I'd like just to say that I think it's a good thing that after debate there are Valentine's days. I shall not forget it and I hope that during this debate they won't either.

I would also like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I've never had this privilege, that in the gallery this evening is my husband and my son and a young friend from Vancouver. I'd ask you to welcome them please.

It's the first time that I have ever been in the position of having a member of my immediate family in the gallery when I was addressing this assembly. I think perhaps I feel more nervous than I ever did before and I'm sure you'll understand. I don't know how one equates one's debate here with one's position as a mother at home, when you're comforting the fevered brows and whipping out the chocolate pudding.

To the debate, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that this is my first opportunity to officially take my place in one of these debates and I have not mentioned the constituency that I have had the opportunity and privilege of representing for the last seven years. In light of the hour, I will just briefly touch on some of their major concerns with the intent of bringing this up in future debate under the estimates.

I'm sure that many Members — and I am pleased to see that one Minister is here, the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) — are aware that one of the major concerns in the Okanagan Valley is the regional college. The areas have put a great deal of effort into the establishment of this college.

I want to make it very clear though, Madam Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that while we appreciate the dangers of heavy and almost unburdenable costs in a multi-campus complex, we in the north are very much concerned about maintaining a multi-campus complex. They have shown their faith in contributing to the cost of the college up until now. We are not concerned about the site of their northern campus, whether it's in its present site, on other land or between Vernon and Salmon Arm, but there should be a multi-campus and a campus in the north if a

reasonable situation can be worked out.

Not to get into the subject of the full-time young students, but more in our concern is for the older working people in our area to have an opportunity for advanced education. I see the Minister shaking her head and I realize that she has some very difficult decisions to make in this area. I do want to assure her of the cooperation of the people in the north and the cooperation of myself in this House and outside the House on this matter.

To back it up, as I was leading into before, I think if there is an opportunity for a campus in the north, she'll find the people, as it comes right down to the line, willing to assume even an extra burden financially — providing of course that it's in reason — in order to receive this opportunity for a real community involvement in the regional college.

To touch on other matters — and the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) isn't here — but to overview it before going into estimates, there have been a number of internal grid studies done in the major cities of the Okanagan. We are most interested in these results and I understand that they will soon be ready.

The Okanagan is particularly concerned about its environment. I think they've led the way in British Columbia in constructive undertakings to protect the environment. We would ask of the Minister of Highways that when the internal grid structure and when the alternate possible sitings of the major Highway 97, Okanagan Highway, are available, there will be an environmental input into this and also that he will take this matter to public hearing.

As you know, the Okanagan is made up of some major centres — really three major centres — with

[[Page 725](#)]

smaller centres in between. Those smaller centres are rural and they want to remain rural. Their big problem is that all the big guys come along and tell them what they should have.

It's my concern as their representative, and their concern to bring before this House, that they have the opportunity for an input, that it will not be the larger centres that can charge blacktop through their orchards or through their communities and destroy a type of life that they're willing to pay for and to zone themselves into and to maintain in British Columbia.

Jobs, naturally, are a matter of concern, but I won't go into that at the moment in the light of the debate.

I am sorry the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) isn't here, because as I mentioned earlier, he got all excited about his ability to solve problems by taking over and I don't always agree with takeover as a solution.

I don't want him to take it over in this case but the matter of Cosens Bay on beautiful Kalamalka Lake is a matter of extreme importance to the people of the Okanagan and to the people of the province. Again, in view of the fact that he isn't here, I will just alert the assembly to this matter and bring it up in further debate.

The same would be in the matter of return to the farmers, whom we all in this House want to have a viable industry and a viable income in order that they can contribute to British Columbia and that they too can enjoy democratic rights and a standard of living fairly comparable to anyone else.

In the budget itself, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that the first impression on reading this budget is that it is a large budget for a population of 2,270,000 people, and that we must indeed be a most productive people to be able to provide \$750 a year per capita for services to people out of one single budget and one single year. This is all from the productivity of the people of this province as they utilize resources in a prudent manner and utilize their abilities to strengthen our economy.

I think that it's of interest to note that this proposes to be a balanced budget with income extended to equal

regular expenditures and with \$85 million drawn from cash surpluses of a previous year to meet some proposed extraordinary expenditures. I would say to the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), through you, Mr. Speaker, if he was in the House during this debate, that it must be very nice to have at his disposal in the first — as we must call them — the first heady days of his administration these accumulated surplus funds which have been handed to him and to his governments the result of what I think even they will admit was the prudent administration of your predecessors and the Minister of Finance's predecessor in office.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you and the

Minister of Finance and the Members would agree that this is a situation the like of which has never been previously recorded in Canadian history. We, the Social Credit Party, appreciate the acknowledgement that the Minister of Finance has made about this fact.

The details of the various expenditures will be examined when we get into the estimates detail by detail. Right now we wish to draw attention to the broad intent of the budget and to sum up some of the points which have been brought up in the last two weeks and to sum up the effects of the comments and actions of this Government outside the House.

We appreciate that you have seen fit to endorse most of the forward-looking policies established by the Social Credit administration — the homeowner grant, the home acquisition grant, reforestation and personal care being but four examples of people independence and people benefit and sound planning started by the previous administration.

You have, by your words and your actions, endorsed the principle of a guaranteed minimum income. While we believe, as we've always made very clear, that if this is to be a fully effective instrument it must be on a national basis, we do endorse the effort made by the Government on behalf of our senior citizens.

But in placing before you today the summary of our party's position in this debate, I must reiterate that this party did have provision to pay the handicapped and the senior citizens in need a guaranteed income of \$225 a month...

MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert): How many people?

MRS. JORDAN: ...and that this was provided for in the revenues of the province.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: I said, "those in need."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Yes, and \$225 a month, Mr. Member. Your \$200 a month looks pretty sick at the moment although I'm sure you meant well.

Instead, you have chosen in this budget to point out the fallacy of the impression that, unfortunately, the now Premier (Hon. Mr. Barrett) and this Government created when they were in Opposition, that they had a formula for a guaranteed minimum income of \$200 a month for every person in this province. That's where we quibble with you — for every person in the province who was over the age of 65." Also, the impression was created that there would be a guaranteed \$200 a month for every handicapped person in the province.

[[Page 726](#)]

The elderly citizens and the handicapped people in this province know that you failed to do this. One can only suggest that it was a bit of flim-flam with those citizens on the part of the now Minister of Finance and that he did in fact lead every citizen to believe this. Now that the cheques are not coming these people know that they were flim-flammed. They voted for that, and we can only suggest that you perhaps hijacked their votes by creating this false impression intentionally.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. JORDAN: It's O.K., Mr. Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Would you stop for a moment, please? No Member of this House "flim-flams" any other Member of this House. Would you please not infer that they do?

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say the Members flim-flammed in this House. I said, "outside this House." I don't want to get into a debate, Mr. Speaker, and take up our valuable time if we are to meet our commitments in arguing, but I would assure you that in the debate this afternoon there have been terms used far more exciting than "flim-flam." If we're going to start this now, then there's no way that I can carry on as I would really like to.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue, please.

MRS. JORDAN: One of the other reasons that I suggest and we suggest that you, in essence, hijacked their votes is that you have unleashed a bulldozer of inflation in British Columbia in the last session, when you removed those vital guidelines on government spending which would have, in essence, kept government spending under control. They also would have exerted an influence in the private sector to keep their spending under control and to have reasonable demands made by them on the economy.

It's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that in this flim-flam impression, or whatever you wish to call it, that was created outside this House in the hijacking of these people's votes, the programme that you came up with — the \$200 a month instead of the \$225 a month — is leaving these people in a worse situation than they were before. It's not going to keep pace with inflation in itself. It's certainly not going to provide the extra benefits and comforts and freedoms that these people so justly need and which I'm sure you, as Members, agree they should have just as much as we do.

I can be no more charitable than to suggest that the Minister of Finance picked the pockets of the working people in this province by destroying those very inflationary controls that I talked about and in this budget by taking off the assessment controls, and by putting the Government in the position whereby it has no legal mechanism through which the public interest can be protected in an extreme emergency. We say again that a legal mechanism should be available to protect the public. It should be on the table, thoroughly discussed and there for all to understand and all to see.

In suggesting that intentionally or unintentionally the Minister of Finance picked the pockets of the Working people in this budget, he did so by fixing basic costs, building basic costs into the budget, which will make greater demands in the future on the taxpayers' money in having to keep up with those fixed costs as they respond to inflation.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, when we examine these facts, we are led to believe that the Minister of Finance does not understand the fine balance which exists within the economy of this province, a balance which is particularly delicate in this part of Canada. As I pointed out in an earlier speech, while we have record growth in British Columbia — almost double the growth of the rest of Canada — 60 per cent of this growth results from immigration primarily from the rest of Canada, a fact that no provincial government can control.

