

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)**

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1972

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 37](#)]

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1972

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Lady Minister without Portfolio.

HON. G.M. McCARTHY (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in the House we have a young man who represents the Kinsmen's Mothers' March on February 1. He is the poster child for the Province of British Columbia. He is visiting Victoria. Last night the Press and the politicians I thought provided rather a very fine show for Schmockey night but the star of the show really was Lawrence Sutherland. I think all Members would agree.

Lawrence is here from Fraser Lake, British Columbia. He is accompanied by his foster mother, Mrs. Eldridge. He has visited the Premier today and been presented by the Premier with a gift from the province. We are pleased to have him here and I would ask all Members of the House to welcome him and to support him on February 1 for the Mothers' March.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. Macdonald moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 2 intituled *An Act to Amend the Administration Act*.

Motion approved. Bill read a first time and ordered to be placed on Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Attorney General.

HON. L.R. PETERSON (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege for me to rise in my place today and participate in this debate. I might say I have almost a sense of gratitude to be able to get up after playing hockey in Vancouver on Sunday and last night in Victoria. But while the goals may have been scored by the news media, most of the bruises I think ended up there too. But it was all for a good cause and a most enjoyable day both in Vancouver on Sunday and Victoria last night.

I am pleased today to be able to speak in support of the motion that is before us so that you are not held in suspense for any length of time.

First of all, I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion, the Honourable Member for Richmond (Mr. LeCours) and the Honourable Member for Shuswap (Mr. Jefcoat).

I regret that I was not able to accede to the request of the Honourable Member for Richmond made to me — that the government pass an order-in-council by Monday at the latest to prohibit the use of nail polish remover by minors. I can assure him, as I assure this chamber, that it is not through any lack of desire, not through any lack of concern of the serious problem in this respect, it is simply from a lack of authority.

I refer to the jurisdiction under the *British North America Act*. I know the Hon. Leader of the Liberal party when he spoke yesterday enumerated a number of states in the United States that had passed legislation on this problem of sniffing toxic solvents — Maryland, California, New Jersey, Rhode Island, New York et cetera.

I facetiously asked them whether they had a *British North America Act* down there, but I put the question to him simply to remind him — if he's not already aware — that the jurisdiction of the states in these matters is considerably different from the jurisdiction of the provinces under the *British North America Act*.

I am sure that the legal member who sits beside him and one who sits behind him could advise him in that respect, that they do have authority in the states, individual states, to pass such laws whereas it has been decreed here that we do not.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Oh, if the Hon. Leader of the Liberal party doesn't know the difference between the *Liquor Act* and the *British North America Act*, it is going to take me a long time to tell him about this problem of jurisdiction.

We've had this problem under serious study by the senior law officers of my department to try and determine what are the courses of action we could take. The advice that I have received is that the only area where we can take provincial initiative in this respect would be under the federal government Juvenile Delinquency Act, on a charge of contributing to juvenile delinquency, where an establishment sold the products with the full knowledge of the use to which it was going to be put — that is sniffing.

A difficult matter, as legal members present would understand. Not an easy provision to invoke but nevertheless, one that should be considered and the director of criminal law has been instructed to consider the laying of charges in this respect.

Another area of provincial jurisdiction is the licensing authority under which these business establishments operate. In this respect, we have been in touch with the officials of the City of Vancouver, corporation members there and also on the prosecution staff, suggesting that consideration be given to the suspension of licenses, calling the one or two real bad operators forward to show cause why their license should not be suspended or cancelled.

This, I suggest, would have a very salutary effect in dealing with the problem of nail polish sniffing and the other toxic solvents associated with it.

Then too, I have telephoned the president of the company that manufactures the nail polish remover specifically to request consideration of restricted sale of the product, and the possibility of an additive being included in the product.

He told me that their laboratories were working on the problem, trying to come up with an additive that would create violent nausea when sniffed. They haven't solved the problem as yet and to the best of his knowledge, no company has solved the problem in respect to this particular product.

The president indicated that they wouldn't be adverse to some kind of a restricted sale list, even on a voluntary basis, and in discussing this with their retailers across the country. They are also considering voluntarily putting on a warning

[[Page 38](#)]

label such as "Prolonged inhalation will be dangerous to your health." So, these I mention to the Honourable Members as some of the things that are voluntarily going on.

But I indicated earlier that we have attempted to legislate in respect of such harmful substances before, where the federal government had legislated and the courts had decreed our legislation ultra vires — that this was a field given under the *British North America Act* to the federal government and therefore, the federal government had the legislative field, not the provincial governments.

Well, the federal government have in fact legislated in this field. I was amazed that the Hon. Leader of the Liberal party, who is often in this House an apologist for the federal Liberals, should have gone to the states and pointed out here what they have done there and suggested that the Attorney General was at fault for not doing what the states had done, when in fact there is legislation on the statute books now in Ottawa that can be invoked. I refer to the *Hazardous Products Act* — legislation already on the statute books.

I've telegraphed the federal government in Ottawa and I will read the text of my telegram which went yesterday:

THE USE BY CHILDREN OF TOXIC SOLVENTS IN NAIL POLISH REMOVERS AND OTHER PRODUCTS SOLD COMMERCIALY IN THE VANCOUVER AREA IS CREATING A SERIOUS HEALTH PROBLEM. I HEREBY REQUEST THAT SUCH SOLVENTS BE INCLUDED EITHER UNDER PART ONE OR TWO OF THE SCHEDULE TO THE HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS ACT. I REQUEST THAT ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO RESTRICTING THE SALE OF THESE TOXIC SOLVENTS TO PERSONS OVER THE AGE OF 16 YEARS.

and that is the end of the text, the end of the telegraph, it was sent Monday morning.

Mr. Speaker, the matter can be dealt with, not by debates in the House of Commons, it can be dealt with simply by an order-in-council of the federal cabinet.

I would hope that if the Hon. Leader of the Liberal party is seriously concerned — and I accept his sincerity in this respect that he is concerned — that he would likewise join in asking that this action be taken. Because while the problem is perhaps most acute in the city of Vancouver, nevertheless, it is a problem, not only in Vancouver but across Canada as well. It relates not only to nail polish remover, but to other products that also use toxic solvents.

Now, Mr. Speaker; both of the Honourable Members who moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne on Friday last have represented their constituencies over the years extremely well in this chamber.

Their views have not always been in accord, if I can put it that way, with government policy. In fact, they have not always seen fit to vote in support of the government. Nevertheless, the Social Credit movement, Mr. Speaker, is large enough and will always recognise the independence of the individual member in this chamber.

While we also recognise the independence of the individual member we also welcome constructive criticism from our own members as we do from opposition members.

Not all the criticism we receive of course, from the Opposition can be put in the category of constructive criticism.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's a fine statement.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Well, you know, I think we have to face that the primary objective of Hon. Members over there is to unseat the government. They want to be where we are. Criticism is their best weapon in this respect. We saw just how far they were prepared to go in that respect. They pulled out a lot of the old clichés once again. You know: "Oh, the tired government, lack of leadership," that they have said from time to time. Although, when we listened to them yesterday, I just wondered who was old and tired.

This is the 16th Speech from the Throne that I've listened to since I've been a member, Mr. Speaker. They've all been subject to this same kind of criticism from the Opposition.

Each of these Speeches from the Throne, if you look back over the years, have referred to the past achievements during the past year. They refer as well in most cases to the current state of the economy and they project to some degree the plans and programmes of the government in the future. To a greater or less degree, because every day even in the first week after the Speech from the Throne has been introduced in this House, we are announcing additional pieces of legislation et cetera that will be coming before this chamber. But you know....

AN HON. MEMBER: Recognise the facts....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. MR. PETERSON: I don't blame the Hon. Member for Cowichan trying to make up for yesterday on the part of the Opposition but I want to remind that Hon. Member, as well as all the members, that whenever the voters of this province have had the occasion to pass judgment on these Speeches from the Throne on the plans and the programmes of this government, they have endorsed them. They've endorsed them.

The only ones that have been out of step in this political march of progress have been the N.D.P. and the provincial Liberals.

Is it any wonder, is it any wonder that the public today are questioning the validity of the criticism they have to offer? Because it is criticism, same old stuff, not based on facts but based on their own political aspirations to take over the reins of government. I invite these members across the way, Mr. Speaker, to compare the current state of this province as reflected in the Speech from the Throne with any other jurisdiction. Any other jurisdiction.

Let the N.D.P. select a province where they are government — and unfortunately, there are one or two instances. Let the Liberals select a Speech from the Throne where they were government and let them compare.

Compare the economy in this province with the economy of any other province in Canada. We're the fastest growing part of all Canada and as the Speech, from the Throne indicates on page six, the population growth of approximately three per cent is the highest in Canada, while the labour population growth is more than six per cent, more than six per cent. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Manitoba...more than double.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

HON. MR. PETERSON: The rate of growth in the labour force in British Columbia compared with that of Manitoba. I'm not going to dwell on the economic situation at this time, because it would be more appropriate. to do so in the budget

debate, Mr. Speaker. However, let's at least agree on one point, and that is that British Columbia leads all Canada in our prospects for the future. Our prospect for sustained economic expansion in British Columbia is better than any other part of Canada.

Now the N.D.P. have a responsibility, as I said, for government. Let them compare the Speeches from the Throne in their provinces with the Speech from the Throne of this administration. I issue the same challenge to the Liberals, the same challenge. It would be a welcome relief, as a matter of fact, from those fictitious paper promises that we were given yesterday of a supposed Speech from the Throne of the Liberals.

AN HON. MEMBER: Blowing bubbles in the air.

HON. MR. PETERSON: You know, a little less fantasy and more fact would be most refreshing in the Liberal leader's presentation because in the budget debate he gives us fictitious budget, a fantasy, and now he has started to do the same thing in the throne debate — rather than deal with realities, rather than deal with facts. The Leader of the Opposition, and I don't want to ignore him completely today....

AN HON. MEMBER: Champagne music!

HON. MR. PETERSON: The Leader of the Opposition had a little travelogue to tell us.

He told of his caucus travelling throughout the province, most of it seemed to be in areas that were represented by members on the government side of the house. But when he described what he found — you know, the public not being adequately represented by the government members and this sort of thing — he reminded me of the knight from La Mancha.

Don Quixote's obsession you know, wherever he travelled, was that he saw evil, and his quest in life was to fight evil. And here the Leader of the Opposition wherever he travelled he saw the public not properly represented by the Social Credit members.

He saw pollution, he saw unemployment, when the reasonable man, when the objective man, would be prepared to acknowledge that in spite of these problems — in spite of the problems of unemployment, the problems of pollution — nevertheless this province has done more in terms of increasing job opportunities. We are growing more rapidly in this respect of any other part of Canada, and we are doing more to preserve the quality of the environment as in other jurisdictions as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's nothing, that's nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Want to rewrite your speech?

HON. MR. PETERSON: Well, the Honourable Member can refer to the accomplishments of the provinces in which the N.D.P. are governing as nothing. That's his privilege.

Some mention was made of unemployment. But you know, if it was not as the Speech from the Throne indicated, if it was not for the great influx of workers who come here from elsewhere, there wouldn't be an unemployment problem in British Columbia, today.

There is no way to stop them, nor is there any desire to stop them. We don't have border patrols, no one stops them at the Alberta-B.C. border, they're welcome to come here. But there is no way that we can have the number who come here equal the number of jobs that are going to be available. There is just no way that those figures can balance out and we might as well face that fact.

The Leader of the Liberal party — he said it a moment ago, and he said it again yesterday — says the dynamic policies of the Liberal Government were going to cure unemployment. Going to get rid of unemployment, by the dynamic policies of the Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, if anything destroyed the creditability of his remarks yesterday it was that one statement. Because we know where the root cause of this unemployment problem has been in Canada. And as a plan in their fight against inflation they announced in advance they were going to create unemployment to fight inflation. Yet the Leader of the Liberal Party has the temerity to refer to this as dynamic policy. Dynamic policy!

The Leader of the Opposition was critical of the dates chosen....

AN HON. MEMBER: Go and get yourself another writer.

HON. MR. PETERSON: The dates in the Speech from the Throne, the October dates. Has he discovered yet why they were chosen? Because, if you recall, and there should be no mystery in this respect, that was the date in the budget of last year of the comparisons, the date of the predictions as to what was going to happen — how many additional people were going to be employed. It's only consistent to use the same dates in this respect.

The Speech from the Throne referred to a number of programmes which will provide direct employment this year. The highway construction programme, page five of the speech, the extension of the railway, hereafter known as the British Columbia Railway, on page five. And these not only provide direct employment, but indirect.

Because of a good communications system being essential to the total expansion of the economy this will create additional new jobs in to those directly employed.

Then also, this reference to the Speech from the Throne which the members of the Opposition and the Liberal group choose to ignore. The references to the development of parks, the school construction programme, the hospital construction programme, the improvement in construction of buildings, all of these positive programmes are important, Mr. Speaker, in the creation of new jobs.

It should also be emphasised that our policy is to encourage the private sector of the economy to flourish and grow: With resultant increases in employment.

Yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, I couldn't help but feel he was issuing a threat, issuing a threat to the mining industry of British Columbia, when he referred to the amount of royalties that were being received. Of course, he chose to ignore all of the other revenue that comes from these industries. He chose to ignore the number of the amount of the payrolls and what that does to prime the economy.

He chose as well to ignore that these industries in British Columbia provide more to the revenue from resources than they do elsewhere in Canada.

The major difference — and this I think establishes, Mr. Speaker, a major difference in philosophy between them and the Social Credit government and I am glad they still recognise it because from time to time — is that they tend to

[[Page 40](#)]

camouflage their philosophy. This establishes the major difference in philosophy between the N.D.P. and the Social Credit government.

Because we believe that the best way to increase employment is to encourage the growth and expansion of the economy through the free-enterprise system. The workers — they whose votes they seem to try and go after — workers of a free-enterprise system can create for themselves a far better way of life than they can under any system of socialism. And that's why they will continue to support this Social Credit administration. When they get the opportunity to do so.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: And, Mr. Speaker, we can have this expansion, we can continue our economic expansion and at the same we're convinced that we can protect and preserve our environment.

We've got the opportunity to avoid the mistakes of other rapid growth areas. British Columbia is often referred to as the California of Canada, and we are, we are. But we can build a much cleaner place, a much happier place than the State of California.

That's our opportunity, that's our challenge, we have the opportunity still to learn from what the experience has been in these other jurisdictions.

We can tap these resources and still have the best environment in the world, Mr. Speaker, the best environment in the world. My colleagues who have responsibilities in this area of pollution control will be developing on our provincial programme as the session progresses.

AN HON. MEMBER: When are they going to start?

