

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, FEBRUARY 6, 1973**

Afternoon Sitting

[ [Page 259](#) ]

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Labour.

**HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to make a statement regarding the school janitors' strike in the Victoria area.

Leave granted.

**HON. MR. KING:** Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I reported that the parties had arrived at a proposal for settlement with the assistance of Mr. Clark Gilmour, the provincial mediator. Unfortunately, the proposal that was put before the parties to the dispute was turned down by the union membership.

I would like to report, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) and myself have met all morning with the parties involved in the dispute: namely the board of school trustees and their negotiating committee, as well as the full negotiating committee for the Canadian Union of Public Employees. On the basis of discussions held during the morning, a meeting is being called this afternoon — or as soon as physically possible — by the union to consider and place before their membership a new proposal for settlement. So I would expect that we should hear early this evening whether or not this settlement has been acted on and accepted by the union people.

I just wanted to make the House aware of the efforts that the Minister of Education and I have put forward in trying to mediate this dispute, and also the situation as it exists at the moment. Hopefully it will result in a settlement, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** In view of the fact that I've given the Hon. Minister of Labour the opportunity of making a statement with your leave, is leave granted for other Members representing other parties in the House to make short statements on the question?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think the Member has already retracted his "no", so would the Hon. Member for Chilliwack on behalf of his party wish to make a short statement?

**MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack):** I would like to commend the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Education for any effort that they are putting forth to bring a soon conclusion to this labour dispute.

We find it rather repulsive that a little more than 260 disputers should be able to put out of operation and out of commission an entire educational function in the City of Victoria. Now that this has continued into the fourth week, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement of this intervention by the two Ministers. We'd like to commend them for it, and hope for a speedy recovery.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. leader of the Liberal Party.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, we wish to join with the Hon. Member who just spoke (Mr. Schroeder) on congratulating the Government on taking an interest in this area.

There is one question, though, on which I'm not clear and perhaps the Hon. Minister (Hon. Mr. King) will clear it up. I gathered that the board has already accepted the new proposals, and it was only a question of whether or not the union this afternoon will accept it. If the Minister will shake his head one way or the other, perhaps we'll know what the situation is on this.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, in any event that question remains. I trust that the Minister, whether he shakes his head or speaks, will answer it in due course.

We feel, however, that the seriousness of this has not been adequately brought home to the Government because it is, after all, the fourth week of this strike continuing. We in this party — and I know the other Members for the greater Victoria area — are going to be watching with great interest the events that take place this afternoon. We trust that if, unfortunately, it happens that there is no settlement this afternoon, the Government will be contemplating action before the end of this week to make sure that on Monday next the school children of the greater Victoria area can be returned to school, and can continue their education with the interruption of not more than four weeks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. House Leader for the Progressive Conservative Party.

**MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would say how grateful we are in this party that the two Ministers concerned have taken action today. I have to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is regrettable that such a length of time has been allowed to go by before the Ministers have taken this action.

I don't say this with any personal animosity to the

[ [Page 260](#) ]

Ministers concerned. I think it's a principle that they were obviously afraid of being accused of interference. I really don't think that this would have been the interpretation placed on their earlier intervention; in the sense of an harmonious talk around the table without necessarily threatening any legislative powers but simply an attempt to bring the parties together sooner.

But at any rate I am very pleased that they have intervened. I would add to the Liberal leader's comments (Mr. D.A. Anderson) that the situation is indeed serious. I spent the whole morning visiting seven of the different schools in Oak Bay. While they're getting by, I think that is the highest statement one could make. I'd like to put it on the record: there is no health hazard as has been suggested.

I also would like to say that the parties have negotiated in excess of 100 hours at this point in time. It is our feeling in this party that if, by tonight, there is no solution...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Well now, just a minute, Hon. Members. Statements made by Ministers and comments by various party leaders are restricted, really, to the question of the facts that they wish to present only, and not

argument or debate. I would ask the Members to please observe it.

**MR. WALLACE:** In that case, I would like to ask the Minister, in making further comment, to consider or tell the House in what light he views the urgency of the situation, and whether some Government action will be forthcoming should tonight's meeting fail to reach a conclusion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Labour.

**HON. MR. KING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be the height of folly to get into a debate in this House on the sensitive issues involved in the dispute at this time. I have no intention of responding to the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. D.A. Anderson), not through any desire to be objectionable, but rather through my concern of jeopardizing the situation that exists now.