The second point is that he doesn't seem to understand the delicacy of the economy of British Columbia due to the fact that it is a large and geographically difficult area of Canada. We do only have 2,270,000 people to pay for these efforts and to pay for the cost of management of this province. To put it in perspective, the problem that we are faced with and you are faced with as Government, is that you just have to realize that we're the same size as the area of France, East and West Germany combined, and that they have a population in excess of 120 million people to contribute to their economy and their management.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the past decade has been a boom period in this province. The fact that the provincial budget is in excess of \$1,750,000,000, to be paid for by a province which relies mainly on its export

trade because of the small percentage of our local provincial market and our national market, and that in fact 70 per cent of our forest production must be placed in that world market — I would suggest that this does not indicate an isolated boom. But it does indicate productivity which has been based on planning and an aggressive people.

It is worthy of comment, Mr. Speaker, that the Government felt it was desirable to record in the budget address the following quotation: "Canada will not survive as a nation unless the federal government learns to understand the needs of the provinces." We agree with that. But it's a strong statement coming from your party, if it is remembered that as the official Opposition, any such observation coming

[[Page 727](#)]

from the Social Credit government would have been greeted with cries of "Why can't you get along?" or "You're separatists."

Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but feel that the apparent cold war that is developing between the Minister of Finance and the Premier of this province with a cabinet Minister in specific and with the Prime Minister of Canada does not enhance the image of either of them. I think the Hon. Member would agree. It certainly doesn't enhance the image of our province. I would say very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that we want a responsible and mature Premier in this province and a responsible and mature image for our province.

We appreciate, certainly, that in a federal system there are many problem situations which arise between various levels of government. Certainly this is a fact of life. It is the same, though, in any place that we occupy in this world. It's extremely important how he acts as Premier of this province and Minister of Finance, not only nationally but internationally, and how he acts and we react, and how he reacts and we react with the rest of Canada and with other countries around us.

We have the uneasy feeling, Mr. Speaker, that this Government does not really understand the complexity of the British Columbia economy, or its relationship to international finance and trade. The learning process could be not only expensive but, on occasion, very painful for the people of British Columbia. Not only is this evident in the internal financing operations in British Columbia, but in the highly sensitive and complex area of international financing and our image.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak for a moment on the international monetary crisis. I know the Hon. First Member for Vancouver—Little Mountain (Ms. Young) talked about this, but I would bring it before you in summing up this debate that on February 12 the United States of America did devalue their dollar by approximately 10 per cent. This was followed by President Nixon's statement that this was only a temporary solution to the problem. Restrictive trade legislation must follow and this would be directed to reduce the huge trade balance deficit and to take the pressure off the United States dollar. I think if we were President Nixon, we probably would take the same position.

Since the Canadian dollar is free to float, it tends to find a rough parity level with the United States dollar, as we all know. I think we must accept that it may be that our trading position with our largest customer for products from our forests and from our manufacturing will not be too seriously affected by the dollar devaluation. It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1971 the United States bought \$1,245,000,000 of produce from British Columbia and that this was 50 per cent of our total export sales of that year.

In light of this fact and the fact that this new Government is essentially riding and basing its new philosophy on the basic income from lumber products and the industry, both as a natural resource and as an exporter of manufactured products, coupled with the fact that two-thirds of the sales in the past year have been to the United States, this situation demands that we view the current international and American situation with considerable concern and a great deal of sensitivity.

It would be nice, now that the Premier's back, if he'd at least listen to the debate.

At this point, we have apparently no assurance from the United States that our exports to that market will not

be adversely affected by their contemplated trade restrictions, not only in the forest products industry, but in other sectors of our economy and our secondary manufacturing and our potential secondary manufacturing in British Columbia.

Now that the Premier is paying attention, Mr. Speaker, I point out to him that British Columbia has only just recently cracked the fashion market in Washington, Oregon and California. This industry in British Columbia, the garment manufacturing industry, has a great potential. Instead of making phony phone calls to the United States White House, when he's down there he should not only talk about the oil tankers plying our coast but he should talk about trade and some of the problems that are going to be reflected in British Columbia by the actions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, our deep concern is that our second largest customer, Japan, has for a number of years expressed grave concern that they buy so much more from Canada and British Columbia than they sell to us each year. The devaluation of the American dollar will raise the price of Japanese goods in both Canada and the United States market. This fact is going to further aggravate Japan's adverse trade balance with Canada, and that's British Columbia. It will certainly not enhance our marketing capability on the Japanese market. We need that market, Mr. Minister of Finance, when you're finished yawning.

In short, the devaluation of the American dollar could create serious problems for the people of Canada and certainly for British Columbians. Yet in this budget, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier, this Premier has not made one statement inside this House or inside this budget about this extremely sensitive situation and this fact.

We would be well-advised to ask the Minister of Finance to weigh these factors very carefully and as best he can, for they have real implications for the future of British Columbia, and these problems demand the most serious and responsible attention. The first Minister of this province, who is also the Minister of Finance, would be well advised to heed

[[Page 728](#)]

his utterings on policy matters as related to the business in this province.

The following statements that have been attributed to the Premier and the Minister of Finance of British Columbia since he assumed his position are worthy of note.

"Development for the sake of development is now a thing of the past in this province." But he does not see any difference between a contingent liability and a direct debt; you can increase the royalty rate on B.C. produced and consumed crude oil and the B.C. consumer will not have to pay for this increased royalty.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and Minister of Finance just does not seem to recognize for all practical purposes that all crude oil products in British Columbia are consumed in British Columbia. We have to import, as a matter of fact, and I will come back to this later.

The Minister of Finance does not seem to recognize that you cannot raise the minimum wage and then absorb it in restaurants, laundries and other outlets without the consumer, the people, the public of British Columbia having to pay directly. Yet he says that is possible. I would suggest that the Premier find out very quickly how foolish such statements are, and that these increases cannot be absorbed by those providing these services and products without affecting the public pocket. A very good example of this fact is the necessity, following the Premier and Minister of Finance's action, of private hospitals having to raise their rates or else go under.

I can see the Premier getting ready to get up and wave his arms and say, "Ah, but they are rip-off artists." I suggest, Mr. Premier, that one example that has taken place, Matson Lodge in Victoria, could not possibly be included in the category of a rip-off artist as you suggest. This Lodge is run by the Salvation Army, who manage well and are very prudent, but they found as a result of some of the Premier's statements and actions of this Government that they had to raise their rates.

We don't quarrel with the raising of the minimum wage, but we do quarrel with the studied lack of understanding of the inevitable economic results. There is, in these statements and actions by the Premier and Minister of Finance, a clear indication of the Minister's lack of understanding of the elementary economics of this province and they indicate that we do indeed have cause for grave concern.

The matter of the oil industry has been thoroughly discussed in the previous debate, but I would just, in the light of the Minister's statements, ask him, does the Minister of Finance know which province he is supposed to be Premier for, and Minister of Finance for? I would even ask if he has discussed it between the Minister of Finance and the Premier.

Alberta exports oil and gas and so does Saskatchewan. British Columbia does not export crude oil. Is this simple ignorance or is it part of a further plan to discredit the big companies by substantially raising the crude oil products to them and then raising a row if the price of these products goes up as a result of this new tax?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we can't understand this type of reasoning. If there is any logical explanation, we would very much like to hear it on the floor of this House from that Minister of Finance. It might also be appropriate in light of this afternoon's action if the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) was to make a few comments in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen ample evidence, and I have cited ample evidence here, of the Premier and his ability to fly off and make shock statements, to make snide comments in *Hansard* and yet to expect there to be a sound reaction to his policies.

I think one of the most startling statements that has brought a reaction was in the *Vancouver Province* on Saturday, February 10 when it said, "Barrett to visit Europe to promote new trade." I would say that the Premier should feel very pleased and gratified that his fame is spreading far and wide.

As a result of this announcement one of the world's most sensitive economists and historical writers composed a play. It is a clairvoyant play which is indicating history in the making. I would like to read just one little section for the Members of this House, and I hope that they will appreciate it. I would say quite candidly that while it may have been written by one of the world's greatest writers, I am not one of the world's greatest actresses.

If you can just relax in your chairs and let your minds wander — you have seen the Minister of Finance take off for Europe and you go to the time, which is the merry month of May in Zurich, and the place is a vault in a gnome's palace. Advertising credits — Menahan and Dunskie, Montreal, Canada, Limited.

There is a synopsis and we see the curtain rise, Mr. Speaker. the play begins.