HON. MR. PETERSON: Then we have the Leader of the Opposition describing his visit to the United States, to Olympia, Washington. You know, Mr. Speaker, his remarks yesterday reminded me more of a report on the State of the Union, rather than a reply in the address to the Speech from the Throne. He told us his purpose of his visit. We all know the real purpose — the public knows the real purpose of that visit is that it was an elaborate attempt to counteract the anti-American image that his party has.

From the Press coverage given to the visit, I gather that his visit created some confusion and misunderstanding. The confusion stems from the fact that the American legislators didn't really know who the N.D.P. were, what their philosophy was.

For some reason — and I'm taking this from a news report — U.S. legislators thought the N.D.P. were Conservatives. Conservatives, that's what it said in the *Victoria Colonist*, by Ian Street. But you know, it didn't take them long to discover otherwise, and in the same newspaper report this appeared, and I quote: "After one closed meeting, a legislator, wearing a slightly bemused smile, emerged to announce to no one in particular; 'They're all pinkos in there'."

All pinkos in there. (Laughter.)

AN HON. MEMBER: Pinkos, pinkos, they talk wonderful, they talk wonderful....

HON. MR. PETERSON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition has been completely frank with us. I wonder if he had told them that both he, the Leader of the Opposition and several members of his group were signatories to the Watkins Manifesto — I wonder then what the reception might have been.

I suggest that the colour they would have used to describe the N.D.P. would have been considerably darker red than pinko.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you ever heard the American Manifesto?

HON. MR. PETERSON: You know, even the Watkins Manifesto was too anti-American for the Federal Leader, Tommy Douglas, to sign. But Mr. Barrett signed it. The Leader of the Opposition signed it and what does it say? I'm not going to read it all but it would have been interesting I'm sure for his American friends to know what he endorsed. This is what it says in part and I quote:

The major threat to Canadian survival today is American control of the Canadian economy. The major issue of our times is not national unity but national survival, and the fundamental threat is external, not internal. American corporate capitalism is the dominant factor shaping Canadian society. In Canada,

and he still believes all of this because after each sentence, Mr. Speaker, for the record, he is saying "that's right, that's right"....

In Canada, American economic control operates through the formidable medium of the multinational corporation. The Canadian corporate elite has opted for a junior partnership with these American enterprises. Canada has been reduced to a resource base and consumer market within the American empire. The American empire is the central reality for Canadians. It is an empire characterised by militarism abroad and racism at home.

Did the Hon. Members tell the American legislators that? Did they tell them that they were an empire characterised by militarism abroad and racism at home?

Canadian resources and diplomacy have been enlisted in the support of that empire. In the barbarous war in Vietnam; Canada has supported the United States through its membership on the International Control Commission and through sales of arms and strategic resources to the American military-industrial complex.

The American empire is held together through world-wide military alliances and by giant monopoly corporations. Canada's membership in the American alliance system and the ownership of the Canadian economy by American corporations precludes Canada's playing an independent role in the world. These bonds must be cut if corporate capitalism, and the social priorities it creates, are to be effectively challenged.

End of quotation. And there are other quotations in this document which the Leader of the Opposition endorsed which would have made very interesting reading for the Americans.

AN HON. MEMBER: For the public too.

HON. MR. PETERSON: So far anti-American, that even the federal leader, Tommy Douglas, would not endorse it or would not sign it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lewis too.

HON. MR. PETERSON: I am still glad that the Leader of

[[Page 41](#)]

the Opposition didn't make a full and frank confession to our American friends because they are our friends and we have a good relationship with them, we have excellent cooperation from them, and if you think that you are doing us a favour in respect of establishing a good relationship or cooperation please don't do us any more favours. Please don't do us any more favours.

Travel all you like, I encourage you to travel, not only to Washington but to the other states and learn from their experiences. Travel from across the country in Canada as well, travel is a wonderful, educational experience for everyone. But as far as cooperation and a relationship exists, I suggest that there is no province in Canada that enjoys a better relationship with its neighbours to the south than does the Province of British Columbia.

You know the Leader of the Opposition tried to make quite a point yesterday with a resolution that had been passed by the House of Representatives in the State of Washington in May, saying that he was called upon to make excuses for the Premier as to why they hadn't received a reply to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Well, that was my interpretation of his remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes!

HON. MR. PETERSON: He'd asked why we hadn't replied. Well I have a letter here and it's dated January 14.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Not when he came home. Not when he came home. No, no, not when he came home.

HON. MR. PETERSON: That certainly wasn't made clear to me. January 14, 1972, it was made clear when the Premier interrupted the Honourable Member across the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: And only then.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Only then. And this is the letter, dated January 14, 1972.

Through an oversight in this office, I am now enclosing herewith House read floor resolution number 71-86 adopted by the House of Representatives on May 10, 1971.

Adopted May 10, 1971, sent January 14, of this year. Just this last month of this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: You didn't know, you didn't know until I told you yesterday. You didn't know that.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, there are obviously other things that the Honourable Member does not know perhaps.

AN HON. MEMBER: Talk to the Governor.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Talk to the Governor? Well, you know, they tried to paint the picture that there was no association, no liaison, no communication between the Governor of the State of Washington and the Premier of this province. I have here a letter dated January 5, 1972, from Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington, Olympia. January 5, 1972 — directed, by the way to His Excellency, Premier W.A.C. Bennett, Parliament House, Victoria, British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: You didn't educate them very well. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. PETERSON:

Dear Premier Bennett:

On October 21, 1872, Kaiser Wilhelm I of Germany as arbitrator established a border between the United States and British Columbia. Thus ending a 13-year dispute in which the San Juan Islands were jointly occupied by American and English forces. Symbolically, the 13-year war is an acclamation that man and nation need not resort to the force of arms to settle differences. During the 13 years of joint military occupation the United States suffered through the agony of the greatest conflict ever seen in this continent. Yet not one drop of blood was spilled between American and English forces on the San Juan Islands. Interest in the centennial has not been limited to the San Juan Islands. A working committee of San Juan islanders has received several inquiries from Victoria and from other Vancouver Island communities regarding commemorative civil and military plans for the centennial.

Our national parks service celebrates the centennial of its founding in 1872. The San Juan Islands national historic park is now part of our national parks system, and scheduled for commemoration next year. The working committee has asked that I head a honorary committee for the Centennial year, and I ask your consideration in joining me as honorary co-chairman.

Historians have termed the treaty and the settlement of the water-boundary the greatest triumph for arbitrated methods the world has witnessed in an event of cardinal importance in the history of the relations of the two English-speaking powers. Such a legacy is as significant to British Columbia and Washington State as to the National powers.

As honorary co-chairman, you will undoubtedly wish to have representatives of British Columbia and the Canadian government, military and industry included in this centennial commemoration. Those of your choice are most welcome.

Commemorative plans are still in the formative stage, with several events now tentatively scheduled for August and September. The working committee will periodically apprise you and the members of the honorary committee selected by you of its progress.

I look forward with pleasure to your joining me.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Daniel J. Evans, Governor.

The Premier has replied by letter dated January 24, accepting and becoming an honorary co-chairman, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell the truth when you go on trips and when you come home.

HON. MR. PETERSON: And you know, Mr. Speaker, if you need any further evidence of cooperation between the

[[Page 42](#)]

State of Washington and this province, you need only look to what they are doing and consulting on the day-to-day basis on matters of pollution control.

You need only look to what is happening in other areas as well. Tremendous assistance, a tremendous cooperation we received from that state just last week and at the present time when these two major power lines from the Peace River were put out of action, when your lights would have been off if it hadn't been for the State of Washington.

Your lights would have been off, as serious an interruption of a power supply as any since the one in the 1930's. Since the 1930's. Washington even re-directed power going to California, to British Columbia. Now, what greater assistance, what greater cooperation can you ask than that? And all I ask of the Hon. Members of the Opposition is to recognize that they were not elected to govern this province, not elected to govern this province, not elected to represent this province internationally, and not to meddle in the relationship that exists.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: I wouldn't want our good friends in the United States, while they came to the conclusion that the delegation visiting them were pinkos, to think that this government is a pinko government, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to enlarge on some items referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

Following an extensive two-year study, we will be proposing a codification of the laws pertaining to matrimonial and family relations. There is an announcement in the Speech from the Throne in this respect.

You may recall that last year we introduced some amendments to the *Wives and Children's Maintenance Act* which were not proceeded with. In the intervening period the existing provisions relating to divorce, annulment of marriage, judicial separation, alimony, maintenance, custody, and property rights between spouses and children, have been examined.

Some of the matters being dealt with will be new responsibilities for spouses, children, and parents. In recent years there has been a growing agitation for complete equality between husband and wife, and this philosophy is reflected in the rights which will be proposed. We are also endeavouring to streamline Family Court practice, to provide an aggrieved spouse or a child with easier access and faster relief through Family Courts. The details of these proposals will be placed before you as early as possible.

Then also, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne there are reference to reports of the Law Reform Commission. The report of the Law Reform Commission is now being printed by the Queen's Printer. Just as soon as it is ready it's my intention to have it given study by members of my department and the various Crown agencies that may be affected by any changes proposed.

Concurrently with that study I hope that the report can be given consideration by a special committee of this House. This report contains a number of recommendations that can form the basis of new uniform expropriation procedures in this province. It will be necessary that a choice be made of those equitable remedies contained in the

report which will be of greatest benefit to the landowner, and which will not unduly retard the development of the province or place an undue financial burden on the taxpayer of this province.

The advice of a committee of this House in this would, I suggest, be most useful.

I hope that as soon as the reports are ready that this special committee could be established and get under way. I mention it now so that the Honourable Members will know in selecting the committees they wish to serve on that such a special committee will be established.

Now I'd like to deal briefly with the general subject of automobile and highway safety, as the final subject today. There has been concern expressed by myself in the past, as well as Hon. Members on all sides of the House about auto insurance premiums and rates. It was for that reason that one year ago, we appointed the British Columbia Automobile Insurance Board.

At that time we were the second province in Canada — I think Nova Scotia was the first, although they didn't set up a separate organisation — we were the second to take a step in regulating automobile insurance premiums by outside authority.

Alberta has recently appointed a similar board, and I understand that in Ontario legislation is under consideration giving this general power, rather than to a separate authority, to the superintendent of insurance.

Under our legislation in this province, the board is charged with many responsibilities. For example, they require insurers and rating bureaus to file rates and premiums. The board has the authority to investigate cases of discrimination in auto insurance rates. They can prohibit any rates found to be discriminatory. An order of adjustment can be brought into effect after due notice and a hearing, whenever the board finds that automobile insurance rates are excessive or inadequate or unfairly discriminatory or otherwise unreasonable.

Their authority is really very extensive. They can in fact investigate all matters relating to automobile insurance. They have just completed their first public hearing which was held recently in Victoria to discuss lower premium rates and the result has already been published.

The board has directed that the premium for the no-fault accident benefit portion of the compulsory policy be reduced to \$15, effective March 1 of this year. Additionally, the board has commenced a study to determine whether the no-fault premium should continue to be flat rated — that is to say, the same for every insured throughout the province — or whether it should be varied according to some system of classification which will reflect the no-fault use of the benefits.

Clearly, the present rating classifications, which are tied to the traditional concept of negligence, are not altogether relevant as a basis for assessing a no-fault premium, and the study will, in part, be directed to finding a basis that is acceptable.

Again, remembering that British Columbia was the leader in blending the no-fault benefits into a system that still makes a driver responsible for his own actions, it is not surprising that such a study is necessary — simply because no one else has done such a study to the best of our knowledge.

Quite apart from the no-fault portion, the board will deal with the general premium levels of the bodily injury, property damage and collision cover. If rate increases are filed they have the full authority and they have given certain warnings in this respect, as far as insurance premiums are concerned.

During the year, the board has investigated 48 individual complaints, as well as enquiries about automobile insurance premiums.

Last fall, I announced formation of the automobile insurance exchange, because whenever you have

compulsory insurance, there is always a tendency for some firms to try and take the cream of the crop and have low premiums as a consequence.

No one wants to take the bad drivers, and of course, there must be insurance provided as well for the bad drivers because it is compulsory for all.

The question, of course, always arises as to what rates the bad drivers should pay, but this is now determined through the facility, which is the reinsurance pool for non-preferred risks. They have established a scale of surcharges for such business based on accident and conviction records.

Throughout 1971, the Automobile Insurance Exchange has referred about 6,000 applications for non-preferred assignees to the facility. Of course, the Automobile Insurance Board has the final authority in respect of adjudicating on any of these rates as you will have read in the way in which we establish these authorities.

But, Mr. Speaker, while great emphasis has been attached to the expenses associated with providing and administering automobile insurance in British Columbia it is an indisputable fact that the one area in which substantial reductions can be achieved is through reduction in the cost of claims. The report of a committee of this House in 1970 points out: Fundamentally, however, the public must realise that the cost of automobile insurance merely reflects in dollars the real problem of human suffering, and accidents that careless and irresponsible drivers cause. There cannot be significant changes in the rates until there are safer cars and safer drivers.

The annual report of the superintendent of insurance shows that in 1969 and 1970, an average 75.4 cents of every premium dollar was used to pay for net losses. It is evident, therefore, that if we are to reduce premiums materially without reducing the benefits available to the motoring public we must attack the problem of traffic accidents and resulting claims. I think this should be one of our major priorities, and this is one of the major priorities of our department — the Motor Vehicle Branch — and the board — the Automobile Insurance Board.

Accidents also directly affect premiums, and by concentrating our efforts on why accidents happen we will assert some effectiveness, I think, on future rates.

The Automobile Insurance Board also administers the motor vehicle branch special fund provided in the legislation. They've given grants for various projects.

The British Columbia Safety Council, the Vancouver Traffic and Safety Council, the Capital Region Safety Council have also done a great deal in respect of defensive driving which I want to speak about briefly today. These are courses operated in conjunction with the Motor Vehicle Branch and they've proven quite successful. They are available now in all parts of the province.

Last year, 18,000 motorists took the course throughout British Columbia. It is voluntary but perhaps one should qualify that in a sense, because when you accumulate a certain number of points, the superintendent of motor vehicles usually tells you: "Well, if you would like to continue to keep your licence you have to take a defensive driving course." That is a form of volition I suppose. But approximately one-third are really voluntary, that aren't compelled to take the courses at all.

As I say, these seem to be quite successful. The courses are designed to assist the good driver in avoiding accidents when another motorist is at fault. The key is preventability rather than responsibility and that's the key of the whole programme.