I think it should suffice to say that they are prepared to consider a proposal. I have made that information available to the House. Quite frankly, I hope they settle on it. I think there is some room for optimism, and it would be conjecture — and possibly damaging conjecture — to start dealing in the hypothetical question of whether or not they accept the proposal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. The Hon. Member for Comox.

**MS. K. SANFORD (Comox):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to extend a special welcome this afternoon to Mr. Carl Spiers the president of branch 52 of the old age pensioners of Campbell River, plus 25 members from that group. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver—Point Grey.

**MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver—Point Grey):** Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to draw to the attention of the House this afternoon that we have two classes of grade 10 students from the Convent of the Sacred Heart in Vancouver in company with Sister Connelly. Their motto, Mr. Speaker, is "Dare to be true," and I've a particularly warm spot in my heart for these students because my wife was a former student of the school. You notice, Mr. Speaker and Hon. Members, I did not use the term "old girl." (Laughter). Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for Columbia River.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also welcome to the Speaker's gallery this afternoon Mr. Ernie LeCours, a man who sat in this House from 1963 until 1972, a man who fought very hard for the little men and little women of the Province of British Columbia. (Laughter). I'd like the Members to join me in welcoming him to the galleries today.

Introduction of bills.

## AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR FAIR PRACTICES IN THE SALE OF MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL

Mr. McGeer moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 38 intituled *An Act to Provide for Fair Practices in the Sale of Motor Vehicle Fuel*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 38 read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

## CREDIT INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT

Mr. McGeer moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 39 intituled *Credit Information Protection Act*.

Motion approved.

Bill No. 39 read a first time and ordered to be

[ [Page 261](#) ]

placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

Orders of the day.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE *(Continued)*

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for Kootenay.

**HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources):** Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members, this isn't the first time I've spoken in the debate on the Speech from the Throne and I don't think it will be the last time. But it's the first time that I've spoken from this side of the House. I want to welcome all the so-called rookie Members, but I think they're not rookies any more, that have come to the House. I think we've got a very fine group of Members in the House. And according to the way the Opposition has been carrying on the last few days, we've got a very active Opposition. I'm not limiting that to the official Opposition. I'm saying that for the whole Opposition.

With the number of bills that have been tabled in the House here the last few days, I hope that they fare better than the bills that we used to table when we were on that side of the House. I'm not making any promises, but after 20 years you will probably weaken if we carry on the same policy as the previous Government did. You will probably weaken in placing those bills on the order paper and almost throw up your hands.

I'd like to say to the new Members that this is a very exclusive club and that many come and many go. I hope that many of you are here for a long time. One thing I'd like to say to you as a senior Member here is that you might get into some very bitter arguments in this House. But when you go out of the door to this chamber, forget about the bitterness and treat everybody as a friend.

We had an election last August 30. Prior to that election there was an election three years before. I had rather a squeak-in, they said. I used to listen to taunts and catcalls across the chamber about ballpoint pens. I'd like to advise the official Opposition now that they really worked the last time, because there was no question about arguing about the results. I was very amused the other day when we had a motion on the order paper stating that we would have evening sittings until 11 o'clock, and the official Opposition cried bitter tears about not limiting it completely to 11 o'clock and leaving it up to the unanimous opinion of the House if we continue. If brought my mind back to what happened last year when, time and time again when that motion was brought before the House, I even wanted to place just "11 o'clock" in there. The now official Opposition voted to a man and a woman against stopping at 11 o'clock.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** That's when we had a one-man Government.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** I don't forget the time at 3:30 in the morning in this House when they booted me out. The Hon. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot), the most gallant individual the other day in trying to protect the rest of the Members from late-night sittings, was one of those that was the most vicious...

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member...

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** Well, I won't say "vicious" but he was very...

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** He just looks it. (Laughter).

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** He was inconsiderate with his taunts because he called me a Communist and a Bolshevik and everything else because I wanted to quit at 3:30 in the morning. Then they booted me out of the House and he didn't get up at any time to protect me. I say to you, Mr. Member for Columbia River, that if the same situation ever happens to you, I'll get up and protect you. And any other Member of this House, if ever we're foolish enough to go to that kind of a time. That was the day that your Government started on the slide, and they slid right down into August 30 and out from this side of the House over there.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Right out the door.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** They're starting already.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** I'd like to thank the people of my area. They are a very intelligent group of people. They weathered the storm of Social Credit — the whole reign of Social Credit — and elected and re-elected me through that whole time.