It shows us a rather portly young gentleman chewing nervously on the corner of a 1973 budget and piled on the table next to him are budgets, budgets, budgets — all the budgets from British Columbia from 1871 on. At this time there enter three gnomes, or gnomes, if you want to call them that.

The first gnome says, as he looks over, "Can this be the Lion of Finance from British Columbia?"

The second gnome or g-nome says, "I heard this Bennett was a smiling man."

The portly little man says plaintively, "My name is Barrett — B-a-r-r-e-t-t."

The third gnome says, "I don't know, first gnome

[[Page 729](#)]

I fear that this one is an impostor. I notice as he is shaking that he does not jingle, and I'm told that Bennett jingled, always jingled, and quite often one could hear the faint rustle of folding money from his pockets as he walked."

Barrett (more plaintively): "But I am Barrett, not Bennett, and I have come to tell you about my assets and my liabilities. I am a social worker."

And the first gnome says, "We can see your liabilities, but over here in Zurich we are only interested in your assets." B-a-r-r-e-t-t says, "But I have great assets."

"British Columbia had an election on August 30 of last year, and you know, Mr. Gnome, I found that what I'd said all along about two or three sets of books, or four sets of books was dead wrong. Our books are in great shape in British Columbia."

The first gnome says darkly, "Well, all reports from budget day speech in British Columbia tell us that you could not find any assets to balance off your liabilities, and possibly no roads to Gnome."

Barrett, with a nervous titter, says, "Oh...." — you know how he does it — "Oh, fellows, I was just fooling. Don't pay any attention to those off-the-cuff remarks that I made in *Hansard*. Here, read the printed copy of my speech." Shakily we see the portly young man hand his speech around to the three gnomes.

The second gnome says, as he thumbs through this and sees the comments, "I think perhaps we should look at the other budgets of British Columbia too." So the gnomes go over to the big pile on the table. They rummage through from 1871, 1971, then they go back to 1952, 1954, 1956, 1958, 1966, 1970, 1972. And they mutter as they go and the third gnome says, "Bennett always said, 'Pay as you go.'"

The second gnome muttered darkly and he said, "Look here on page 3, 'Balanced whenever possible and when in the public interest.'"

Barrett, a portly little fellow said impishly, "Aw, gosh, fellas, in our country that just means debt only if necessary but not necessarily debt." Then he gives a nervous little chuckle as he does in here.

But the third gnome is not impressed and he says, "This man is an imposter. Why, even McKenzie King had one Minister who had class and knew what a million was."

Then we see the curtain fall and as the lights fade the poorly little Barrett sits there, crumpled in his chair, holding a copy of a 1972 budget. Gazing plaintively at the chief he wails forlornly, "Gosh, chief, how did I go wrong? I thought I had your act down pat."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: That's right. I'll be expecting an academy award on next Valentine's Day,

Mr. Speaker, on further examining the budget, after our trip around the world, we have to come to the conclusion that it was pretty hollow and fuzzy in its presentation — I was going to say theatrical — and really quite vacant in content. There is no more evidence in the supposed emphasis that it gives to services to people. The implied way that it seeks to downgrade the high level of services which were achieved under the Social Credit regime is amazing.

To be quite specific, Mr. Speaker, the budget provides for 69 per cent, proudly said by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett), 69 per cent of revenue to go towards the social improvements of our people. And that's great. But that's exactly the same 69 per cent that was provided in the last Social Credit budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to get any kind of comparison which seeks to illustrate the shortcomings of the previous administration, the Minister of Finance has chosen the years 1965 and 1970. When one recalls, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of the 1966 election the then Premier of this province (Hon. Mr. Bennett) indicated that the quality of life in British Columbia was to be the chief objective of budget-making decisions.

When one examines the past budget, as the portly Barrett did in our skit, and the quality of life achieved, one realizes that during the course of the last years of the decade of the sixties no government anywhere produced a

greater number of programmes towards this end than did the Social Credit.

To be specific again, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the record in just four areas. For the convenience of *Hansard* I'll list these very quickly under the headings of education, public health, hospital insurance and mental health, commencing with the budget year 1969 in each case and the indicated increases between each year.

In education, and Hon. Members will pardon me if I hurry through this: 1969, 18.3; 1970, 12.9; 1971, 9.8; 1972, 10.8; 1973, this great budget, 10.4. That's up .4 per cent. That's a real deal.

In public health: 1969, 10.3; 1970, 7.7; 1971, 11.5; 1972, 8.4, and 1973, 8.7. Big deal. Up .3 per cent.

Hospital insurance, the only one where you might really give it a little bit of a clap: 1969, 20 per cent; 1970, 16; 1971, 17; 1972, 12; 1973, 17 per cent. But when you examine the inflationary controls that you took off, and that the majority of that is going to be taken up in increased wages and previously committed hospital beds, you won't be cheering quite as loudly.

In mental health, the great new thrust in British Columbia: in 1969, 10.2; 1970, 13.3; 1971, 9.3; 1972, 10; 1973, 10.7. Big deal, a .7 per cent increase. And again the tremendous increases in wages and the removal of the inflationary controls will eat up most

[[Page 730](#)]

of this.

Mr. Speaker, any fair minded analysis will conclude that this is no spectacular contrast when one compares the percentage allotted to each of these people's services during the last four years of the Social Credit regime and the budget increases provided under this budget.

Even when taken as a percentage of revenue, Mr. Speaker, education, for example, occupies 28 per cent of this budget, as opposed to 31 per cent of the previous budget.

The real point in this, Mr. Speaker, is that in order to provide for these increases over the course of the last four years it has been necessary in British Columbia to maintain a steady and qualified rate of growth. This has been reflected in growing revenues without any increase in the general taxation load of the province.

The low tax rates under the previous regime are a matter of record. Yet the record I have outlined for you clearly shows that the revenues were sufficient to provide for yearly rates of increase which were not possible to maintain in any other jurisdictions of Canada.

Yet in other jurisdictions not only were the percentage increases required not met, but along with these limited increases went an ever-increasing burden of taxation. The Hon. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) admits this. He waved the tax comparisons on the floor the other day when he was speaking. He talked about the low tax rate of British Columbia. We appreciated that but we do ask what is, the legacy that the socialists are going to leave?

Just to prove the point, one has to examine the budget of two socialist provinces to see that such is the case. Residents in Manitoba pay 12 per cent more income taxes than do the residents of British Columbia. Residents of Saskatchewan pay 10 per cent more personal income tax than do the residents of British Columbia. Taxation on gasoline in both provinces is substantially higher. Even amusements are taxed in Manitoba and, heaven forbid, that's a province that needs some amusements. It shouldn't be taxed.

Socialist Manitoba has seven cents more on their cigarettes than does British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, because of the fuzzy way in which they run their auto insurance over there in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan, car licence plates and drivers' licenses in particular are significantly higher in both those socialist provinces.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fuzzy way in which — excuse me. I'll withdraw that statement at this time.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's interesting that for hospital care in British Columbia we have managed with this low rate of taxation to maintain hospitals and care from general revenue. While both Saskatchewan and Manitoba, those great socialist bastions, have a 5 per cent sales tax as we do, the

Saskatchewan family pays — and listen to this, fellas — \$24 per year single; \$43.20 per year per family for hospital care. In Manitoba, the second bastion of socialist enterprise, they pay \$86.40 per year per family and \$43.20 per year for single by way of not voluntary, but compulsory premium.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Yep. As the Member for Boundary-Similkameen (Mr. Richter) says, you go to jail in those great democratic provinces if you don't pay it.

One sees this as a legacy of socialism in those two provinces and we again ask: What is the legacy of socialism going to be for British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty clear from any reasonable, honest analysis that the budgetary procedures of the previous administration maintain a very high level of service without theatrics. And the records prove it. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the very budget speech of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) on February 9 proves it — and he's proud of it.

Let's examine a part of the record involved with handling social assistance in British Columbia. The federal government employment policy wherein the Prime Minister — and I'm sure we all deplore it — the Prime Minister of the country of Canada deliberately set out to quench the fires of inflation by throwing the bodies of growing numbers of unemployed Canadians onto the unemployment heap. We are outspoken in our disapproval of that federal policy; nonetheless we too were faced with a problem as a result of that policy.

We in the Social Credit administration found that, as a result of that policy in the early seventies, the social assistance rolls were growing. Mr. Speaker, we did not in this province simply do what the current Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) has done and blame the entire development picture on the federal government.

We set out to deliberately reverse that trend by starting a job opportunity certificate programme; by starting the training-on-the-job programme; by starting the alliance of businessmen programme; by taking the entire benefit....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ooh!