To familiarise the Hon. Members of this House with the type of course that is being conducted and perhaps to assist them in their own driving habits I have made arrangements for a defensive driving course to be held in the Motor Vehicle Branch building and urge each one of you to take the course. It will take eight hours of your time — two hours on each of four mornings. The course starts at 10:00 a.m. on February 1 and will meet twice a week for two weeks. If enrolment is sufficient, and I hope it will be, then another course will commence on Monday, January 31.

I have a circular for distribution which describes the course, where and when it will be held and you could indicate if you will whether you would be interested in taking such a course.

Normally, if you go to your home community to take it, it will cost you money. It's not going to cost you anything here. It will also, I might say, not reflect to your detriment in your driving. Your licence won't be suspended if you fail it. There are in fact no examinations in that respect, but we can't fail as long as you attend. So, it's safe. I think also I'd like to extend the same invitation to the members of the Press gallery, not for any particular reason, but only so they might also be more familiar with the programme. So will you send that up to the Press gallery, please?

The Automobile Insurance Board is also investigating the possibility of purchasing some simulators in conjunction with defensive driving courses. Thus far, they haven't been used in defensive driving courses. They are used in some other areas. And so that is under investigation.

I don't think we should conclude in any sense that defensive driving is the final solution to the traffic accident problem. You can't be so foolish as to suggest that eight hours of classroom lectures would transform a million holders of drivers' licences into good drivers or anything of that nature. But nevertheless, as a first attempt to improve driving habits of the mature and experienced motorist, this programme does offer some hope and encouragement for improvement.

There are other projects that I've referred to here that have been in operation. For instance, the new curriculum for high school driver training that's sponsored by the capital region safety council, etc.

Probably one of the most successful programmes, I think, last year was the information campaign on seat-belt use and the hazards of drinking and driving. This was aimed at the driving public over the major holiday weekends and some research follow-up was done, which indicated its effectiveness on the Labour Day weekend and showed that public awareness of the programme and the desirability of using your seat-belt, et cetera, was quite high with certain of the media.

The result was that a concentrated campaign was developed to emphasize the hazards of drinking and driving, which are a major problem over the Christmas and New Year holiday period. From all the reports we received, this programme seemed to have had an impact on the number of people found to be drinking and driving over the Christmas and New Year weekends. In addition, the agency that developed the television commercial that you saw won the top prize for these in competition with all the United States and Canada, which I think is quite significant as well.

On this question of impaired driving, this is one of the

[[Page 44](#)]

most serious problems we have as far as traffic accidents are concerned. For many years, the superintendent of insurance has been dealing with people that have poor driving records. For the past three years, he's taken the approach that where drivers were convicted of impaired driving, they would automatically, without any special review of their licence or their driving record, have a suspension.

A case went to the courts and the courts decreed that the superintendent did not have this authority and therefore this practice had to cease.

This was last year that we ran into trouble on this. The result has been that in the past nine months drivers have not faced the former severe sanctions that they did heretofore. They received a more lenient treatment.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can review them on their merits.

HON. MR. PETERSON: No, no, it's not quite that simple. To review each case on its merits is not the answer, I suggest. The advice that I have from the superintendent is that there has been more leniency shown in the past nine months than there has heretofore and the figures that he's provided me show a 20 per cent increase in

impaired driving convictions in 1971.

What we want to counteract in part is the feeling that this is a socially acceptable practice of drinking and driving, and there is that. The feeling seems to grow and that's the purpose of the campaign. That's why in my view it's necessary to deal firmly with the problem and you're going to be asked to do so at this session.

You'll be asked through legislation to serve notice to every driver that if they drink and drive and they are convicted of impaired driving, they will lose their licence. Their licence will be suspended for a period and there will be no exception to that rule.

No matter who you are, no matter how influential you are, no matter how eloquent your lawyer is, you're going to have an automatic period of suspension if this House approves the legislation in this respect, and a higher period for those who are on second offence.

AN HON. MEMBER: How wide is this ban?

HON. MR. PETERSON: Complete, complete. Because everybody makes a good plea — "Oh, I need my licence, I need my car in my work, I'm a real estate salesman." This is awfully difficult for the police to enforce, for one thing, as to whether a person is driving on business or not and so you might as well face the fact now. You know, right now, whether you need the car in your business so you know the consequences of your action before you take the first drink. And that's the policy that I'm going to ask this Legislature to endorse.

There are other amendments, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Second Member from Vancouver South (Mrs. Kripps) has directed public attention to the fact that persons who hold out-of-province drivers' licences can drive British Columbia licensed cars without the need for insurance coverage.

These persons are availing themselves of concessions of the Motor Vehicle Act which were placed there for the convenience of tourists. It's become apparent that many new residents can somehow acquire a driver's licence from another province and they use this loophole to flout the compulsory insurance law in British Columbia. You'll be asked to close this loophole, you'll be asked to close this gap. And we're still trying to protect the position of tourists in this respect.

Hon. Members will also be asked to provide us with better means of dealing with the person who presents to the enforcement agency a pink card for an insurance policy that has ceased to exist. We need to recognize that there will be dishonest persons who will continue to present these cards as evidence of insurance. But I'm hopeful that they will diminish in number when they learn that they may be brought into court later to face charges for what we regard as a dishonest practice.

Now in most cases the drivers — and I've been talking thus far about the drivers — are to blame for accidents. There are some, of course, resulting from faulty automobiles. In this respect, I should tell Hon. Members that the motor vehicle inspection services were expanded in this past year. We opened a major station in Burnaby in 1971 — some of the Honourable Members were there — and this serves the municipality of Burnaby, the cities of New Westminster, Port Moody, Port Coquitlam and the District of Coquitlam. With this station, along with other stations operated now by the Motor Vehicle Branch — Hon. Members will recall we now assume the operation of the Vancouver station, also those in Richmond and in Victoria — we now provide motor vehicle inspections for at least 60 per cent of the licensed motor vehicles in the province.

We have further expansions to the vehicle inspection programme in the planning stage. We're getting a number of requests from the municipalities, and it's been well received in the province.

But our immediate aim of course has been to place the stations where the greatest number of vehicles can be serviced. But I hope before long that the more heavily populated centres in the interior of the province can also have this service made available to them.

In conclusion, the goal to which we are working is to make our highways the safest in North America.

Through these programmes, we intend to increase awareness in the motorist of his responsibilities in highway safety. It will require an attack of the problem on many fronts. But the stakes are great, I suggest, because of the tremendous loss of life. Hon. Members will find the figures, which I haven't burdened them with today, recorded in my printed text. We must reduce the loss of life, disablement through injury, as well as the mounting property damage as a result of motor vehicle accidents on our highways.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kootenay.

MR. L.T. NIMSICK (Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I heard the Hon. Attorney General say he wasn't plugged in. I don't know whether he's talking about plugged into God or not, but he might have been.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, once again, to get up and give my contribution in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I've done it a good many times. You know, I've done it more times than I will probably in future, but it's because time catches up. Like I and the Premier there — he won't give as many budget speeches in the future as he has in the past.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. NIMSICK: Mr. Speaker, I guess that's how the

[[Page 45](#)]

Honourable Member, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Campbell) feels about it when he's trying to get the leadership. You figure the Premier is going to keep on going and he doesn't like that idea.

AN HON. MEMBER: Watch your back.

MR. NIMSICK: Listening to the Honourable Attorney General, some of his remarks were quite amusing and his excuses in regards to the problem of glue-sniffing seem to me rather weak. He found many other methods and took chances of crossing up the *British North America Act* in many other ways at times and without too much consideration. In this case, he didn't seem to find that.

Maybe he's more interested in covering up those statues up there than the glue-sniffing proposition. Because I noticed that he went out after the topless problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Taking out waitresses.

MR. NIMSICK: You know, they told me the other day they saw the Hon. Minister around the museum and down around Thunderbird Park there and they figure that those carvings were going to be covered up.

AN HON. MEMBER: They hid all the paintings, too.

MR. NIMSICK: So, I'm not sure how it is coming. He spoke about the majority of the people being out of step or that the majority of the people supported this government but this is actually wrong. The majority of the people did not support this government. They voted against this government.

He also said that this is the fastest-growing part of Canada. We've also got the fastest-growing unemployment and the fastest-growing glue-sniffing areas in the province, in Canada.

And the same old cliches that he talked about the Opposition bringing up, he brought up today because not less than a dozen times he spoke about British Columbia being the best of all Canada and taking the lead in all Canada and doing this in all Canada.

This we've heard this year after year, year after year the same old cliches.

AN HON. MEMBER: Using more of my stuff, is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, you need help, Bennett....

MR. NIMSICK: He admits defeat in regards to getting people back to work, because he threw up his hands and he said: "What can we do?"

HON. MR. PETERSON: I did not.

MR. NIMSICK: Well, to that effect, what can you do....

AN HON. MEMBER: That's libel.

MR. NIMSICK: And you expect Ottawa to do the job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let's have a daily *Hansard*....

MR. NIMSICK: You know, when I am talking about our trip to Olympia, I noticed in the paper this morning that they're going to withdraw from Vietnam altogether. Maybe our trip down there did some good after all. (Laughter.) That's all right. You criticise our trip down there but somebody has got to take the lead and do the things that the government should be doing. Somebody has got to take the lead. And if you fail to do your job, then we have got to move into the vacuum and show some leadership. Maybe you'll have to come after us. We admitted this to the Washington government and we told them what the government was up here. They didn't even know....

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. NIMSICK: Yes, we apologised all over the place for your inadequacies, of not recognising them in Washington. I know it hurts a little bit now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't come crawling to us.

MR. NIMSICK: That is exactly what you've got to do. You should rationalise some of the dealings in Nelson, with the B.C. Hydro. They tell me they're in a bad way, so you better look after your fences there because it might not be so good.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is Nelson?

AN HON. MEMBER: Your electrical fences....

MR. NIMSICK: Now, in regards to impaired driving, I was very interested in what the Honourable Minister said about impaired driving and what he's going to do and how tough he's going to get.

I've got no brief for impaired driving but I sometimes wonder if there shouldn't be some variation. I don't quite understand how you can say that a person who has a 0.079 is not drunk and a 0.08 is drunk.

Once you reach 0.08 you get the total deal. I think there should be some sort of an area in there. Now, the police have got the discretion today to give you a 24-hour suspension. But, that discretion can go to anybody whether he's real drunk or whether he isn't. It depends on the police, and how he treats the party that he finds.

I say that there should be a grey area in there where the police would have the discretion. I don't think a person that goes driving and has got 0.25 percent of alcohol in his blood should be treated the same as just one 0.08, for the simple reason that that person is really drunk and he definitely went out on the road and was a real menace. But to cut off the thing right at 0.08, I think is just a little bit severe.

There should be an area in there where the police would have this discretion. For what it's worth, it's just my opinion, Mr. Attorney General. Because I feel that sometimes some people are punished unduly and other people are getting away and they were really bad.

Well, I know about roadside suspension — I mean, sure, a policeman can come to you and doesn't have to give you the test, but you might be drunk. But I say that the discretion should be for the purpose of determining the area in which he could use that discretion. If a person is really drunk, then I don't think that discretion should be allowed.

Now, I'd like to say that I was interested in, and congratulate the mover and seconder of, the Speech from the Throne. They did a good job with very little material. They admitted that there was very little material in it.

[[Page 46](#)]

The Speech from the Throne was very anemic and you know it. The Honourable Member for Richmond (Mr. LeCours) said that he couldn't find anything, he was going to leave it over to some other day, the Speech from the Throne.

I understand it, because it's a rehash. The Speech from the Throne, this year, was a rehash of other years. The government has reached a stage where they haven't got the vision anymore that they should have in the Province of British Columbia.

They've got to do something if they want to go ahead, but the Speech from the Throne is nothing to go ahead with. It is a rehash of what they did during the year and it didn't make very good listening, even at that.

Unemployment and poverty, I think, are the two problems in this province and in the country that should have top priority, top billing, when it comes to what the government is supposed to do.

Governments are elected to look after the common good of the people. And you haven't got the common good at heart if you don't try and bring those people who are not receiving a decent standard of living up to where they will have a decent standard of living.

The reference in the throne speech to making jobs was very weak, not even as good as it was last year. And that was bad enough. The result of that was very poor. From the remarks of the Hon. Member for Richmond in regards to people living in poverty and the unemployed and the reasons for it, we got quite a lesson. He blew up all sorts of bubbles and then watched them burst.

He was telling us that the fault first was the federal government. Then he said it was the system that we live under. But then he went on to say we must perpetuate that system. Now, how do you perpetuate a system that is creating all your problems?

The Hon. Member said that we must do everything to see that the capitalist system goes on, and that's exactly what he said. I'll agree with him that the economic system is basically down at the very roots of our problems of unemployment and poverty. And as long as we don't take a new approach, the best that any government can do that's dedicated to the capitalist system is to try and patch it up, try and make things a little better for the people in the lower stratas of society.

The Hon. Member divided our society into two classes. You know, we've been trying for years to get a way to think that there was no class warfare in our country, but the Honourable Member for Richmond brought it up quite vividly that there are two classes in our country and that there is class warfare in our country. The one should be allowed to have all the privileges and pleasures and good things in life and the other class are not entitled to that kind of treatment.

The Hon. Member is critical of the worker when he organises for more wages and he relates the top wages with the poverty level. But he doesn't relate it with the coupon clippers and the elite.

He says that the fault of all our problems and our inflation and our troubles with the poor people that are on fixed incomes not being able to get a decent living, lies with the worker asking for more wages at the top. He always brings this point in.

We must not forget that the worker is a part of the capitalist system. The worker is in business and his business is to sell the only product that he's got — and that is his labour power. That's the only product that he has got.

And the worker has got overhead, too. He's got to see that he gets enough food and he is entitled to the best, just like the coupon clipper and the elite. He's got to have good clothing — himself, his wife and children. And he's entitled, I'd say, to just as good clothes and just as good a living as the coupon clipper and the elite, and the owning class.

He's got to have shelter and he's entitled to a comfortable home, he's entitled to have a fridge, a TV, a coloured TV, good furniture.

He wants a summer home. He may want a second car so his wife can drive. He may want a power boat to go out on the lake with. If he's up in my country and probably down in Victoria, he may want a Ski-doo. He may want a vacation to Europe or Hawaii. And why shouldn't he have it?

The news media tell him that he's entitled to it. They're advertising every day. And if he can't afford it today, the loan companies come out and give him a loan and put him in hock there.

So, when he adds up all these things that he needs and all these things that he knows he should have, he's got to figure out how much he's going to get for his labour power. And if he isn't getting enough, he's got to sell that labour power for more and he's got to bargain for higher wages or go out and get a second job.

With unemployment the way it is, it's not very easy to get a second job: Then he has taxes, insurance to look after. In the business of selling his labour, this is the only product he has got. He must get sufficient to cover his costs.