MRS. JORDAN: Laugh if you will. You have nothing yet to compare with the number of people that were put to work through that programme. You're hung-up again. You're all hung-up over there jumping around all hung-up. The entire benefits of the federal government's winter works project money was given to the municipalities to help their problem and to fight unemployment. Where is that money, Mr. Minister of Finance? It's in that vault with you

[[Page 731](#)]

and the gnomes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. JORDAN: As a result, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) in this House knows full well it happened and he has substantiated it by his own report in this House. As a result, Mr. Speaker, of the above-mentioned Social Credit thrust to help combat the federal government's policy of unemployment as a means to combat inflation, the assistance rolls in British Columbia were down some 14 per cent over the previous years. The downward trend continued well into 1972. But the trend started upward again and the unemployed employables in October stood at 27,963. In November that total had reached 29,550.

It's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that with the unemployment figures announced in January, the Government opposite has done nothing about this trend. Now we have a gap of nearly five months and nothing has been done to employ the employables. This was successfully tackled — not to complete success, we admit that, but there was a good start and there were good programmes underway — by the Social Credit administration. We on this side of the House certainly have no objection to you canceling our programmes, Your Government — that's your prerogative.

What we simply say is that to do this for political reasons and not other reasons, and to toss out the job opportunities programmes, to eliminate the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen and not to have your own particular programme available, is irresponsible. It's our prediction, Mr. Speaker, that they are already reaping the whirlwind of what they have sown for political reasons only.

It is the people of British Columbia who suffer. Municipalities, as has been explained in this debate, will be severely hit by this reversal of policy. This in turn will hit hardest those that all of us wish to help — the senior citizens and those who are on low income.

Their tax bills at the local level are going up as a result of this budget and they are going up because the NDP didn't have any programmes when it came into office on September, 1972 — no programmes at all, just rhetoric. No programmes to replace those that were working. They just tossed them into the ashcan and you replaced them, Mr. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) with a vaudeville performance.

I'd like to talk on tenant rentals, but time is short. I would just say that the Hon. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) outlined what we feel is a very useful policy to help people into their own homes and to help those who are now in a difficult rent situation.

I would also ask Mr. Minister of Finance, through you, Mr. Speaker, that you are getting \$24 million from the federal government and you budgeted for \$20 million in your own budget. Please, Mr. Minister of Finance, you've got some public housing projects on the drawing board. There are some that were started by our administration.

But there's a gap right now, and there's no mention in your budget about any rental increase of the \$50 renters grant. We ask you, Mr. Minister of Finance, through you, Mr. Speaker, please will you look at these surpluses, will you look at your budget in light of the new federal government's movement and would you please raise the *Renter Grants Act* to \$100 a year for this interim period? For these people who need that assistance now.

There was a problem before — and I'm not going to get into all the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources' (Hon. Mr. Williams) problems — but let's not kid ourselves. These people are old, they have a problem — they had a problem before and they have a problem now. It's been aggravated for various reasons that I've mentioned earlier.

Please, Mr. Minister of Finance, take a look at the situation. Help them now. Help them until you have your programmes, and combined with our programmes, active, so that they can move in. If you'd just shake your head, Mr. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) through you, Mr. Speaker. Would you just indicate, Mr. Minister of Finance, that you will consider, with that extra \$24 million, meeting this crucial need now?

AN HON. MEMBER: It's Friday night exhaustion.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, he looks half-asleep.

Mr. Speaker, another matter that I'd like to bring up briefly, and I'll cut it down, is that in light of some of the surpluses the Minister of Finance is expecting, we would like the Government now to extend medical coverage to those drugs that are used by people with chronic disabilities.

We're disappointed that you didn't expand the drug programme we had started. I hope the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) will take this into consideration with the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and the Minister of Finance, and you'll all get together. We'd like to have seen that programme expanded, first to all men over 65, regardless of their income.

We've got this mid-group that don't come under your rolls. They don't go anywhere. They're just getting squashed by circumstances. If they could have their drugs under that programme, men 65 and over — and would you consider women 60 and over? I believe that this is a justifiable move, Mr. Minister. I hope the Minister of Finance as I say will get in a twirl with the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social

[[Page 732](#)]

Improvement.

We want the extension of the drug programme to men over 65 and women 60 and over, regardless of their financial circumstances and regardless of whether they fit into a little pigeonhole of rehabilitation.

Then we would ask you please from those surpluses to take and make free the drugs associated with chronic illnesses. I see the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) is shaking his head in agreement.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: I don't care what you call it. You can call it anything you want. I'm only concerned with the people, Mr. Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. JORDAN: I would suggest the more common examples — many of the coeliacs and people like this are under special programmes. But the diabetic, probably they are the greatest majority that would be affected by this, and they don't get under any pigeonhole. If their insulin could come under that programme, and also probably vitamin B-12. It's expensive....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, now, the Minister wants to get into politics. My gosh, I'm trying to be as sincere about this as possible. So I'll just say that we want insulin and vitamins for diabetics free; we want dietary supplements; we want patients with chronic heart disease to have their drugs, which they can't live without — nitroglycerin, peritrates and the anticonvulsant drugs for those people who are subject to convulsive disorders and epileptics.

Now the Minister's got off his high horse and he's shaking his head again. So I hope that's good news for these people. We ask you, we beg you and, by George, we demand you do it. How about that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Minister, just one more point briefly — if you want to cut down the incidence and the cost and the emotional problems of abortion, would you please make birth control pills to all British Columbians resident in British Columbia free? There are other omissions here but I won't go into them.

I just want to briefly point out — and I'm not nearly finished. I would say to the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) and the Provincial Secretary. (Hon. Mr. Hall) that we have a good sports festival going in British Columbia, contrary to what the Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) says. I don't agree with him. We don't agree, as he suggested....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: You've got a lot of other worries, Mr. Member.

He says take all that money and pump it into youth programmes. Well, Mr. Member, we're for youth programmes, but we feel that that festival has created a climate, an opportunity for people of all ages to enter into

competition. If you laugh at that, all you have to do is go into a truck loggers' event in the festival.

Well, now the Member for North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) gets up, and he doesn't know — if you go and get out of your bailiwick, Mr. Member, you'll find that there are men and women of all ages keeping alive one of our cultural heritages.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, the city slickers ask, "What's that?" Such things are high-rigging, bucksawing, axe-throwing, they may not go into your sophisticated catalogue, Mr. Member, but they belong to people and they have a right to expression in this province. They have a right to be part of our heritage, and this festival posture platform gives them the incentive to keep it alive.

What about the wheelchair sports, Mr. Speaker? These people want the opportunity, they need the opportunity a lot of them to enter into competition. It's been denied them through their life through their disability. Through the sports festival they have this opportunity too. It's basketball and it's swimming — you get 60-year-old people — have you ever seen a 60-year-old-man go up and win a medal for bowling? Well then you'll know how important it is.

Sure there may be ways to trim the fat out of the budget. I'm not opposed to that. Cut out all the paid positions, that's fine. Keep the money where it belongs. Keep the festival part of people's lives. I don't for a minute suggest that you over-emphasize what I call professionalism in amateur sport. But keep it alive and, Mr. Premier — the time is short — expand it to include a cultural festival in British Columbia on an amateur basis.

The professionals have got their level. But all over British Columbia there are people potting — that's pottery — they're playing chess, they're woodcarving, the senior citizens have Popsicle stick construction. This should be part of our cultural mosaic that we want to build in British Columbia.

You've got the vehicle through the Sports Festival Association now. Then work through the Community

[[Page 733](#)]

Arts Councils; get those Community Arts Councils working with the local recreation commissions. Let's break down this stupid barrier that there is between culture and sport and then the grey area where people are.

Get these people working together. I believe they want to. And a good way is to start the cultural festival in conjunction with the sports festival, Let them build together. Eventually they may separate, but that's in time.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP have traditionally been opposed to class structure. We completely agree. But was as the Social....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll save that part of my speech till later.

I'd like to conclude by suggesting that during this budget debate the actions of the few Ministers who spoke were to ignore the omissions of the budget....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member make his point of order.

MR. CHABOT: My point of order is that there's a lot of disturbance across the floor from Members who are not in their seats. Mr. Speaker, I wish you'd ask them if they are going to interrupt the speaker, that they resume their seats.

MRS. JORDAN: Time is short. I know the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) wants to get on ...

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

In regard to your point of order, I see no person standing in their place on the floor.

MR. CHABOT: They have taken other Members' seats, disrupting the speaker, and that's contrary to the rules.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member for North Okanagan continue her speech please.

MR. CHABOT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I raised a very important point of order here and you've given me no indication that I was right in my point, that there were Members that are sitting in other than their own seats and causing a disruption. I wish you would bring the matter to their attention, that they're not in their seats and they are disrupting the procedure of this House. I wish you'd bring that to their attention.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see no Member out of their seat that I recognize. Would you draw my attention to someone being out of their place?

MR. CHABOT: The Member for North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) and the Member for Prince Rupert (Mr. Lea). I think the Premier should probably adjourn until 2 o'clock tomorrow.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I think that as long as the decorum of the House is preserved we will allow the Hon. Member to continue.

MRS. JORDAN: Man, if this is decorum, I sure would hate to go to a ball-game. Especially after the Premier brings liquor into the ball park.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw one portion of my speech which I advise the Press of because it is in there and I would ask you not to use it. I will use it later.

I would like to again go back to the fact that in this debate there has been the action of the Ministers to ignore the omissions and glamorize the few commissions in this budget, also that they and the Hon. Liberal Members tried to paint a picture that this was a Social Credit economic posture in this budget — pay as you go budget, based on sound economic analysis and projection. However, Mr. Speaker, as we have studied the budget and listened to the debate from those Ministers and private Members, we recognize — you know, if you want to get out of here on time you had better settle down because I'm not sitting down.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: I named you the Minister of Laugh-in because of your sense of humour. Do you like that, Mr. Member?

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Hon. Member please address the chair?

MRS. JORDAN: In view of the fact that when I started so many of the NDP Members were out that I missed the Hon. Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) when I was talking about various aspects of the previous debate. Now that he is back I would just like to say that I thought in your comments about my advertising campaign in the session, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the tractor and the accompanying equipment was right on. The only thing that was missing was you, with me, on that tractor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MRS. JORDAN: We recognize that there are not only major shifts in this budget that we insist shouldn't be there, but that there are several subtle policy changes which we believe will ultimately prove

detrimental to British Columbia. I would explain why this is not a Social Credit budget.

I think you will all agree that the former Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Bennett), was a remarkable man, not only because of his lifetime dedication to Christian and human principles, for his dedication to and his deep belief in the inherent goodness of man and for his faith in man's ability to do right and to grow in the face of moral and physical challenge, but economically speaking he was remarkable because of his inherent understanding of finance and the marketplace. His dedication too was outstanding to make money the instrument of British Columbians rather than British Columbians the instrument of money. As a politician I think it is acknowledged that he was supreme in his ability to walk a straight fence and keep both his ears to the ground, and that takes quite a politician.

But what is evident in British Columbia and in this budget now is that, in his own words, the present Minister of Finance is dedicated to an historical biography which is outstanding for a socialist revolution for which he will be answerable. He has said that he is a part-time, caretaker Premier and Minister of Finance, and he is encouraging socialist revolution rather than sound social reform based on sound economic policies and a thorough understanding of economics.

The present Minister of Finance and promoter of this budget has admitted his lack of financial understanding, and this is clearly evident in his actions. But I would say that as a politician he falls short, for he too is trying to walk a fence with both his ears to the ground. The only difference is that it is a socialist fence and it is theoretical rather than substantial and that isn't strong — it is rickety, and one of his ears is longer than the other.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Do you have a point of order, Mr. Member?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Regardless of what the previous Minister of Finance did, I can't do that....

MRS. JORDAN: Your ear is getting in your way.

What we want to know, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the length of his ears, is, who is the architect of this budget? Is it the Deputy Minister of Finance? Is it the Waffle economists who are in the shadow of that Cabinet over there? The architect is not, as some have tried to say, the former Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Bennett).

No, Mr. Speaker, there are too many subtle shifts in the basic philosophy of this budget, in the statements of the Ministers accompanying the budget debate, and as outlined by the accompanying legislation now before this House. One major shift is a subtle form which Caesar tried, and it led to his downfall, and you ought to pay attention to this, Mr. Minister of Finance.

MR. G.V. LAUK (Vancouver Centre): Which Caesar?

MRS. JORDAN: There was a Caesar then and it looks like there is a Caesar now, and it will lead to his downfall because he is trying to reform local governing boards and give them so-called greater autonomy I under his rules that he himself has established.

It is evident in this budget — the drawing to himself and his cabinet of greater powers without consultation with the proper legislative bodies. The establishment of a greater governing bureaucracy of British Columbia is evident in this budget. The erosion of democratic rights under the guise of state need is evident in this budget. The philosophy that the state knows best for people is evident in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, we suspect that there are a number of architectural shadows, but one of the architectural shadows of this budget and this Government's industrial and economic policies, we suggest, is one Eric Kierans. We say this because we see his mark. We see his mark on the royalty policy in this budget and we suspect that that mark will emerge in greater royalty policies coming in future budgets. It is the mark of a man who is a castoff from the Liberal Party. You have to be pretty bad to be cast off from the Liberal Party, let's face it, even you will agree to that. But it is the mark of a man whose theories were so messed up that he even had to go out of the simple portfolio of the Post Office, and all we got from him in British Columbia was an increase in the 5 cent stamp, a 60 per cent increase just to say hello to your mother.

Mr. Kierans, and I think this is important when you are laughing about this because he is one of your shadows, is a man who by his own admission as late as February 26 in the Vancouver *Province* said that he opts for deficit finance, and I would repeat:

"The federal government should opt for deficit financing rather than wage and price controls to combat inflation, former Liberal Communications Minister Eric Kierans said on Friday. Kierans told the industrial relations management association conference here," — get this — "Canada can afford a deficit between \$2 billion and \$3 billion."

Mr. Speaker, deficit financing, in our view, should be the last resort in the most acute emergency of any government. Mr. Kierans may think that Canada needs it, but I assure you that British Columbia doesn't need it, British Columbia won't need it if it handles its economy realistically, and if its policies evolve out of its capabilities to finance and support these policies. To opt for this "lazy-faire" policy and then wonder what happened when the crunch comes, as the federals did, is as foolish as asking any child

[[Page 735](#)]

has a stomach ache after he has just gobbled down a bag of jelly beans.

What Mr. Kierans should have said was no deficit financing. He should have got up and said that the federal government must tighten its belt, must cut the fat out of its bureaucracy, must cut the waste and must cut the debt with its staggering interest rates.

It is common knowledge in Canada today that the federal government is generating more revenues than it ever expected in its wildest dreams. Yet one must admit and say, and it is time it was said, that Liberal waste and Liberal fiscal mismanagement has resulted in Canada, which is one of the richest countries in the world, having and outstanding dead weight debt of nearly \$50 million. I won't break it down. We know what it is and we know it amounts to 14 cents out of every tax dollar that everybody in Canada pays.

Along with this great debt we lay claim to massive unemployment and we lay claim to one of the richest bureaucracies in the world, and it should go.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we are not debating the federal budget, but it is useful to learn from it. It is of real concern to many British Columbians that Canada is putting off the evil day that it has created by its own folly. If we in Canada don't come to grips with this now and cut down our own ambition and cut down our own spending and cut down the bureaucracy and the fat and the waste then we are just keeping an unconscionable yoke and burden on our children and on our children's children. Mr. Speaker, they will have their own debts they will have their own complexities of life. We are just crushing a future generation with our own folly and stupidity, as it has been expressed at the federal level by the federal Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want this to happen in British Columbia. We want our future generations all to share and have a high standard of living, but we don't want to do it stupidly now and on top of that give them a burden of debt from which they cannot possibly escape.

We in British Columbia, as I said, have a temporary Minister of Finance and he has said that he is barren in economic knowledge. We see a subtle shift in this budget to Mr. Kierans' philosophy and the federal government's philosophy of deficit financing. All I can say is heaven help us if this is the type of shadow financial help you have over there. Man, just look at history, it doesn't change. Look at what brought down the Roman Empire, or the French Empire — deficit financing and its accompanying philosophy, and it is the philosophy that goes with the deficit financing that's bad.

You look at old Juan Peron, dear old, lovable Juan Peron, in Argentina. What brought him down? Deficit financing and the accompanying philosophy what goes with it.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: What collapsed the Roman Empire? Deficit financing and the accompanying philosophy

that goes with it. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) in his reply to the budget two weeks ago made our position clear when he said that the Social Credit Opposition, the official Opposition, will not tolerate tinkering with the economic balance of this province. We think that there is strong evidence that that Government is becoming drunk with sudden power and new found power. And that's their prerogative. It's the manner in which it's being done that we object to.

Mr. Speaker, as I outlined, the philosophy in this budget is exactly opposite to the philosophy we stand for. The subtle shifts in the budget, either intentionally or unintentionally are going to lead to problems in British Columbia.