There was a bargaining committee where one of the union representatives came to the table and said: "Gee, I just got a notice last night my taxes went away up." One of the representatives of the company said: "Well, you don't expect the company to pay your taxes, do you?" And the union rep said: "I don't know who else will pay it, you're the only one I work for."

This is exactly the way you've got to look at this issue — that if it's going to cost the working man so much to live decently, he's got to get that increase. And if the cost of living is going to increase, he's got to get an increase so that he doesn't slip back. Why should he have to stop at \$8,000 or \$10,000?

Many people are amazed when a working man earns \$14,000 or \$15,000. I'd like to ask the Hon. Cabinet Minister over there in the \$40,000 bracket. Many people are in the high range. You pay a mediation commission \$40,000 a piece to look after their problems.

Don't you think that the man that counts most in the country is the worker, a man that produces? He is a man that should have an equivalent to anything that's going in the country. He should be able to take a trip to Hawaii, just like some of the cabinet ministers this year. Just like I did a year ago.

They should have that right, but there's a lot of people will not give them that right and feel that they shouldn't have that right.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. NIMSICK: The organised workers, the only group in our society compelled by law to negotiate for the price of his product must adhere for that price for two and three years ahead. The businessman, the professional, the coupon clippers, can increase their price at will.

Big governments like this one attempt to interfere even with this type of bargaining by setting guidelines. They set

guidelines for the teachers, they set guidelines for the hospital workers, they set guidelines for different ones. They don't take into consideration what they're making but they set guidelines and say: "You can't go over that."

In my area, the government set the guidelines and interfered with the bargaining process in regards to the school teachers. They would have had that problem settled, all settled without any trouble, but the minute that they found the guidelines put on by the government, up went their backs and nobody would talk real negotiation from then on.

That's exactly what's happening many times and while you might think you're doing the right thing by setting guidelines, you are interfering and you know what it means to interfere.

Just like the Honourable the Attorney General said today. He was very upset because we interfered with the powers of government by going down to Olympia. Very upset. He said: "We're the government, not you," and that's exactly what the workers and the teachers and the people say. That is their problem and not a problem of the government. They have compulsory arbitration. How quickly the Minister of Labour can step in when a strike is threatening that might involve a lot of people. How quickly he can step in. But he couldn't step in on a simple basic problem that concerned the Sandringham Hospital. He couldn't do anything on that, could he?

AN HON. MEMBER: He didn't know the address.

MR. NIMSICK: I wrote to the Honourable Minister and I got a nice letter back from him. And this is what he said:

I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 20 relative to the Sandringham Private Hospital strike. Let me assure you that the government is doing a satisfactory solution to this problem. In the initial outset of the dispute, a mediation officer was appointed, and attempted to resolve the dispute but was unable to do so. In an attempt to resolve the dispute, I have met with the union and with management of the hospital, and at the moment this has not resulted in a settlement. In the meantime, there has been a change in management of this hospital, which further complicates the matter. This department is ready and willing to assist in the resolving the dispute. I wish to assure you that I am keeping a close watch over the situation and I'm hopeful that some satisfactory solution can be found.

Now, the other day when the hospital workers threatened to strike in the other hospitals, he quickly moved. But don't forget, in the Sandringham Hospital they haven't even got the right to bargain. They won't recognise them, or give them the right to bargain. And this is something that he, as a minister, should grant. This is one of the basic philosophies of organised labour, the right to bargain.

This is where he should have laid the law down. The hospitals should have to recognise the right of the workers to bargain, the right to negotiate. The right to negotiate, that's all they asked. He didn't give them that right to negotiate.

To me, it's a weak argument when you consider a few people and do nothing just because they only amount to a few voters in one place. But to those people it's just as big in economical problems as if it was a 1,000 workers.

Those people who are in the picket line up there at the Sandringham, walking back and forth, they're low-paid people. In most cases, they're probably under the poverty level as it is and yet the minister is doing nothing to see that they get their rights to get back and even negotiate for a little better wage.

The Honourable Member for Richmond said that no one should be earning less than \$2. Many people today in our province are only getting \$1.50 an hour. Well, that's what I say. He said it shouldn't be less than \$2 an hour.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring in a bill....

MR. NIMSICK: And we're only paying a minimum wage of \$1.50, and this is below the poverty level in our country. All our waitresses and I've even got people that are looking after senior citizens' homes — managing them — on \$300 a month....

AN HON. MEMBER: A shame.

MR. NIMSICK: These people are beneath the poverty level. And what is the Hon. Member doing about it? He's sitting on the side of the night. What is he doing? What is he doing about it? Mr. Speaker, they increased it to \$1.75 at least.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, big deal!

MR. NIMSICK: Yes, big deal, we're still at a dollar and a half.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two-bit government....

MR. NIMSICK: If those members want to do anything, get back into that caucus meeting and fight to see that the Minimum Wage Act is increased. When we bring a bill in — or bring a bill in yourself, we'll support it.

Twenty-five percent of the people in the country are below the poverty level and many are working. Many of these people are working.

Lip service, you give lip service to this. It's easy to get up in the House, you know, on the government side and give lip service. I've heard this for the last 20 years from many, many members on that side about the poor old folks, about the people on low wages, about the mothers with children and all the rest of it and yet the government will sit on \$100 million surplus this year and do nothing about it. Why don't they get some action in seeing that something is done in this regard?

These people that are below the poverty level, they don't get the opportunities that you people get that have got cash, or myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: Crybaby.

MR. NIMSICK: They pay top prices, they get no cash price advantage, they pay top interest, they don't get preferred rates. If they need to borrow some money they've got to go to the loan company and pay 15 or 20 per cent interest. They haven't got the opportunity of the person that's got the money. You've got a double advantage when you're in the high-paid bracket compared to the people that are in the low-paid bracket.

With those receiving \$2,000 or less, 60 per cent of their \$2,000 is drained off in taxes. Just imagine it, anybody earning \$2,000 or less, 60% of that \$2,000 is drained off in taxes.

If you earn \$10,000, there's only 37 per cent of it drained off in taxes. Senior citizens get \$135, a few maybe might get

[[Page 48](#)]

up to \$150 with a B.C. supplement in some cases. Widows on compensation of \$146 a month are below the poverty level. It's cheaper for the company for a man to get killed than it is for him to be totally disabled. Take a man and a wife. If the man is totally disabled in an industrial accident then he'll get up to \$400 dollars a month. But if he gets killed the wife has got to reduce her standard to \$146.

And you proudly put in the paper last week that there was a 4 per cent increase for the widows.

While the cost of living has gone up 8 per cent you give them four. Now, is that common sense? If you want to keep them in line with the cost of living then you must give them at least the percentage that the cost of living goes up.

And the government is not doing it, you're not doing it. The Hon. Minister of Labour has got a responsibility in this regard. That widows get \$146 per month is not good enough. It is not good enough.

People who are handicapped and unable to look after themselves get up to \$100 a month. Mothers with one child \$135 a month.

Now, we talk about poverty. This is poverty and what are we doing about it? What are we doing about it? How many Hon. Members will get up over there and claim that this condition in an affluent country such as ours is a shame? How many of them will go after the cabinet and see that something's done? Because they can do it. They've got a \$100 million surplus coming up and they sweat it out of these people.

This is how they got their \$100 million surplus — by sweating it out of these people that are not getting enough pension to live on. That's how they got their \$100 million surplus. They should be proud. They should be proud of their government. They get up and talk about the government with no debts and all the rest of it and \$100 million surplus. Then in the next breath they start to talk about the terrible conditions of the poor people in an affluent society such as ours.

I get fed up, sick and tired of listening to people who especially on that side of the House, who are in a position to get into the inner sanctum. Many of them saying these things have been outside the cabinet and when they got in the cabinet they grew very quiet.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture grew very quiet after he got into the cabinet. The Honourable Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Chabot) is quietening up considerably since he got into the cabinet.

MR. BARRETT: Silence is Golden.

MR. NIMSICK: Silence, silence. The Hon. Minister of Labour got up and made a big splash last year in a very breathless speech about transporting coal from Michel down through the United States. They said if it was going to mean jobs they were in favour of it going through an all-Canadian route.

Now, what have they done in the cabinet in regards to withdrawing the support from the Burlington North? Have they done anything? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable the Minister if he has done anything in his cabinet now that he is in there and can talk in the inner sanctum. He hasn't done anything. And he knows he hasn't done anything. He was talking for the benefit of his voters. That's what he was talking for. Just as the Honourable Member for Richmond talked about the poor people the other day. All this for the benefit of the voters so the Press could pick it up and go out and tell the people that so and so spoke clear and loud. That's what it is.

Responsibility of government is for the common good. Now, I say this. If this government wants to do anything — and I know they're not going down to the roots of the problem and make any real solutions — they should increase the allowance so that people unable to look after themselves, mothers on pensions and senior citizens, will receive at least \$200 a month. Up the minimum wage immediately to \$2 per hour.

Except the senior citizens receiving the supplement from paying municipal taxes on their homes. Free bus fares for senior citizens receiving the supplement. Free fishing licences to senior citizens. Free passage on the Vancouver-Victoria ferries for senior citizens.

This is something that could be done immediately. And you might use a few million dollars of that surplus but don't forget you should feel ashamed that you can come up here with a budget and have a surplus at the expense of these poor people. That's what the government should be ashamed of.

It's easy to sit in the seats where they can get anywhere up to \$40,000 a year. Anywhere up to \$40,000 a year.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. NIMSICK: I know it irks the Hon. Member a little bit, because he's one of them that can go to Hawaii

every year. But these people can't go. They can't go to Hawaii. And it's easy to say that they should be getting it, like the Honourable Member for Richmond. But when it comes back in their own little group I guess they figure that the pie is just cut right so that they get the big pieces and the poor people will get the small ones.

The Honourable Member for Richmond said there's only so much in a poker game, no matter how you divide it.

MR. BARRETT: Well, they've got all the cards.

MR. NIMSICK: Well, this is correct. There's only so much and if you're going to give the big slice of the pie to a small section of the people the rest of them have got to take the little bit that's left.

AN HON. MEMBER: They get the House rake-off too.

MR. NIMSICK: Unemployment was referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I rather smiled at the Honourable the Attorney General and the Premier when they were suggesting that our expansion is going to take care of the unemployment problem in the country. Our expansion is going to take care of it. Do they realise that our gross national product is increasing by leaps and bounds? And our unemployment is increasing at the same time? At the same time our unemployment is increasing. The reason is of course that automation has crept into a lot of this. And we're producing so fast that the people are being unemployed.

The Honourable Minister has got a good example in the mining industry. In 1951 it took 8,000 men to produce \$193 million of values. In 1969, 4,000. One half the number of men produced \$394 million of values. Twice the amount, twice the amount with half the men.

Now, how do you figure out that by expanding the mining industry you're going to catch up on employment? You just can't do it. You've got a lot of other ways that you've got to do it.

[[Page 49](#)]

The federal government in their desperate attempt to solve unemployment are running around giving donations of millions of dollars of welfare to industry, to expand the plants, to build new plants.

In some cases the new plants they build put other plants out of business. No idea of where they're going or what the plan is going to be. No equity for the people of Canada.

People don't criticise that kind of welfare. They don't criticise when we give an incentive to big industry and say it's welfare. But if some poor person gets a few dollars extra on welfare he's a dead beat.

Why shouldn't industry be treated the same way then? If they're going to get this, let's get it on a means test or let's get an equity for the people of Canada.

Why should this government go out and pay half the wages for anybody that's taken off welfare? Why should industry get the welfare? That's a contribution from the welfare department to industry in this province, when you say to industry that we'll pay half the wages. What an admission of the weakness of the system that you're operating under.

If we're going to give money in regards to the wages of these people and pay half their wages, let's do it on socially necessary things in the public sphere. Help out the municipalities. Fine — but for goodness' sake I don't think transferring welfare from one individual to industry or to the business people is solving the problem at all. And it's proven that it fell down flat. Because you've got thousands of very qualified men on the unemployed list that can't get jobs anyway. So you're not solving your problem by this method at all.

The advertising. This is another thing about this job opportunity programme that the Hon. Minister brought out. "Are you on social assistance?" Now, paying hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds, of dollars — thousands of dollars — to ask people: "Are you on social assistance?" Who are they asking? Don't you think that the people who

are on social assistance know whether they're on or not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't you know whether they're on or not?

MR. NIMSICK: Don't you know? Don't you send your people around every so often checking up on them? Why did you have to advertise this job opportunity programme and spend half a million dollars advertising? I'm sure that the reason that the government put this big advertising on was to appease newspapers. Because they took away their liquor advertising. This is the reason that they're doing it....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. NIMSICK: And so is the liquor advertising a flop. I've got a magazine in my office there that had a big liquor ad in it.

MR. BARRETT: With Frank Ney's picture in it.

MR. NIMSICK: And a big liquor ad in it. And what do you mean, that was just a foolish move as far as I'm concerned? It didn't do any good except injure some of the people in the Province of British Columbia. But to spend money on advertising when you've got all the records — when you could have sent each recipient of social assistance a copy of the job opportunity programme! You didn't need to advertise it, to that effect.

MR. BARRETT: Frank Ney is pushing booze and Reader's Digest.

MR. NIMSICK: And in addition to that, what are you doing? You are trying to destroy jobs. You're fighting on behalf of the Kootenay Elk Railway, so Burlington North can haul our coal from the Crowsnest down through the United States, and we can give the jobs to the United States.

Just think of how many jobs it means. Every 100 car train that leaves Michel or Sparwood by the time it returns has involved 72 wage earners, not counting all the other things that are related to it. Seventy-two actually that are operating the train — as they go along all the way to the coast.

Now, how much would you have to pay out in paying half the wages to solve unemployment if you're going to throw 72 men out of work every 100 car train by allowing the coal to be shipped down through the United States?

The Honourable Minister of Labour said something about this and I quote: "I strongly supported the all-Canadian route for the movement of export of coal as in my opinion this would be most beneficial to British Columbia". That's what he said in the House, for public consumption. I wonder what he's done in the cabinet?

We've got another problem up in our area where we could get more jobs. There's a consortium of companies across the line in Montana that are going together and are going to build a thermal plant right on the American side of the line — so that all the pollution will go up into Canada because that's the way the prevailing wind goes. They use this as a lever to get this Kootenay Elk Railway built. And if they've got to transport the coal from the Crowsnest down to this thermal plant on the line, once they get if of course they figure that this argument is going to convince the supreme court to allow the railway to be built.

But I say if there's going to be any thermal plant let's put it up at the source of the coal. Let's see that the pollution is controlled.

You've got no control when it's built across the line. So let's build it in Canada. Let's give jobs to Canadians.