We certainly say that we will find some things in this budget to support, estimate by estimate, but as a total overview of this Government's policy, its philosophy and its future economic management, we discredit it and we are going to vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have been wondering for a couple of days whether or not....

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't mention the time.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'm not mentioning the time. I'm talking about the fact that I'm taking my place in this debate. I'm very happy to have the opportunity of taking my place in this debate. I have a few pages of notes here (laughter), 56 pages of notes, that's all. But I promise you I will be finished just as soon as I can get through them.

As a matter of fact, this is the annual extra report that's given by the Department of Highways on statistical data for the year 1971-1972 by the Department of Highways, and all of you will be getting a copy of this report at the earliest possible moment. So getting rid of that 56 pages was fairly easy. All I have to do is get through the next 56 pages in the same length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I won't make much reference to the speech we've just heard from the Hon. lady Member, except that I did get something out of her story about the three gnomes. I did get something out of it. It reminded me that three gnomes arrived in this province on August 30 — gnome more give-aways, gnome more special privileges and gnome more Social Credit. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, the opening....

[[Page 736](#)]

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it was a proud day for me, February 9, 1973, when the first NDP budget was read by the Premier and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett). Take a look at even the physical format of that budget speech, compared to what we have had in the past. It even looks different.

The previous budget speeches were longer than they were wide — this one is wider than it is long. (Laughter).

It's more embracing, it covers more territory, it says more than any of the previous budget speeches that we've heard in the last 20 years.

It's different in other ways. There are pictures in it. There are pictures in this one as there have been pictures in previous budget speeches. But look at the pictures. No picture of the Premier, along with every other Member of the House. And you look at the pictures in there — they're all of people.

MR. PHILLIPS: McGeer said that.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's all right. I want to repeat it. Because it's an indication that there is a difference between what this Government intends to do with its budget and what previous governments did with their budget. Because all the previous budget speeches had pictures and they were pictures of buildings and monuments — dead things — but not for people. That's why that budget speech has pictures of people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unemployed people.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to have to inform the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Barrett) that after listening to the last two debates in this House it's obvious there's some fat and waste in the budget that you brought down on February 9. After looking at what the Opposition has produced, it's obvious to me that all that research assistance, all that office assistance, all that fancy office space, is a complete waste of money. What a pitiful job they have done.

I sit here and listen and I've had a little experience in Opposition. I sit and I listen to that pitiful, miserable job they've done as the Opposition. Other people notice it too. The Premier's been in Opposition. And it's been so unbelievably bad he keeps threatening to send me over there to coach you.

You know, the budget speech came in on February 9. On Monday February 12 the leading spokesmen for the three Opposition parties got up and made their contributions to this debate on this budget. Their addition to this debate was so catastrophic that President Nixon devalued the U.S. dollar, (laughter) and threatened retribution in the way of surcharges against Canada and the rest of the world.

I listened to one of the Members across the way talk about how terrible it was that up until the time he had spoken some of the Ministers hadn't participated in the debate in this House. Twenty years ago I sat in this House with a new Government sitting on this side of the House. I was sitting on that side. There was a throne debate. A Minister moved the motion with regard to the Speech from the Throne; a Minister seconded the motion; we went through the whole throne debate; not only did not another Minister speak during that whole debate but not one backbench Social Credit Member said a single word right through that debate. And the debate was wound up by a Minister too. That's how they treated their responsibility in their first chance to speak in this House as a Government of British Columbia.

MR. PHILLIPS: They didn't have 38 Members.

MR. CHABOT: They had 19.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That Member who has just spoken raised the matter about answering questions in this House. We used to get questions answered sometimes — sometimes — by the previous administration. I remember that in 1958 I put a question on the order paper asking about the prices paid by the Liquor Control Board for liquor in this province to the various suppliers. That question stayed on the order paper all during the session. The day the House prorogued — oh, you're leaving are you, Mr. Member? Well, let's read it into the record. That question was answered the day the House prorogued. So I went into the Clerk's office to get the answer to this question. It was a question I had asked of the Attorney General (Mr. Bonner). The answer was: "See answer of the then Attorney General in Journals of the Legislative Assembly 1930, page 203."

So I went to the library to see how the Attorney General had answered the same question in 1930. And I found that a man named Mr. Wrench had asked the Attorney General at that time, in 1930, the same question — what was the selling price of each brand of liquor and so on. The Attorney General of 1930 gave the answer that was in essence the same answer as that government gave me.

What was the answer to the question? "It is not in the public interest to give any information at this time." That's the kind of answers we used to get across the way — not in the public interest to give answers at this time. And they have the gall to refer to how questions are answered and whether or not they're answered correctly.

I want the record to show, Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that there was an amendment moved

[[Page 737](#)]

in this House yesterday by the Liberal Members of this House which upset the normal debating procedures in this debate. I want the record to show that at 6 o'clock the next day we were still debating something that arose out of their amendment. I want the record to show that the Whips in the House agreed to sit between 6 and 8 in order to wind up the debate. And I want the record to show that from 6 o'clock until 7:58 not a single Liberal was sitting in his seat in this House.

MR. BROUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I was here until 6:40 and the Hon. Minister of Highways had left for his dinner.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think this is a point of order and I don't think it is at all relevant — either what the Minister or the Hon. Member has said — to the debate or the budget.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: One of the Members across the way in the official Opposition, the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) said there is certainly a demarcation — a distinct difference between the policies, the hopes and the aspirations of the Opposition in this House and those of the NDP and their philosophies. I would agree with that.

But I want to remind the House first of all, as I make a short addition to this debate, that this budget has been called many things by the Opposition. The Social Credit House Leader said it was a Social Credit budget. The Conservative House Leader said it was a socialist budget. The lead-off speaker for the official Opposition said it was a tinker-toy budget. The former Liberal leader said it was a shell game. The present Liberal leader, the pro tem present Liberal leader, said it's more of the same.

Now I want you to remember these comments about this budget as I make my few remarks because I will remind you of those comments as I proceed — a tinker-toy budget, a shell game, more of the same. The House Leader of the Conservative Party was dead on when he said, "It's a socialist budget." He was dead on. While that might perturb him it makes me very, very happy.

There were people who indicated, and some of my colleagues in the Press gallery indicated, that there really wasn't much difference between this budget and previous budgets. They perhaps were misled by the fact that the budget contained a substantial number of large figures and that the estimates are divided into the same departments as they always have been. But there is a substantial difference in how these figures were handled.

I was at this point going to make some comments about the Department of Highways. I just want to point out to you what has been happening and reflect on one or two of the comments from across the way.

How difficult the Opposition have found it to really get to grips with what this budget is doing, because they are used to the old way of doing things. The Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) who spoke during the budget debate, accused me of the highhanded use of power — high-handed use of power because I made a statement about the possibility or the likelihood of moving ferries. Then when it comes to doing something with Blanshard Street, he said, "Show some leadership."

I want to tell the Member for Victoria that the Department of Highways, the City of Victoria and the Municipality of Saanich, since last October, have been having discussions with regard to the continuation of the Blanshard Street development — to try and clean up the mess that was made by the previous administration in their handling of that real problem for the City of Victoria.

Both Members for Peace River (Mr. Phillips and Mr. Smith) had a lot to say today about the north. One of them said that what this Government does about the road to Fort Nelson and Fort Simpson will indicate to the people of the north the intentions of this government, and the true feeling of this Government toward northern British Columbia. That's what you said, it's in the record.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): That's one of the things.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: That's what he said. Don't start to fish around now, because that's exactly what you said. Here it is.

MR. CHABOT: Blue sheet.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Blue sheet. "If and when I see an answer on the order paper to question No. 179 that stands in my name with respect to the construction of a highway from Fort Nelson to connect with the Fort Simpson road at the northern boundary of British Columbia...."

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. What's the point of order, Hon. Member?

MR. D.E. SMITH: (North Peace River): The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. The Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) is quoting from the blue transcript that is placed in the hands of the Members on the strict understanding that it is for their use and their information only. It is not to be quoted from or used in any way.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me. It is my understanding, and perhaps I had better get this clear, that it is

[[Page 738](#)]

for the use of the Members after they received the pink copy for them to correct, and that it is for their use in the House but it is not for the use of the public outside this chamber.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Then it can be quoted?

MR. SPEAKER: I assume it can be quoted in the chamber but you are responsible for the remarks that are in there. If they are not correct you have the right to correct them in this chamber.

MR. ANDERSON: Not corrected here but for use in the chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: They may not be corrected here....