I've got a letter here that says coal shipped down to Eureka will bring \$3.50 a ton. But when you turn it into electricity it's worth \$27 a ton, and this will give more men work. This is what I say should be done if you are going to try and create employment.

Other points the government should be considering is giving a person the right to take his pension at an earlier age to make way for the young people. Ten per cent of our unemployed are under 25. And this is the time that

you can either destroy or make a person.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty per cent of the unemployed are under 25.

MR. NIMSICK: Total — but I'm talking about the actual unemployed — 10 per cent are under 25. This is the time when you can make them or you can break them. If you've got them walking around without a job month after month it doesn't take long until they get frustrated and there's no way out of it. So I say let's give the opportunity to people to take their pension at an earlier age. And the government could start this right in the civil service, and in the cabinet too. They can start this.

MR. BARRETT: Some are overdue.

MR. NIMSICK: Increase their annual holidays.

[[Page 50](#)]

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. NIMSICK: Yes, I'll say that too. If the Premier quits, I'll quit too.

We should increase the annual holidays. We should develop projects in the department of recreation, highways, forestry and assist the municipalities. We should develop a secondary industry. We should process our minerals in B.C.

I'd like to quote something here — a joint venture. This is how we send our jobs out.

Joint venture in ore smelting. A joint venture between Canadians and Japanese is paying dividends to both. The venture — smelting lead ore in Japan — ensures the market for Canadian lead and stable raw supplies for the Japanese companies.

The companies involved are Canadian Pacific Investments Limited, its Pine Point Mine and its Cominco Limited Plant in B.C., and Mitsubishi, which ranks with Mitsui as the largest of Japan's integrated trading companies. They jointly own the smelting operation on an island near Yokohama in western Japan.

Now, I think that lead concentrate should be smelted in British Columbia. We've got the smelter in Trail, let's see that it's done there, and not shipped out.

I know probably we have no power over Pine Point ore, but we have power over the ore once it comes into British Columbia. And this is what we should be doing. And if we did these things we would gradually get rid of some of the unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I notice too the throne speech made reference to expropriation. And the Honourable Attorney General made reference to it today.

You know, we've been promised this for 10 years. And it's difficult to believe that there is any real substance in the promise. If the government is serious about this I can only say it is long overdue. We had a Royal commission on this about 10 years ago and it's still gathering dust. It is high time that we made laws which will never again allow the situation to develop that has happened in the East Kootenays.

The war of attrition that has been carried on in Natal and Libby pondage area is a shameful reflection on the actions of this government. The settlements still to be made in the pondage area bear the deadlines so we know that the battle will end soon in this area.

But the Natal issue is one where a number of elderly people have been kept in suspense. In December expropriation notices were given to these people that are left in Natal, because they did not wish to give up what amounts to their life savings, their homes, for peanuts.

The prices offered to these people is much less than half what they would be worth if they were situated in the relocated area of Sparwood. To think they'd offer \$7,000 for a home that's worth at least \$16,000 to \$18,000.

I sent a letter last summer to the Premier of this province. No, he didn't answer it. I didn't rank in the same position as Governor Evans. And I take it that none of the M.L.A.'s ranks in the same position in his mind. Because they'd get short shift when it comes to letters from the Premier. I said:

Dear Mr. Premier:

I am writing this letter as an appeal to your good offices to correct the following injustices that I consider have been created and sustained by your government.

The first one deals with the relocation of Natal-Michel. You will remember your 1964 statement that your government desired relocating the residence of Natal-Michel without any cost to themselves. For the purpose of beautifying the eastern entrance to the province. This sounded very good to the people who had struggled over the years to keep their houses neat, and clean in an area smothered in pollution and dust. As a result they voted overwhelmingly in favour of the relocations.

Following this, your government passed the responsibility of proceeding with relocations to the regional district of the East Kootenay. The cost of relocation was to be born by federal, provincial and local governments. The amount considered necessary was allocated and the regional district was to administer it.

Properties were appraised and while some accepted, a number did not feel they were getting a fair deal. After visiting some of the homes I heartily agreed.

For example, I was in two of the homes. One had three bedrooms, living room, dining room, kitchen, bath and full basement. The lot landscaped and cultivated for a garden, enclosed by a fence you could not replace for \$500.

Appraised value of this property was \$7,000 including the house. If you saw it I'm sure you would agree that it could not be replaced for \$16,000.

Another was a two-bedroom house with full basement on its own lot. The value placed on it was \$5,000. If you or I owned these homes under present conditions we would be highly insulted by such prices. To relocate to Sparwood an unlandscaped lot cost \$2,000 or more. At today's prices for building what sort of a house could you build with the balance?

These are only two of many people who feel unjustly treated. The lives of these hard-working people are enshrined in their homes, while moving to a new location may be upsetting to them. They should at least be able to continue without having to start all over again, loaded down with a mortgage not of their making.

There have been threats of expropriation, and they welcome their day in court. But it does not materialise. It seems that you are carrying on a war of attrition with these people in hopes that you can wear them down to the point where they will throw up their hands in despair and accept any offer.

Mr. Premier, you are keeping them dangling on the end of a string. I think it is cruel treatment. It is not too late to correct this injustice and prevent lingering distastes in the mind of these people. I appeal to you to act.

I didn't hear back from that but they did issue the expropriation notices in December. They're going to go to expropriation and probably spend \$100,000 in legal fees to try and force these people to accept less than half of what they should be getting. Is that justice?

MR. DOWDING: Social Credit justice.

MR. NIMSICK: One member of the regional board which had been given the responsibility of relocating these people asked, why they did not offer to buy the properties rather than to steal them? One member of the board said this. Why didn't the regional board offer to buy the properties rather than try to steal them? This is the thinking of one of the members of the board.

I know many of you think that this isn't so. Many of you probably think that this isn't so. But I'll make a challenge. I challenge this House to send a committee of three people to Natal to check on these houses, and form

their own opinions

[[Page 51](#)]

as to the value of those houses.

And I throw this challenge out today to the Premier, and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Send a committee down to Natal. Let's pick a committee from that side because it doesn't take anybody with very much brains to figure out that with those houses what they're offered is less than half of what they're worth.

Interjection by Hon. Members.

MR. NIMSICK: What? I didn't say ordinary laymen I said a committee from that side of the House. That's what I said, I said, I challenge them to send a committee and I said, it won't take very much brains.

Anyway, that's a challenge, Mr. Speaker, to the government of the province that they send a committee into Natal to form their own opinion as to whether these people are getting justice.

We need justice in that area. And another thing that the government should do in the area is initiate a public housing scheme.

The relocation was instituted by the government. The local people don't feel that they're qualified or ready, or had the time to go into the public housing field. Let the government go in and make provisions for these people so they have some place to move to, and use the money that they're going to use for arbitration purposes. If we use the money that it's going to cost the government and give it to the people, they'd be able to make a settlement.

Now, we come to another problem, and I want to take a few minutes on Mr. Speaker, and that is the problem of land use in the East Kootenays.

Land use in the East Kootenay has been kicked around for a good many years. And promises on top of promises have been made by this Government and yet nothing has been done.

The wildlife of the East Kootenay is a very important resource in the East Kootenay. In a question that I put on the order paper last year the government said \$48 million was the capitalised value of the wildlife in the East Kootenay, \$2.9 million per year from wildlife resources.

Today we find a dwindling resource, because this government has fuddle-duddled along over the years doing nothing. That's exactly what they've done over the years. Nothing. And the resource is dwindling. It should be managed properly. The Honourable Minister of Labour made a statement last year, in regards to this question.

He said: "I suggested that the Wildlife branch through its biologists undertake a complete survey of the areas. Which they feel are necessary to maintain our big game herds."

I realise that government has taken limited steps to protect sheep after a serious epidemic develops, but I don't think we should wait until such time as we are confronted with a serious problem before acting.

I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour before he got into the cabinet. I suppose he hasn't said anything, because there have been no results.

MR. BARRETT: Silence and Golden.

MR. NIMSICK: We must recognise and place in some priority this resource that can be continued into perpetuity. A renewable resource, compared to the one-shot resources that we are dealing with in that area — like minerals and coal, they'll come, and they'll go. But we can keep the resource of wildlife going on.

I'd like to quote a warning that was given to the people of British Columbia, back in 1915: "Nineteen Fifteen

Game Scare. East Kootenay a few years ago before 1915 was one of the best game countries in B.C. In fact the Kootenays were synonymous with big game. But now through indiscriminate slaughter game is scarce except in almost inaccessible places."

Then there's another. The second article was written in 1950. It was published in the official transaction of the third British Columbia Natural & Resources Conference held in Victoria. It is a text of a speech by Dr. Clement then head of the U.B.C. Zoology Department. Here are excerpts.

Grazing animals which spend the summer in the mountains must find adequate winter food in the right type of habitat or perish. Further investigations in the land-use survey of the Rocky Mountain trench are urgently needed. It is desirable to conserve at least limited areas of habitat ideals for various species of both game and non-game animals, to provide the opportunities for observing, studying and enjoying them under undisturbed conditions.

In 1963 the Libby project briefs were presented to this government. We must not forget that we have taken 18,000 acres of land away...that was winter grange land for the wildlife. When Libby is fully flooded 18,000 acres of the best land will disappear. Now these animals are not going to be able to find the feed that they found on the bottom land. And we've done nothing about it.

In 1966, they sent the Selkirk Brief in, asking that something be done in regards to the land use for our wildlife. And what did they do? The minister at that time came up to Cranbrook and had a meeting with the sportsmen of the area, and they set up a committee at that time. The committee asked for more personnel. We didn't get that.

Down in Oregon they'll have seven biologists for 30,000 square miles, while we'll have one. They'll have 66 conservation officers while we'll have a very, very few.

This is the most important big game area in the province. And it seems to me that this government doesn't put too much value on this problem. Now they've put out another brief to the government, asking them to do something because they're getting desperate.

I'll just read you the paragraph at the head of the brief — this was sent to the Premier of the province.

That our frustrations stem from the failure of members of your cabinet to fulfill promises, to halt the misuse of Kootenay land and waters, and to preserve our once magnificent wildlife resource. We feel there is a great urgency to protect this natural resource now, or it will soon be gone. Once gone it cannot be restored.

Then we had the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Forest come up. And this is what he said — to the people, the owners and the farmers — and this is trying to create dissension among the people there, because the farmers and the wildlife representatives are quite close together they even had a joint brief brought in here called the grass roots brief to the government.

He said and I quote: "On a personal level I'm on your side"...he said this to the farmers..."but there has been tremendous pressure from the wildlife people". Who are the wildlife people the Minister referred to?

Is it the fish and wildlife branch of the Department of Recreation and Conservation? Is it the Rod and Gun Club or conservation organisations? Who are the bad guys? Are they for another? Are they people who believe that

[[Page 52](#)]

an annual renewable resource is worth saving and could be worth as much in the long run than a once-in-a-lifetime shot at resource exploitation? Or are they those who believe that through research and planning it is possible to have the best of two worlds?

Who are these people that the Minister of Lands and Forests said wouldn't let him do these things?

Here is another one, an excuse by the Honourable the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, and I quote here:

In 1967 the Minister of Recreation and Conservation at a public meeting in Cranbrook stated that a land use committee was being set up by the government and that the Department of Lands and Forests would be appointing representatives on this committee.

Two years later after many enquiries regarding this committee the Minister of Recreation and Conservation stated at the B.C. Wildlife Federation convention in New Westminster that his colleagues would not go along with this idea.

We must assume by this that in 1969 the Minister of Lands and Forests and other cabinet ministers opposed a land use committee to study land use in the Kootenays.

And this is the runaround the people of the East Kootenay have had.

The vegetation is eaten up, and if you're going to save these wild animals you're going to have to feed them, pay the farmers to grow hay or something, like they do down in Montana. They do this in Montana, because they too in some cases have used up all the bottom land. There's no place for the animals to go. They've got to live, these animals have got to live. They'll die of starvation if they don't get fed.

Now what are we going to do in this regard? Is the Hon. Minister going to do like he did with the sheep some years ago when I fought against him selling land on the Big Horn sheep range? Then about 10 years later, after he had lost a lot of sheep he bought the land back at an exorbitant price. That's what he did. And that's good foresight.

If he had taken my advice then he would have been better off. But he didn't do it.

In "Progress Grass Roots", the Honourable Minister of Rehabilitation even went to the defence, and stated he was wanting better management for the wildlife. But I don't see it forthcoming from the cabinet.

Down in the State of Washington, of course, they have got dedicated funds for wildlife and nobody can touch those funds. But up here, the government even takes away from the sportsmen part of their fees to assist them to make their surpluses of \$100 million that are coming up this session. They are letting the wildlife go down the drain, they are destroying one resource, and the rest of the resources they are giving away.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the way to govern a province as rich and as bountiful as British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Second Member for Vancouver Centre.

MR. E. WOLFE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, and fellow members, it is a pleasure once again to take my place in the throne speech debate and in somewhat of a contrast, I find the throne speech packed full of goodies. I just don't know where to start.

You know, job-creating legislation, family relations, suggestion of a new securities law — about the only thing that isn't in there is something about fixing up the weather and maybe we will come to that. Actually I am amazed at the attitude of the Opposition. Absolutely amazed.

I guess it's a case, Mr. Speaker, of "the beauty is in the eye of the beholder", I see a sort of beauty in the throne speech and that's the important thing about our enthusiastic attitude on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it can be said often enough that we do appreciate our new offices and that we do appreciate those who are responsible for these. I find that they are extremely nice. Once again, when this government decides they are going to do a job on something in the way of buildings, or facilities, it's my opinion that they do a very good job. Needless to say Hon. Members can do a more effective job with these kind of facilities. As a matter of fact I am going to miss writing letters on the windowsill.

I haven't heard anyone before this mention the sort of the unsung heroes of these buildings and that is the maintenance people. I have had people bring to my attention that these buildings are kept in first rate condition by the people who keep our floors and windows and facilities clean, and I am referring to the one that is principally responsible and that is Mr. Bill Harris who is chief of our maintenance crew for these buildings. So I think they are owed a lot of gratitude.

Now in case you want to jot these down, these are the subjects I propose to deal with today — very briefly in each case.

The subjects of sniffing, heart surgery, transportation, detoxication centre, regional economic expansion and another item that I will keep secret until the last. So any of you are not interested in those subjects may feel free to leave.

This matter of sniffing: not to elaborate on what has been said before, it seems to me it does indicate a basic social problem caused by lack of parental supervision and the policy of housing families in large-scale housing projects in certain areas.

I think that we can thank the Mothers who brought this to the attention of the public. I would like to name two of them — probably I would be passing up many others who are involved in this but Mrs. B. DeLorni and Mrs. Rainer have been very active in focusing public attention on the problems in one particular area.

Many suggestions have been made and not too many are practical, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put forward a couple of suggestions. First of all that the city council in Vancouver should pass a resolution making it an offence against the licensing bylaw, if these products are to be sold as a kit to kids under the age of 16 years. I understand such a resolution would be before Vancouver council today and I would be interested to hear what action has been taken.

As an alternative to this, as mentioned earlier by the Attorney General, if this particular action is thought to be beyond the power of the city, they could simply indicate by a resolution that they disapprove of the sale of these kits following which if a complaint arises, a merchant must show cause why his licence should not be suspended. One of these two courses by the city could have a material effect on the sale of these kits.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I do think that the federal government should take some action under the new *Hazardous Products Act* or through the excise tax department at the manufacturers' level.

From my own experience in dealing with bay rum — that's right, I've brought it right into the House here Mr. Speaker — I know that it is possible to place a quota on the

[[Page 53](#)]

distribution of these products where it is obvious that excessive volume is being sold which would indicate it was being used for purposes other than as cosmetic.

I made such a recommendation to the federal authorities in connection with bay rum over two years, at which time a company called Bromley Wholesale Drugs, were selling as much as 800 gallons in 5 gallon drums in Vancouver per month. This suggestion was ignored because it appears that the opinion of many is that bay rum is the lesser of several evils and doing us no particular harm.

So getting back to the nail polish remover and products used for sniffing, I understand that the sale of these kits has almost stopped primarily thanks to the action being taken by these concerned mothers and I say they deserve a lot of credit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the more significant improvements in our province in the last 10 years has been the rapid development in the art of open heart surgery. Chest surgery is now an everyday occurrence in Vancouver, and the result has been that many patients with chronic heart and arterial problems are now able to extend their life span significantly and live like normal human beings again.

Naturally, these operations are very complex and can only be done by a team of special surgeons who are well trained in the procedures and accustomed to working together as a cooperative unit. At the moment, members of the team practising at the Vancouver General Hospital under the direction of Dr. Peter Allen, are operating with a high degree of success. They deserve much credit for their dedication to this job.

A year ago I became aware there was a long waiting list of patients for heart surgery at the Vancouver General Hospital and I arranged to visit the operating room facilities with the Minister of Health together with Dr. Peter Allen. Subsequently I also attended meetings with the Hon. Minister in Victoria to discuss the problem.

I have been involved in several discussions with members of the heart team and other doctors who supposedly are knowledgeable in the matter of hospital privileges.

I can only say as a layman that it has been a frustrating experience for me to be in the middle between, more or less, two hardened positions — the position of the doctors and that of the Hon. Minister — and to see to much delay as a result of this dispute.

In a way I sympathise with the position of the Minister in the problem which he has, more or less, or who gets to use expensive facilities paid for by the people of this province. At the time of our visit in December, 1970, it was reported to me there were about 125 people on the waiting list. Five years ago the government had equipped the complete operating amphitheatre for heart surgery at a cost of about \$250,000.

However, there was a real shortage of post-operative intensive care beds which were needed in the vicinity of the operating room. The provincial government Willow Chest Pavilion, immediately next door to the heart unit, had some empty beds ideally situated for this purpose and the heart team was anxious to have these turned over for its use.

These beds can be adapted to post-operative intensive care at little cost. Turning these beds over to the heart team would enable more heart operations to be performed and would result in substantial headway being made in the backlog of patients.

Now Mr. Speaker, at that time, in December, 1970, the Hon. Minister indicated to me that the entire north-south corridor of the Willow Chest Pavilion of 21 beds could not be allocated but that one ward, consisting of two or three beds, might be available and he asked for information regarding the necessary alternations.

The Minister also obtained a report from the medical advisory committee of the B.C. Hospital Insurance Service, outlining future requirements for heart surgery in this area. This report listed necessary improvements at Vancouver General and St. Paul's Hospital in Vancouver; the Royal Columbian in New Westminster and Royal Jubilee Hospital in Victoria.

In the meantime, the matter of deciding which doctors are privileged to use these facilities has become an issue. Dr. George Stefanik, now practising in New Westminster, has been anxious to use the facilities at the Vancouver General. He is trained in open heart surgery but the heart team at the General does not find him acceptable. The heart surgeons don't want him on their team. Because of this Dr. Stefanik has lobbied extensively with the Hon. Minister and other M.L.A.'s.

In other words, the matter of outside doctors having privileges at the Vancouver General became a real issue in this case and I am afraid as a result, the necessary renovations in the facilities at the Willow Chest Pavilion have been delayed.

Just the other day, at the same time as Mr. McKinnon was being sent to Montreal for heart surgery there, the Hon. Minister announced he was approving an expenditure for renovations at the Willow Chest Pavilion.

I would like to add that I am encouraged by the Hon. Minister's announcement that renovations at the Vancouver General would proceed. Plans are now at the engineering stage and construction work is expected to be completed some time in June. This will improve both the operating room facilities and the post-operative bed situation to the extent that the number of heart operations will be increased from about eight per week to 13 Mr. Speaker. By this time next year, there should be a substantial reduction in the waiting list.

Having said that, I would also like to suggest, if I may, to the heart specialists, that they could enjoy a much more harmonious relationship with the Minister of Health if they pursued a more flexible course in permitting other

surgeons the use of their hospital facilities. In my view, they have been dogmatic and most uncompromising in their attitude.

The Hon. Minister has announced the formation of a new advisory committee which will have some say in deciding which doctors are privileged to use the heart facilities and in determining which patients have priority on the waiting list for surgery. It seems to me this committee could serve a most useful purpose in establishing the guidelines. But if it is to go further than that and make what could be life and death decisions, it is essential that heart surgeons be well represented in its membership. For, after all, the heart specialist is certainly the best judge of which cases on the waiting list are the most acute and should be dealt with on a priority basis.

Mr. Speaker, still on the subject of hospital patients, it is hard to believe that in most municipal elections in this province, hospital patients are not given an opportunity to cast a ballot. When one considers the thousands of people in hospital beds who lose their right to vote, through no particular fault of their own, this should be a matter of real concern. By comparison, our provincial government does a much better job in giving hospital patients an opportunity to vote. During provincial elections, a poll is set up in each

[[Page 54](#)]

hospital and the poll goes to the beds.

The federal government is also taking some steps regarding hospital voting in their elections and have now introduced a proxy vote for patients.

The City of Vancouver is now requesting an amendment to its charter to provide for a mail ballot for hospital patients during civic elections. Here it is proposed that only if a patient asks, he will be given a ballot to mail back. I just don't think this is quite good enough.

It seems to me that this mail ballot does not go far enough in attempting to get a representative vote from eligible hospital patients. The municipalities should follow the provincial example and set up a poll in each hospital, which would be taken around to the beds. As far as I can see, from enquiries that I have made, the only reason this is not done is that it would be too much trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Campbell) will see fit to take some action upon this and perhaps he should consider some amendment to the *Municipal Act* which would make a hospital poll mandatory in civic elections.

On the subject of transportation and particularly as it applies to rapid transit and the proposed First Narrows crossing, the Greater Vancouver Regional District recently took what I think is a most significant step. They have now agreed in principle to assume responsibility for the transportation function and they are now negotiating with the provincial government on the question of cost sharing and the constitution of the proposed regional transportation authority.

Mr. Speaker, by now you will be all too well aware of the fact that I have been stressing the need for a regional approach to transportation and the need for a regional transportation authority to be established.

In fact, two years ago I introduced a private bill to establish a greater Vancouver Regional Transportation Authority. So, naturally, I am more than happy to see the regional district take these steps.

A part of their intention is to take over the existing B.C. Hydro bus system for \$1 and to share in any increases in the annual deficits attributed to the Hydro transit system. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this proposal was put forward last February by our cabinet ministers who sit on the board of the B.C. Hydro.

The Greater Vancouver Regional District Transportation Committee recommended immediate and extensive improvements to the regional bus system, including a network of express lines as a logical first step to be followed by the introduction of a mini rapid transit system.

Mr. Kelly, chairman of the Regional District Transportation Committee, is of the opinion that we are not yet ready for a proper rail rapid transit system. This part of the transportation committee's report really concerns me and is in disagreement with the findings of the Deleuw Cather study as to the feasibility of rail rapid transit for this area.

I can see the establishment of a proper rapid transit system being delayed 20 to 30 years if we don't include it in the transportation plans of the regional district now.

Mr. Speaker, the Deleuw Cather study of September, 1970, which was commissioned jointly by the regional district and the provincial government, came up with the following significant recommendations:

First of all that there is a role for rapid transit in the Vancouver area in the next 20 years.

Secondly, that the population of the Vancouver area will be two million by the year 2000.

Thirdly, that we should build a two-stage network involving 24 miles of track, and costing about \$300 million. And last, that this would be only part of a balanced transportation system to function under a single agency or authority.

The report further states:

Based on passenger estimates, a route in the Kingsway corridor of Vancouver would be a viable rapid transit project now. If an early decision is received to proceed with rapid transit, this line could be in operation by 1978. Other lines could be placed in operation one by one to complete the 20 year network by 1990. For rapid transit to be fully effective in the longer term, construction should start at an early date and be well under way by 1990. This would polarise development into the rapid transit corridors and build up a pattern of travel by this mode.

Now that's the end of the quotation of this report.

I want to say that I admire the work being done by the transportation committee of the regional district. And I agree with the need for improved bus service in surrounding municipalities — but I think we're wrong to set aside the plans for a proper rail rapid transit system merely because we may feel that we can't afford it and, in particular, because we are afraid that the federal government has no plans to participate or assist in the urban transportation scene.

As far as the provincial government is concerned we have certainly shown our willingness to support rapid transit in Vancouver. Our government has made a commitment to pay 37 1/2 per cent of the \$300 million cost on condition that the federal government put up a similar amount.

The replies to this offer from the federal government haven't exactly been deafening. Furthermore, I understand that the federal minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson, refuses to discuss this matter with the regional district. He will only discuss this directly with the provincial government.

I understand Mr. Kelly, chairman of the region's transportation committee, has made attempts to negotiate with the federal government for assistance on local transit and has discovered that the federal Minister of Transport won't discuss local participation with regional district — he will only discuss this at the level of the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, just to remove any road blocks — and since the provincial government offer has only been announced through the Press — I believe it would be worthwhile for a direct meeting with our Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Campbell) and the federal Minister of Transport Mr. Jamieson, with the purpose of discussing a formula for financing urban transportation with particular emphasis on rapid transit.

I believe our Hon. Minister attempted to arrange such a meeting last year in Vancouver with the federal minister of Transport and the federal minister was not available. Another attempt should be made, and I hope such a meeting can be arranged in the near future.

I wouldn't like to think that such an important matter was bogged down merely through lack of proper communication between senior levels of government.

What we need is a formula for all major inter-urban transportation projects — say 37 1/2 per cent Federal, 37 1/2 per cent Provincial, and 25 per cent local money. After all, the rapid transit system is only part of the job ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is my 6th session in this House. At each previous session I have always mentioned the subject of the

[[Page 55](#)]

famous First Narrows crossing and I certainly don't want to disappoint you now.

I said once before that the Second Crossing was waiting out that way, although I would have to say that it now looks more likely to go ahead than ever before.

Thanks to the constant efforts of Alderman Halford Wilson, who urged the federal government to pay its share of the cost of the Second Narrows bridge now, providing the Hon. Minister of Finance for this province (Mr. Bennett) would turn these funds over to the completion of the First Narrows project, the cost-sharing formula has been completed.

And I'd like to thank our Premier for cooperating.

HON. MR. BENNETT: We get no cooperation from Ottawa.

MR. WOLFE: No, I know we don't.

And I want to say, despite recent newspaper reports, that I don't believe however that the agreement to proceed with the First Narrows project is 100 per cent sure. Of great help at this stage to get the project moving would be for the provincial government to lay out more emphatically with the federal authorities those sections of the crossing for which British Columbia will be responsible — specifically the approaches at each end of the proposed tunnel, stretching from the Upper Levels Highway on the North Shore to the waterfront and then from the south escarpment through the Thurlow tunnel and the False Creek bypass to the Georgia Viaduct connection — and for the Vancouver MP's to go to bat for this area and indicate to the federal cabinet very strongly that we want this First Narrows crossing.

As far as I am concerned, this proposed crossing is of particular importance to the City of Vancouver. It will provide us with what we need, Mr. Speaker, the beginning of a balanced transportation system. It will remove a considerable amount of through traffic from our downtown streets, and rather than destroy the possibility of rapid transit, will provide the future access for rapid transit to the North Shore. It will also give a psychological boost to starting rapid transit throughout the lower mainland region.

And all of this Vancouver would pay almost nothing — most of the cost would be paid by tolls and by the provincial government. We just can't afford to turn down a bargain like that.

It is interesting to see certain groups now suddenly arriving on the scene to argue against the crossing, particularly when it has been under discussion for some 20 years. However, the Vancouver and District Labour Council is one that particularly surprised me. I always thought the Labour Council were primarily in favour of increased employment. This project will create 8 1/2 million man hours of work. For this reason their position in opposing the crossing is most strange. As far as I'm concerned, both the Narrows crossing and the full rapid transit system should move forward together to provide the beginnings of a balanced transportation system for the Vancouver area.

They are both major projects which take several years to complete, and there is just no time to lose in starting

them. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned several times before in this House the great need for a detox clinic or alcoholic receiving hospital in the Vancouver area. A detox centre for Vancouver has been under discussion since before 1967. It was in 1967 that I first urged action on this matter in the Legislature. Recently the concept for this clinic has been expanded and, instead of just an alcoholic receiving hospital, it is planned to include treatment facilities for drug as well as alcohol addiction. Although this project has been a long time in taking shape, I am glad to say we are now beginning to see something more encouraging in that a hospital society has been formed known as the Greater Vancouver District Hospital Society. I attended a meeting of this society in October and they have obtained a consultant's report which recommends a permanent facility to accommodate both drug and alcoholic addicts. The concept of this new detox facility is now under consideration by the regional hospital board, and indications are that the cost-sharing aspects of the proposal will receive approval and the projects should soon get the green light. At least, I certainly hope so.

They are now talking about 18 months to two years to complete this hospital and I can only urge those involved both in the hospital society and in the regional hospital board to get on with the job and establish a high priority on this hospital. It is badly needed in the Vancouver area.

In the meantime, this committee is planning to set up an interim detox facility to take the place of the city jail, and are looking to the Salvation Army and Central City Mission for facilities and assistance.

At their conference on alcoholic addiction in October, the Vancouver Detoxication Centre Society passed two very important motions. One was to the effect that the Vancouver Detox Centre Society be the organ through which all existing alcoholism treatment facilities be coordinated for the purpose of referral and undergoing treatment.