MR. SMITH: Then, do I understand you to say that any of us who are in this House have the right to quote from this particular document in this chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: That is my understanding. But let me say that it is not a corrected copy. So if you find something objectionable that is attributed to you that is not correct, you have the right to correct it if someone else quotes you in this chamber.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I always receive a pink for correction. I send the pink back by a certain time and it is corrected in the blues.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: First of all I want to know if all the Members across the way have their shoes on? That's the first thing I want to know. Secondly, I want to point out that the new Government proceeded with the work in hand on that particular road. We have contacted Ottawa to see what they are going to be doing about their end of the road. I understand that Ottawa will be very busy — and just last week we discussed it with Ottawa — that they are going to be very busy with the road up the Mackenzie.

They don't know whether or not they will be able to do any work this year or next on their section of the highway. They don't know whether or not they will be able to do anything on it. But, despite the fact that the

previous administration were reluctant to add to anything unless Ottawa would help us pay our part, I have already told the department to go ahead and build our part of the road.

Now if it happens, as it could happen with the present Liberal federal government in Ottawa, that they don't proceed with their part, I don't want anyone over there getting up and saying that I built a road that starts at Fort Nelson and finishes nowhere. You won't? Well, I'm just reminding you that that's very likely to happen.

Despite this inability of the federal government to give a clear indication that they will come to meet us, we are going to build our section of the road to the Yukon boundary.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I had some other highway items there but I will let them go.

I just want to refer briefly to the matter of....

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the road down to Monkman Pass?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: All right. You asked about Monkman Pass. The road is ploughed and open to Quintette Mountain and the areas where exploration is taking place. It is quite narrow but certainly usable. The district superintendent advises there is very little traffic.

I told the Member from up there that no matter how much money we spent on the road, because the companies that have the leases have their headquarters in Alberta, they are unlikely to transfer much of the traffic from Alberta into the Dawson Creek area. There is very little use being made of the road. With regard to ploughing it, this letter went through to the president of the Pouce Coupe and District Chamber of Commerce, February 16.

"With reference to your telegram in regard to the development and maintenance of an access road south of Dawson Creek to the resource-rich areas of Monkman Pass, I have arranged for further snow-ploughing to be carried out on the access road should it be required to keep it open until the period of spring break."

So there you are.

I want to refer just briefly to the matter that has been referred to by a number of Members about the fact that here have been some lay-offs in the Department of Highways of extra casual temporary help. I just want to give you the figures from 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971. In July, 1968 there were 5,100 people working for the Department of Highways. In November it was down to 4,600 — a decrease of 515 that had been laid off. Between July, 1969 and November, 1969 a decrease of 625. In 1970, in that same period a decrease of 232. In 1971, a decrease of 492.

So it has been a normal procedure in the Department of Highways, as the year end approaches, to reduce the work force out there in the field.

In the course of this budget debate, we had the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) making reference to how worried he was about the flood

[[Page 739](#)]

plains of Chilliwack. I want to draw his particular attention to this because I have an indication that they are going to vote against this budget. I want you to remember what's in this budget too, my friend. In this budget is the provincial part of a \$6.5 million flood control agreement for the Chilliwack area. Now, my question to the Member is: Is he going to vote against this budget which contains the money that the province is going to contribute toward settling and helping with what you said was one of your greatest problems? It is in this budget, my friend.

I want to draw your attention to some aspects of this budget where the real difference is between this and previous budgets, because it shows the different direction that is part of the policy of this government. I am going to refer to things that are happening in many of the departments.

In the Department of Agriculture, we find for instance, an increase of 31 in the number of agriculturalists that are going to be working to help the farmers of British Columbia — 31 more agriculturalists out there to help the farmers help themselves and do a better job.

Are you going to vote against that, you and your amendment? Are you going to vote against that — 31 extra agriculturalists to go all over this province into the farm areas, to help and advise the farmers to produce, to help them solve their problems so that they can help themselves? That's in this budget.

For the first time, in this budget in the agriculture department there's an allowance for a research director to do some basic research — something that's never been done in the Department of Agriculture, a brand new position; again, to help the farmers with the research required to be sure they're producing what's required for the local markets. You're going to vote against that? Is that a tinker toy effort?

There are 15 more laboratory workers in the Department of Agriculture to help the farmers with any problems they have — 15 more. There's \$100,000 for new demonstration and applied research in the Department of Agriculture — \$100,000. Brand new vote, brand new programme — you're going to vote against that, you rural Members in the farm areas?

This is a new direction for agriculture in the Province of British Columbia, with more real help than the farmers of this province ever had through 20 years of Social Credit. That's part of the new direction that's involved in this new Government — to help agriculture and the farmers to help themselves, Let's take a look at education. That's in the budget. Education is part of the research markets — brand new programme. Curriculum resources, three more people. Jericho Hill School, 18 more people Have any of you been to Jericho Hill School? Eighteen more people — are you going to vote against 18 people to help those unfortunates in Jericho Hill

School? Are you going to vote against that? Is that socialism? Of course it is, because it's helping people. Grants to school districts are up \$28 million, a new vote. Again a new vote, educational development research and evaluation, three-quarters of a million dollars to help the young people of British Columbia get the kind of education they need in the years ahead.

Socialism? Tinker toy budget? More of the same? It's a socialist effort. \$12 million as an extra adjustment. payment for the annual operation costs of the school districts. Rural power subsidy, \$3 million. You Members from the rural areas are going to vote against that?

Let's look at health to the people of this province. Public health services, 34 new people in that department. These are the new jobs you were talking about — new jobs to help people in British Columbia. That's socialism; that's not tinker toy. Public health services, the division for the aid to the handicapped, up from 12 to 18 people — an increase of 50 per cent in the number of people working to give aid to the handicapped.

Service to people — are you going to vote against that? That's what the people of British Columbia will realize: that's not tinker toy; that's looking after the needs of the people of British Columbia. That's the objective of that budget.

Local health services — in your own locality, right in your own home town — 82 new people to help preserve the local health in every community in British Columbia. That's looking after people. That's not this tinker toy or Social Credit. That's a socialist approach through a budget to help the people.

For years, Mr. Speaker, we've known that all over this province there was a need for an increase in the community mental health services, I was at a meeting in Duncan last Saturday morning and I heard a cry for help from some of the parents of that community. They do need more help than they've ever had before in community health services. I've heard that cry for years. I made that cry from that side of the House and I cried in vain.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now you're crying from the other side.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Thirty-four additional people to help the community mental health services. Are

you going to vote against that? 212 more people in the mental health service to this province. That's what that budget means — 212 people in the mental service of British Columbia. That's the socialist approach in this budget and through this budget to help the people that need help in the Province of British Columbia.

All this noise you made ignored completely the fact that the whole thrust and projection of this

[[Page 740](#)]

budget is to bring services to people — services they've been looking for and demanding for years that the previous administration refused them — 212 — how you could overlook that in the documents presented to you on February 9 I'll never know.

MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, please.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Two hundred and twelve new people in this most important factor. Somebody said, "It's a shell game." Is that a shell game — providing 212 more people to help those who need help for mental health? That's a socialist budget to help people.

Mr. Speaker, for years this province has had problems with labour-management relations — a real problem in this province. People say, "Oh, what would you do?" We have said time and again that we would put in more people to work in the labour relations field. We find that this budget means 18 new industrial relations officers to help in the labour relations field to help bring industrial peace to the Province of British Columbia. That's in this budget. Are you going to vote against industrial peace in British Columbia? That's what that means.

What else is there in that same department? Apprenticeship and industrial training. Again, the employers say, "We cannot get the young people with the proper apprenticeship training." We find 23 new people in the apprenticeship and industrial training aspects of the Department of Labour — 23 more people in that department to help evolve and implement this programmes so our young people will be trained to fit in and do the job that our employers say they can't find the people to do now.

Is that a shell game, or is that giving the people of this province through a socialist budget the kind of things they have the right to expect? I say it's giving them what they have the right to expect.

To protect the natural resources of this province, 30 more people in the water resources. Protection and management of our forests — our greatest natural resource — 46 new people. Mines and petroleum branches, 21 new people — a geologist and technicians to protect our natural resources.

Safety inspection to protect the lives of our people — 32 more people to be sure that our workers on all their jobs have safe working conditions. The youth training Programme, one of the most important programmes and one I've fought for for years — I've managed to get it up from \$75,000 up to \$400,000. Our young people in grades 10, 11 and 12 — give them two months out in the woods working in the youth training camps, all they eat and \$3 or \$4 a day. Up by 33 per cent this year, in one jump. Social improvement to help people, up 60 per cent.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to what the Members across the way were saying, I couldn't help but think of the fact that I've been in this House a few years. I've heard people build straw men before, but it's the first time I have ever heard anybody build straw bogymen. Because that's what you spent your time doing — building straw bogymen.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's "boogie."