The other motion was to the effect that the society retain an office and a co-ordinator and apply to the B.C. government for a grant to finance its interim program.

Mr. Speaker, I have assisted in applying for this grant, and I would like to thank the Council on Drug, Alcohol and Cigarette Education through their chairman — the Honourable Minister of Education — for approving this grant. I understand that the fund has decided to allocate \$21,000 to establish an office and pay the salary of a coordinator.

I think this is a very important step and should speed up the whole process of building the proposed hospital. To date any progress has been strictly the result of interested volunteers and what was badly needed was someone working on a full time basis.

It is interesting to note that the Province of Alberta has now established an Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and has built a new 64-bed residence in the Edmonton area known as Henwood. I have heard some very good reports on Henwood and would like to commend it for investigation by our government and our drug alcohol committee.

Henwood is a 64-bed alcoholism rehabilitation unit, providing rehabilitative treatment for resident patients and their families — plus teaching and training for professionals and individuals involved in community alcoholism programmes.

Henwood has been built in an attractive rural setting in which people stay for some 30 to 60 days. It does not provide emergency or first aid treatment for acute alcoholism and it is not "drying out" or treatment for physical or psychiatric complications. The goal of the treatment received at Henwood is to interrupt the repetitive pattern of drinking. They utilise a team including the services of a doctor, nurse, psychologist, social worker, consulting psychiatrist and clergyman to help the patient and his family to recognise and understand the illness, and work together for the patient's recovery.

The cost per day at Henwood for Alberta residents is \$2, and for non-residents of Alberta \$20 per day.

This is a new type of institution in this field and I think we should watch it very closely as it may be worthy of adopting in British Columbia.

Recently Mr. John McKeown, chairman of the Vancouver and Lower Mainland Industrial Development Commission, released some statistics which should alarm British Columbians.

He stated that British Columbia is being short-changed under the federal government's regional economic expansion program. He quoted statistics showing that between July, 1969, and March, 1971, per capita in Nova Scotia; \$8.84 in Quebec and \$1.85 in Ontario. Grants to the Prairie provinces amounted to \$7.84 in Manitoba, \$5.44 in Saskatchewan and \$13.21 in Alberta.

McKeown also stated: "The poor performance of the regional economic expansion program in British Columbia is a further manifestation of Ottawa's neglect of this part of Canada."

He noted that the unemployment level in B.C. for the last decade has been above the Canadian average while Ontario and the Prairies during the same period have been substantially below the national average. "Yet in terms of regional development grants, we find that on a per capita basis, Ontario receives more than seven times what British Columbia gets and the Prairies receive almost 38 times more."

MR. G.H. DOWDING (Burnaby-Edmonds): No special areas in B.C. at all.

MR. WOLFE: This is the only province in Canada that does not have a special area defined under this program.

The East and West Kootenays are the only section of British Columbia designated as eligible for federal grants. Yet all of the Atlantic provinces, most of Quebec, all of Northern Ontario, most of Manitoba, all of Southern Saskatchewan and a major portion of Southern Alberta are designated under the regional economic expansion programme.

Mr. Speaker, considering the unemployment levels and the rate of population growth in British Columbia, a good case could be made for designating all of British Columbia with the exception of Greater Vancouver, Greater Victoria and the Okanagan.

The whole regional economic expansion program was originally weighted heavily in favour of the Maritimes and Quebec. Interim changes have helped to alleviate the imbalance on the Prairies but no such changes have been made to give the people of British Columbia a fairer deal.

I think it is important that our Hon. Minister of Industrial Development (Hon. Mr. Skillings) urge the federal government to carefully re-assess this programme as it applies to the Province of British Columbia. We are simply getting the short end of the stick out here, even in comparison to other "have" provinces such as Ontario and Alberta.

Mr. Speaker very recently my associate the First Member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Capozzi) and I sent out a questionnaire to our area. And I have some replies to that which are of considerable interest.

To give you some idea of the size of the questionnaire, there are 31,000 questionnaires mailed. And I have just a sampling of the replies based on 449. I think we have in total 1,500 back. But I haven't been able to summarise the balance of them.

So I am going to point out four particular answers which were of interest to me.

1. The question was, do you think welfare payments should be increased?

The answers to that were about three to one in favour of "no".

2. Are you in favour of a system of mandatory price and wage controls in Canada? I'll bring this to the attention of the Hon. Member from Richmond (Mr. LeCours) — the answer to that question was 68 per cent "yes",

32 per cent "no". I think it's high time that we took the position that the public are ready for regulatory controls in this country in terms of price and wages. Nothing else is about to work, in my opinion.

3. The third question is, would you be in favour of the government increasing the dollar-per-day hospital charge to those who can afford to pay?

The answers here were about even. "Yes", 56 per cent. "No", 44 per cent. Still a substantial number in favour of this suggestion.

I don't put that forward because I'm of the opinion that it's going to happen. But you never can tell.

4. In connection with tenure at our universities: Do you think university professors should be subject to a review of their qualifications every five to 10 years?

"Yes", 90 per cent. "No", 10 per cent.

And when I see the answer to that particular question I am all the more pleased to see that the legislative committee on tenure has been called from this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion today, I would like to leave with you something new — A list of proposals which I believe, as a representative of the constituency of Vancouver Centre, should receive priority attention in the interest of our city and the entire province.

In summary, these are as follows:

1. A greater Vancouver regional transportation authority.
2. An early start on the First Narrows crossing — preferably a tunnel.
3. An early start on the first corridor of a full rapid transit system for greater Vancouver, namely the Kingsway corridor.
4. Amalgamation of Burnaby and Vancouver. A preliminary study on this amalgamation was carried out in the year 1968 and since then the matter has been dropped. This study indicated that the amalgamation of Burnaby and Vancouver was entirely feasible.
5. Regarding the new British Columbia Building — that we preserve the maximum amount of open space at the ground level. Secondly that it should be developed — (and I think this will be the case) it should be developed in full cooperation with the City of Vancouver planning department, as promised. Lastly, that after completion, the annual grants to the city in lieu of property taxes, should be at the same mil rate as charged to normal residents.

The next three items on my list, could be under the heading of "Things which are taking too long to complete", generally due to bureaucratic red tape.

I will start off with number 6; as I said before:

6. Detoxication centre, now known as an Alcoholic and Drug Addiction Hospital for Vancouver. This has been under discussion since 1966, or earlier.
7. West End Community Centre and Senior Citizens highrise. The local plebiscite here was passed in 1968.
8. The Britannia Community Services Centre. The concept for this centre was approved by our city hall in 1967.

So those are three items which are symbolic of the terrific amount of time taken up in multi-level partnership agreements from the day they are conceived to the time they are actually completed.

9. Increased funds for law enforcement. We need a big increase in our police staff, particularly beat policemen and those involved in traffic control.

10. Development of the Moran Dam on the Fraser River in the interests of cheap power for the lower mainland and long-term flood control.

11. As I said before, price and wage controls now. Our province should go on record as favouring controls and should pressure the federal government to install these now.

12. An efficiency task force to survey the Civil Service, look for waste and duplication and obsolete work methods.

13. The Home Acquisition Grant should be increased and paid only on a needs basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No way!

MR. WOLFE: No? Makes sense.

14. In connection with hospital care, the \$1 per day charged should be increased to \$3 or \$5 per day.

15. In connection with *Landlords and Tenants Act* we should amend the Act to provide the landlord with greater protection against the tenant who refuses to pay his rent. The Act should once again permit, in my opinion, the use of distress. Also, Mr. Speaker, tenants are not well informed on their many rights under the Act. It should be necessary for a landlord to post a summary of the Act in every suite.

Last but not least.

16. We need more cooperation and liaison between the provincial government and the City of Vancouver, both at the staff and political level. The reason I say this is based on certain recent indications of what I would call poor cooperation.

Just two instances were: the refusal to invite our Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs to participate in discussions on the civic structure in Vancouver and secondly, the recent mixup over allocation of the federal winter works loan abatement money where Vancouver was left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, most of these 16 proposals I have mentioned before in this House. But I am repeating them today in summary just in case they may have slipped Hon. Members' minds. I know they would like to hear more of my proposals but I think I will save them for a later date. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G. S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure, despite the pending absence of the Premier, to take my place in this debate.

Mention has already been made of the new seating arrangements in the chamber and in this regard I would like to offer my personal congratulations and best wishes to the Hon. Member from Columbia River (Hon. Mr. Chabot) on his elevation to the cabinet. There is no doubt that he holds, in my opinion, at least one of the most difficult portfolios and I wish him well in his endeavours. Inasmuch that he and I moved and seconded the throne speech last year, I suppose in the meantime it might well be said that we represent the ups and downs of political life.

Regarding the seating arrangements, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it quite clear that I am perfectly satisfied with the location that I have been accorded.

One of my friends asked me how I feel about being seated immediately downwind from the N.D.P. and I would have to say at this point that it is too early to give an opinion. But seated as I am between the N.D.P. and the Liberals, I can certainly inform the House that during debate, I have already become aware of some of the more intimate N.D.P. and Liberal comments which would hardly find acceptance in your ears, Mr. Speaker.

One thing is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that if I am to be of some use in this Legislature, I consider it more important as to the content of what I say than where I sit or when I speak. There have been changes indeed in this chamber and I think it's only fitting the House should know that the change which I appreciate most lies in the fact that I now have a much easier time in caucus. (Laughter.)

I have however gone from the shelter of a large team to a rather solitary stance. I think it is only fair to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have a sense of loneliness but I have great hopes that my caucus will be substantially enlarged after the coming provincial election.

As a Member of the Conservative Party of British Columbia, I consider it my obligation during this session of the House to spell out the principles and policies of the party.

Since the opinion has been expressed that I was elected as a Social Crediter and should not sit as a Conservative, I would assure the electorate of Oak Bay that they will be given every opportunity to express their displeasure with my decisions at the coming election. I will certainly respect and honour their verdict.

I would only add this, that I ran for election in Oak Bay on a platform which was based essentially on certain democratic principles and aims in which I believed and in which I mistakenly thought the Social Credit government believed. It is my personal conviction, which can certainly be debated, that the voters supported me because of these principles and aims rather than because of any particular label.

Since the Progressive Conservative Party believes in those principles and philosophy, I feel that at the present time I am serving the electorate of Oak Bay best by following the path I have chosen. But, I would repeat, that since I fully believe in democratic procedures and the right of the voter, I will respect completely their verdict at the coming election.

As spokesman for the Progressive Conservative Party, under its new leader, Mr. Derril Warren, I wish to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that any contribution I hope to make in this House will be on the constructive, positive nature.

It will not be my function, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, to oppose simply for the sake of opposing. The vital and essential purpose of opposition is not to devote its time pointing out what is wrong with the government, but to demonstrate to the people of the province the alternative policies which it believes will improve the quality of government and hence the quality of living in this province.

Too often in this House — I agree, you have to point out the need — but too often in this House members are purely negative and destructive in their approach with the very clear and obvious single aim of attacking a party and frequently worse still by attacking individual members.

On those issues in which the government demonstrates sound, sensible, responsible policies, it will receive, Mr. Speaker, the support of the Conservative Party. While mentioning the positive approach, and it has been mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to compliment the

[[Page 58](#)]

government sincerely on the provision of quarters for the M.L.A.'s, myself included. I feel that the room which I have been provided is most adequate and very satisfactory and I sincerely thank the government.

To return to the matter of my role in this session, I would regard it as my first duty and obligation to set forth the policies and beliefs of the party on current issues — but equally important, to outline the style of government

which the Conservative Party would favour.

It is our opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the present government in its method of governing, quite apart from its policies, leaves something to be desired. It will therefore be my hope in this session to outline clearly for the people of British Columbia, the political philosophy and policies of the Progressive Conservative Party and to describe the style of government by which these policies would be implemented.

The throne speech has been widely criticised because it reveals very little in detail about the government's proposed legislative programme. This is a valid observation and yet there are proposals in the throne speech which at least in principle promise much-needed social reform, such as increased benefits to the permanently handicapped, hospital coverage for those undergoing withdrawal treatment from drugs and alcohol and action to improve existing expropriation laws, an urgent need which I referred to in my speech in this debate a year ago.

It is on such issues as these, Mr. Speaker, that if the government brings forth sound sensible responsible policies, it will receive the support of the Conservative Party.

I do not agree that the throne speech should be vague and indefinite, but the very fact that it tends to be so makes it difficult to attempt any appraisal in depth.

Under these circumstances it would seem appropriate and timely for me as spokesman for the Conservative Party to define the main issues facing the people of British Columbia as we see them and to outline the policies which the Conservative Party would adopt to deal with them.

It is equally important to describe the manner in which our government would function, providing a truly democratic style of government which would afford the voter and the media ready access to Hon. Members and Ministers and would ensure that individuals, groups, and organisations would always be given a fair opportunity to have their views considered by government.

The individual must always be considered the vital element in society. Living as we do in a highly technological and mechanised age, it is all too easy to overlook the essential human needs of people. Those basic needs — so well described as the standard of living — encompass food, shelter, housing, medical care and a healthy environment in which to grow and flourish.

The Progressive Conservative Party would regard as its first priority the urgent need to raise the standard of living of those on welfare, those in low income groups, the elderly sick, the disabled and those on fixed incomes. These are the groups in society who are most heavily penalized by inflation and who depend almost entirely on government to help them in their plight as wages and prices continue to spiral.

The recent Senate report on poverty demonstrates the grim fact that one Canadian in every four lacks sufficient income to maintain a basic standard of living. It also reveals that 60 per cent of the poor are not on welfare, but that the vast majority of the working poor continue to work at jobs which pay little more than they would receive on welfare.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, to point out that of those on welfare, 90 per cent are outside the labour force and that they are handicapped or disabled or deserted or widowed or in some way handicapped for reasons beyond their own control.

Any permanent solution depends on the cooperative efforts of provincial and federal governments, but certain measures could be taken provincially.

A Progressive Conservative government would raise the minimum wage. It would provide hospital insurance coverage and the facilities to all patients requiring any level of care in any hospital or nursing home. It would remove the education fraction of property taxation from all homeowners over 65 and would, within context of the complete budget, raise allowances to the disabled, the blind, the deserted and the handicapped.

It should be evident, Mr. Speaker, that while we believe that every person has the right to a basic standard of living, we also believe that every person has the right not to work, but it would not be our policy to support by way of revenue from the taxpayers, able bodied men and women who refuse jobs that are available.

The first and foremost goal of a Conservative government would undoubtedly be to give increased assistance to all those in our society now living in poverty through no choice of their own.