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Bogy, boogie. They said, "Oh, my goodness! How awful it is; an air of uncertainty because of this Government and this budget." Right after the budget one paper said, "British Columbia's mining industry reacted favourably to Premier David Barrett's budget." Then this paper said, "Big business heaved a sigh of relief over this budget."

The B.C. Chamber of Commerce president said, "Generally many of the programmes are a good start to the extent that they produce jobs and give impetus to the province.

"It's tax money well spent," said the president of the Chamber of Commerce of British Columbia. Yes. To give impetus to the province and produce jobs — that's the terrible thing you did Mr. Minister of Finance, when you brought down that budget. You gave impetus.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Jim Pattison!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Jim Pattison? Oh, what does he say? "Nothing to fear in NDP plan." I wonder who these people were talking to that kept up with this "air of uncertainty," the terrible things that were going to happen because we were here, because of this budget. "Nothing to fear," said Jim Pattison.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The President of the B.C.-Yukon Chamber of Mines says, "It's a fairly reasonable budget."

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Let me finish. "The world of finance did not appear alarmed at the socialist Government's first budget." Securities trader Robert Atkinson said, "Generally the investment community can live with it." Now that's what they said.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'll come to that in a minute. Don't worry.

For two weeks we heard these people, all the free enterprisers, saying what an awful budget it was; how

[[Page 741](#)]

it created this "fear and uncertainty" throughout the business community; how terrible it would be for the future. I don't know who they were talking to because there are the people...Mr. Minister of Finance, it's now obvious that there are only 17 people in British Columbia opposed to this budget, and that's that group over there.

The workers like it. The senior citizens like it. The school children like it. The school teachers like it. Everybody lost their way because they couldn't read a budget speech and didn't know the fact that this is a change of direction for the Province of British Columbia. Any time any government budget can satisfy business, labour, people government budget can satisfy business, labour people budget, as you said, Mr. Minister of Finance.

I've heard talk today from Members over here — all free enterprisers who love free enterprise. They love the jungle of the marketplace. This is their way of life. But the minute any of that little group get hurt, you know what they say? "Please, Government, help us." They say, "We've got no freedom. We can't have this vicious socialism directing the lives of the people or interfering with the freedom of the people to do with as they please." But he wants us to do something about the mortgage industry.

Interjection by an Hon. Member,

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I know they are.

Then we had this Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) talking about condominiums and how this Government should bring in legislation which would interfere with the right of the individual to do with his property as he pleased.

Mr. Speaker, we've already tested the water on what you think about that as a principle. There was some

legislation brought in here yesterday. What did you call it? What were the words you used?

MR. PHILLIPS: It was "devastating."

HON. MR. STRACHAN: It doesn't do any more than you've asked us to do with condominiums.

AN HON. MEMBER: You've lost your sense of direction, Bob.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Oh, no. I know where I'm going. I know where we're going. And I know where you're going.

MR. PHILLIPS: And we know where you're going.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Actually, Mr. Speaker, we're suffering from the many years of your kind of free enterprise economy. That's what we're suffering from — the many, many years of your kind of free enterprise economy. That's right.

You know, Mr. Speaker, all through this budget debate the Members over there have been saying, "Do this; do that; do something else. Spend money here; spend money there; spend money in the north, in the south, in the east, in the west."

Here's the budget speech. They don't want to give us any money to do it with. They want us to do everything but they're going to vote against the budget, they say. They don't want to give us any money to do it with — all of these new programmes that I've outlined to you.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in this province, in this socialist budget we have a document that reflects a philosophy that people come first; that reflects a philosophy that the economy must exist to help people and not vice versa. It is the first time that we've had a budget that directs the economy to promote developments which most benefit the people of the province; that spells out clearly a philosophy and belief in the Canadian entity; that promises that B.C. will work to preserve and build that entity as the western anchor of Canadian federation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that unless mankind changes his ways, our society will perish. The computers tell us that man is on the way to destroying man's civilized life.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that computer a part of the free enterprise system? Don't believe it.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Someone said that if the human family does not change its ways, it will finally overcrowd, gut and poison its tiny fragment of the universe. It is the people as such, the various communities throughout the world — North America, as such, has been headed for destruction as a society, as a community. In recent years this has become very evident because of the kind of policies that have been measured in every way by the exploitation of the country itself.

We in British Columbia can't solve all the problems of the world. We can't save the world by ourselves. But as a new government, recognizing the fact that to continue in the old ways will lead us to that kind of destruction and make us part of the self-destruction of North America, this province is changing its course through this budget.

As I said, we can't save the world by ourselves, but as a Government we have a responsibility to British Columbia. We have to play our part as a Government, charged with the responsibility of governing this province, to see that we change the direction and stop what has been happening to this Province of British Columbia.

That's what this budget means, Mr. Speaker. Those who vote against this budget are voting against —

[[Page 742](#)]

what are they voting against? They're voting against \$64 million to carry out the guaranteed \$200 monthly income plan for those aged 65 or over. They're voting against \$32 million more provided in 1973 over 1972 for school

districts. They're voting against the extra \$15 million for universities; the \$3.5 million for elderly citizens' rental grants; \$90 million for Medicare; \$40 million for hospital insurance; accelerated parks; accelerated reforestation, provincial land acquisition and community recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of a new direction for British Columbia. Those of you who want to stay on that old path that was leading this province and its people to destruction will vote against that budget. You'll be voting for the same old thing — the same old exploitation, give-away and the ignoring of the rights of the people and the needs of the people.

MR. PHILLIPS: And providing jobs for the unemployed.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I've outlined to you briefly what this budget means to me; what it means to the people of British Columbia and their future. I suggest that if you're for British Columbia, you have no alternative but to vote for this budget. If you're against British Columbia and its people, then you'll vote against the budget. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the question now be put.

AN HON. MEMBER: Once again there's a bright light that goes out in the dark of night.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 30

Hall	Barrett	Dailly
Strachan	Nicolson	Brown
Radford	Sanford	D'Arcy
Cummings	Dent	Levi
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Calder	Skelly
Gabelmann	Lauk	Lea
Young	Lockstead	Gorst
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves
Webster		Lewis Liden

NAYS — 12

Richter	Chabot	Jordan
Smith	Fraser	Phillips
Morrison	Schroeder	Anderson, D.A.
Williams, L.A.	Wallace	Curtis

PAIRS

Hartley	Brousson
Macdonald	Gardom
Nimsick	McClelland
Stupich	McGeer

The House in committee of supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will come to order.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Vote No. 2. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

Leave granted.

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to make a very brief statement.

Leave granted.

MR. CURTIS: One week ago in this House, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to an incident in which a teacher put his hands around the neck of a greater Victoria junior secondary school student. This has been thoroughly investigated, and I appreciate that fact, in the space of a few days. I'm informed that while the incident did take place, the action described was carried out in a spirit of jest and apparently with no violence intended. I'm happy, therefore, to put the record straight and accept the word of the teacher in this respect. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Levi files answers to questions.

Filing reports.

Hon. Mr. Lorimer files the annual report for the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ending December 31, 1972.

MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could inquire from the Premier as to the direction of business for Monday. I assume it will be estimates.

[[Page 743](#)]

HON. MR. BARRETT: First, we are going to do the Premier's and the Minister of Finance's estimates. Then right after that on Monday afternoon we're going to do the Attorney General's. At 6:00, we'll decide after that.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, Columbia River. Is that a seat in this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Barrett files answers to questions.

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

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Premier's indication of the business order for Monday. Are we to understand that the proceedings of previous years will be followed in that the matters of the Crown corporations may be debated under your estimates, sir? I'm thinking of Hydro and British Columbia Railway.

HON. MR. BARRETT: As we did in the past, the Hydro estimates would be debated under either one of the Ministers on that Crown agency's board. Either one, whichever one the Opposition wish to choose. Certainly the Railroad, I would expect, would be debated under my estimates.

MR. WILLIAMS: Let's be clear about this, Mr. Speaker. In previous years it's my understanding that it was under the estimate of the Hon. Minister of Finance, as the chief fiscal officer of B.C. Hydro and of B.C. Rail, that we dealt with these Crown corporations. Now if it is intended that we should deal with them under the other Ministers who are directors of the British Columbia Hydro, I think we should have it clear.

HON. MR. BARRETT: The best way to approach it, if the House agrees — and I'm at the hands of the House — as I see it, it would be appropriate to deal with the Premier's office, the Minister of Finance and the B.C. Railway, and with either one of the directors on Hydro, deal with that Crown agency at that time.

However, if the House wishes to deal with Hydro under my estimates, I've no objection to that decision, I would only hope that once they were dealt with under my estimates, we wouldn't go through them again under someone else.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

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

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