Closely allied to the problem of poverty is the problem of unemployment, and in fighting this evil we again have to recognise and adjust to the highly technological and rapidly changing society in which we live. The more highly-educated, skilled, trained person has a much greater chance of remaining steadily employed, but even he in his working lifetime may have to change his occupation two or three times because of changing techniques and the changing needs and demands of society.

Retraining must become an integral part of our total educational programme. Financial assistance for such retraining would be made available by the Conservative government to persons who become unemployed when the work for which they were originally trained is no longer needed.

Statistics Canada reported the other day that among the 1.7 million men with no better than a primary school education, the unemployment rate is 8.5 per cent. Because machines are progressively taking over work previously done by people, there are fewer jobs for the poorly-trained person and this tendency, it seems certain, will only accelerate as further advances in science, engineering and medicine are made.

Mindful of these basic factors, the Progressive Conservative Party would create a non-political employment research board, composed of educators, employers from the industrial and business sectors and economists whose primary purpose would be to look ahead many years in this rapidly changing society and advise government as to what types of jobs will become redundant and which types of jobs will emerge in new fields.

In this way, government could prepare training programmes and education curricula so that appropriate numbers of people could be trained to fill the number and kind of new jobs as they become available.

The fact that many university graduates are unemployed would suggest that in this realm of education, the intake of students is not intelligently related to the availability of jobs at the time of graduation. In this respect I support the government's emphasis on education at many varying levels, including technical and vocational schools, colleges and such

[[Page 59](#)]

as a specific example as cited in the throne speech in the opening of an open-pit mining school.

The Progressive Conservative Party would thus endeavour by way of the employment research board to measure the specific employment needs of the province in advance and then educate and train the required numbers of persons for the jobs available.

Of more immediate impact on the unemployment problem would be the provision of incentives to encourage secondary industry to locate in this province. The Conservative Party would introduce an incentives programme, applicable to new businesses and industries starting up in the province in which property taxation would be relieved by the cooperative participation of all levels of government on a reducing scale over the first few years.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House accord some quietness, please, to the speaker?

MR. WALLACE: During the years of tax relief the provincial government would protect the revenue sources of the municipalities. In our opinion this would provide a more permanent way of creating jobs than the present government programme which is limited to a six-month period and has been unsuccessful at only 4.6 per cent of applicants obtaining work. It is our opinion this use of the private sector of the economy would create lasting jobs.

The throne speech mentions that jobs are to be created by Hydro, P.G.E., forest and park development and by housing programmes. Certainly, the Conservative Party would support such programmes but would go further in emphasising jobs in the service and retirement industries. With citizens retiring to British Columbia from other parts and with a steady increase in tourism, together with a shorter work week, the service, retirement and recreational industrial should be encouraged to expand — if need be with incentives from government.

Low-cost housing is a continuing urgent need, particularly for the young people and the elderly. The Conservative Party would expand existing programmes for senior citizens' housing and in every way possible encourage housing construction as a means of creating jobs. Where construction is on the increase, all sectors of the economy benefit, and particularly those out of work.

I would like to say that the next issue we consider of high priority is labour-management relations, Mr. Speaker.

One of the biggest dangers posed to the continuing prosperity of this province is the danger of strikes and lockouts in vital industrial which can paralyse the province and cause great hardship to many individuals.

Because of the immense damage to the citizens and to the economy which can arise from strikes and lockouts, our party believes that there must be brought into play new mechanisms which will help to prevent or minimise strikes and lockouts.

The Conservative Party would consult with management and labour as to the feasibility of setting-up a permanent management labour council. This council would be composed of representatives from management and labour as well as economists and statisticians.

The purpose of the council would be to act in an advisory capacity to any employer or union early in the process of negotiating new contracts. The council would serve as a fund of information and research to both employers and unions and be in permanent existence for reference early in negotiations to serve a useful purpose in preventing confrontations and strikes and lockouts.

The Conservative Party would introduce legislation providing for cooling-off periods similar to the legislation in force in the United States. This legislation has the effect of putting strikers back to work with the assurance that they are entitled to strike again after a stated period of time, if the differences have not been settled in the meantime.

Since in almost every realm of human affairs, Mr. Speaker, time has the effect of healing differences, the use of cooling-off periods we consider to have a great deal of merit.

Believing as we do in incentives, we would also ask for consideration and exploration of the proposal that employers and unions consider including in contracts some financial guarantee or fringe benefit which would accrue to the workers, if the succeeding contract is negotiated without a strike.

We would review existing legislation with two main objectives in mind. A balancing of collective bargaining power as between management and labour, and increased protection of the rights of the individual worker.

The Conservative Party believes strongly in the principle of collective bargaining and in the right to strike and will always lend every assistance to bring an end to a strike or lockout through negotiation.

It must be recognised, however, where a strike is clearly threatening the safety or total wellbeing of the citizens, or perhaps the very economy of the province, then it is the essential duty of the government to use legislation in one form or another — such as cooling-off periods — to put the strikers back to work. Such compulsion would be used by this party only as a very last resort and only in the mildest way necessary to restore a serious provincial situation to normal.

In the event that a final and binding solution to a dispute is required, we believe that such a decision should

be imposed by the Legislature and not by an administrative agency of government. For this reason, as well as the fact that the mediation commission has failed to fulfill its role, we believe the mediation commission should be disbanded.

While we recognise the right to organise and the right to strike, we equally strongly recognise the right of an individual or individuals not to organise and not to join a union. The Progressive Conservatives would protect that right and would ensure that non-union members are not subjected to harassment by union members.

The fundamental philosophy underlying....

AN HON. MEMBER: Or union members being harassed by employers because they're union.

MR. WALLACE: Or vice versa. We'll try and give justice to everybody my friend.

Interjection by Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: That's why I'm not on the other side. The fundamental philosophy underlying all our policies in the field of labour management relations, would be confidence in the collective bargaining process and the provision of every possible manner of advice and assistance in settling disputes by negotiation, not compulsion.

The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, that I have chosen to emphasis as having high priority, is power development in the province.

One of the most critical challenges facing any growing,

[[Page 60](#)]

developing country or province is the provision of adequate sources of electrical power to meet the ever growing needs of an enlarging population and an expanding economy. Just how vital are power supplies was shown by our ice conditions last week and our emergency reliance on United States power.

In this sphere of government, responsibility arises and shows perhaps the best example of how modern governments are challenged to provide a vital essential service to the people and at the same time inflict the least possible damage upon our natural environment.

The throne speech mentions that the B.C. energy board is completing a study to determine the best method of providing electrical power to 1985. Unfortunately the terms of reference given to the energy board made no mention whatever of the possibility of considering the use of nuclear power. The board was asked to consider additions to existing plants, possible new plants, using hydro-electric power, and possible new plants using fossil fuel. Now Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange to me that when every developing country in the world is making peaceful use of nuclear power, that in British Columbia's planning of power needs for the next 13 years, the very existence of nuclear power is not even mentioned.

In the United States approximately 40 per cent of new power plants use nuclear energy and the latest development involves fast breeder reactors which produce more fuel than they consume. Russia and Britain have already built such plants which are shortly to go into production.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am not necessarily suggesting that nuclear power will solve all the problems for British Columbia or that it may even turn out to be the one of choice, but I would suggest that any modern government should pretend that nuclear power does not exist is tantamount to believing that the world is flat.

Indeed, there are dangers inherent in the use of nuclear power and these have been well documented, but if nuclear power is not even to be considered by the energy board, now can its disadvantages be evaluated against the possibly far-reaching and equally serious disadvantages of damming the Fraser River — or any other river for that matter?

The government at the present time is studying a proposal to complete the development of the Alcan Aluminum Co.'s Kemano power plant some 40 miles south of Kitimat. The development would cause extensive flooding and drastically affect several lakes and rivers in northwestern British Columbia. A report by the fisheries service of the federal Department of the Environment states that full development of the plant would result in extensive loss of salmon spawning areas, an annual economic loss in fish of about \$12 million and reduce food supplies for over 7,000 Indians.

The area to be most severely affected would be the Bulkley River system and indirectly affected would be the Skeena and Fraser River systems. It would seem that the energy board in considering only hydro sources of power is being unrealistic in looking at only half the overall picture of power sources in the 1970's.

A Conservative government, without prejudice, would look at all potential sources of power and evaluate every such possibility in terms of development cost, safety, dangers to the environment and the provision of maximum benefits to the people of British Columbia at the lowest possible costs. In this area — as in all others where expertise and the most up-to-date knowledge is required — a Conservative government would enlist the consulting advice of the best scientists, engineers and biologists available.

It may not be that nuclear power is the answer for British Columbia, but I believe most strongly that any responsible government planning the power needs of the province for the next 13 years should consider and compare the possible use of nuclear power along with all other sources.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, the two main goals of the Progressive Conservative Party are to bring forward positive, constructive policies to meet the needs of B.C. in the 70's and to bring to the people of British Columbia a new style of government. It is on the style of government that I would like to make a few remarks.

The main aim of the Conservative Party in providing this new style of government would be to involve the private member and the individual citizen to the greatest possible degree. In the Progressive Conservative Party it will be our aim at all times to allow the philosophy and policies to germinate and mature from the grass roots of the party, rather than impose the policy from on high.

In every way possible a Conservative government would seek to follow fundamental democratic principles, while it would seek to involve every private member in the discussion, creation and amending of legislation. More importantly, it would seek to encourage many individual citizens, groups and organisations to become actively involved in the political process.

To be specific, Mr. Speaker, the party would insist that all standing committees of the Legislature, of which there are eight, would be active not only during the session of the House, from January to April, but all the year around. These committees could be made to serve a useful modern function by listening to individuals and groups who frequently have a refreshing informed and detailed point of view to present to legislators.

Special standing committees to deal with specific issues as they arise — such as the ecological danger of having tankers traverse the Strait of Georgia — would be created. The issues in our modern world change so rapidly and new issues literally rise out of the ground to face us day by day, so that a more flexible and more accessible style of government is imperative if political leaders are to meet the needs of modern society and to come forth with exciting new answers to the challenge.

Those committees, to fulfil their greatest potential, would hold public hearings on appropriate issues at suitable locations. In no better way can one bring the government to the people or provide complete access of the people to the government.

A Progressive Conservative government, recognising the complexity and highly technical nature of our modern world, would be always eager and ready to employ skilled and experienced experts to put before the government the up-to-the-minute facts bearing on any important issue. The government would always seek out the facts as the essential basis upon which to build any policy. And this would be done through the frequent use of objective neutral nonpolitical experts whose advice the government would, of course, remain free to accept or reject.

But the facts would be obtainable from the most reliable available source.

The Conservative Party will always allow individuals or groups to express their point of view to government prior to introduction of legislation which will affect these groups. This is in no way to suggest that a Conservative government would give in to the demand of pressure groups but simply to state that the democratic rights of individuals and groups to

[[Page 61](#)]

be heard by their elected government would be respected.

We live in such a highly-specialised complex society with a multiplicity of problems which did not even exist 20 years ago, that no leader or government can hope to provide even some of the answers without the guidance and informed advice of the trained and experienced professional. It would be a strong tenet of the Progressive Conservative Party that it would constantly avail itself of the best technical and professional advice available.

In the Legislature, the Conservative government would encourage the use of free votes where individual members would be free to vote as they choose, regardless of the official position of the party on the particular issue.

In such votes, a defeat of the government position is not regarded as a vote of non-confidence, and an election does not automatically follow. While such votes obviously would not be held on matters of fundamental government policy, there are many matters where an honest uninhibited expression of opinion of all the members, regardless of party lines, would provide not only valid conclusions, but would breathe a fresh breath of life into the sterile political process of this province. For much of the cynicism with which the electorate view politicians and the political process stems directly from the obvious fact that members vote blindly along party lines, regardless of convictions.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: I'll get to that, just give me a minute. I'll get to that, just a minute. I've got a quotation right here. It is refreshing to recognise that in the Mother of Parliaments recently a free vote was held on a fairly vital issue as to whether the United Kingdom should revert to the use of Greenwich Mean Time.

AN HON. MEMBER: A very political issue, very....

MR. WALLACE: At the federal level, a study group headed by Defence Minister Macdonald and party president Stanbury, recently did recommend that there should be more free votes in the House of Commons, in which M.P.'s would not be bound by party discipline. Does that answer your question?

Such trend in this provincial legislature would signal an exciting rebirth of one of the fundamental concepts in the democratic process.

What goes on in this Legislature is mainly play-acting. This chamber is a political theatre rather than a forum for democratic debate and decisions and much of the public display by members is a performance by actors on both sides of the House simulating alarm, anger and outrage to win the attention of the public rather than to give or receive useful information.

Debates on ministers' estimates and on legislative bills move drearily ahead to predetermined conclusions. From the voters' point of view, all they can see is that their M.L.A., if he is a government member, always toes the government line, and if he is an Opposition member, always opposes the government but never manages to change anything.

With the use of free votes and the more effective involvement of the private members, a more honest and reliable picture of the opinions of all the legislators would be obtained by the public, who in turn would gain confidence and courage from this obvious increase in the validity and integrity of the political process. The two most

vital ingredients now lacking in our political system — conviction and credibility — would be enhanced.

In an effort to create a truly democratic style of government the Progressive Conservative Party would institute various practices some of which have already been mentioned in debate. The party favours the use of a totally accurate unedited *Hansard*, the intelligent use of night sittings, and the introduction of a question period as the starting point of each day's proceedings.

In addition, the party would reorganise the session in such a way as to provide a realistic amount of time and consideration of Private Members' Bills.

Since no government or its agencies is infallible, and as a result of errors, the individual may suffer great harm, a Conservative Party would abolish the fiat system and allow individuals to sue the government where some prior objective investigation shows that the individual has reasonable grounds for such an action.

In the same vein, the party would create the position of ombudsman to provide the individual and society with some recourse against the ever increasing and often misused powers of government and its agencies.

The use of orders in council would be limited to housekeeping measures and emergency situations and to problems where the solution clearly cannot await the next session of the House.

In all non-urgent matters, and particularly those affecting the rights and freedoms of individuals, only formal legislation introduced for debate and decision by the vote of the House, would be employed. Government by order in council all too readily becomes government by edict, a form of government which history alone has shown to be inhuman and futile.

As a measure of reasonable supervision and restraint, the Conservative Party government would create the position of Auditor General, with complete freedom to explore and comment upon all the financial actions of the government and its Crown agencies.

I have endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, to outline a few of the policies which the Progressive Conservative government would pursue. As the session unfolds I hope to provide the people of this province with a clear and comprehensive picture not only of our policies, but also of the style of democratic government which in the 70's our citizens not only expect, but deserve.

Mr. Williston moves adjournment of the debate. Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Peterson moves adjournment of the House. Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

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