This is the first time that the people of British Columbia have had an opportunity to have a government in power that really speaks on behalf of the people. In all history, governments in the past have been dedicated to the vested interests in the province. They were the real governors of the province. This is the first time that the people of British Columbia have a government that's going to look from the standpoint of people rather than of the vested interests.

It's easy for somebody like myself or any of the other cabinet Ministers. Getting into the House, we

[ [Page 262](#) ]

get into the position of a cabinet Minister. It's quite easy, when you get into the ivory tower, to forget where you came from — to forget your people back home. Maybe that's what happened to some of the Ministers in the previous Government. But I don't intend that that should happen in my case.

First, I'd like to say that we have got some unfinished business that I'm going to speak on from my area. You know, being a cabinet Minister, we don't even see each other as cabinet Ministers as often as we used to when we were sitting in the Opposition.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** We're sitting in our office busy with our works and sometimes you lack the real communication. And here, in the House...

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** You proved that already.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** Here in the House, I realize that I can speak to cabinet Ministers and I've got them where you can communicate with them without having them able to say anything back to me until I get through.

One of the questions that was left over by the previous government, and I think it was one of the shambles that this government created, originated out of the Columbia River Treaty.

I was rather amazed when I listened to the Hon. First Member for Point Grey (Mr. McGeer), when he spoke about the Columbia River Treaty and what a fiasco it was. I remember the day that I stood on that side of the House and warned the then Government what was going to happen in regards to the Columbia River Treaty. The Liberals were dancing from one foot to the other in regards to the Columbia River Treaty at that time because they didn't want to look as though they were going to take a stand against the federal government. But today, I am very pleased that the Hon. First Member for Point Grey has come to the conclusion and has exonerated the Members who were in the Opposition at that time who were called by the then Government obstructionists and stating that they didn't know what they were talking about.

I asked at that time for a clause, an escalating clause, to be placed in the treaty which would have looked after

the increasing costs as they went along, and the increasing values of the electricity. They turned me down flat. The Hon. Premier at that time (Hon. Mr. Bennett), said, "we didn't need it." Now, we know that we needed it. Now we're going to go turning back the clock and do that job.

Because of this bad agreement we had the Libby situation. And in 1951 I believe it was, or 1950, a Senator came up from the States and talked to the farmers up in our area — and told them at that time what a grand deal they were going to make in regards to buying out the farmers. I forget the name of the Senator, but...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** No, I don't think it was. But anyway, this was given to the people that there was going to be no limits to the deals. But after the treaty was signed then we found out that the Provincial Government had to foot the bill through the Columbia River Treaty, to clear the pondage area, on the Canadian side. According to the treaty, Mr. Speaker, we're the ones who had to do it.

Because they made such a bad deal they had to shaft the farmers in many ways in that area. They had to cut them down and pare them down, give them as little as they possibly could.

They not only did that, they divided the problem to buy out those farmers — divided it up between three or four different departments. If they had given it to one agency to handle the whole job we wouldn't have the mess that we're in today. Undoubtedly there are a lot of farmers that have been settled with. But there is a number left. And because of the bad dealings that have been made, and the promises that are claimed to have been made — one department makes a deal to buy the farm then the other department has to make a deal whether they can hold their grazing permits, and the other department has to make a deal whether they can get land in place of what they are taking away from them.

These are the problems that we've got today. And you don't know who is who. To go back and correct all those mistakes — it's impossible. It's impossible to go back and solve all the problems that this previous government caused in that area. We're working on it now. But let me tell you if we'd have been the Government at that time, there'd have been a different story. And we wouldn't have been afraid to pay those people who were deprived of their home sites, where they have lived for years. If you'd have paid them a little extra money it would have been far better than to try and cut them down to the very, very minimum.

In that area you've got two factions. You took 6,000 acres of land out of the winter range for the game. And nothing was provided for the game, because the game couldn't come back and argue with you — with the previous Government. So there was nothing provided for them at all. Now we've got the problem that the people are taken off the land, and the game is without winter range. It's just a mish-mash created by the previous Government. But I'm sure the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), has things pretty well in hand right now and we're going to solve those problems.

Natal is another area where this Government created a problem.

[ [Page 263](#) ]

That question hasn't been settled yet. In 1964 they told those people that it wasn't going to cost them a cent to be moved. Finally they got a lot of them moved through one way or another. And for four years those people have been under the threat of eviction by the previous government. Eviction after eviction, they never carried them through. But nevertheless how would you people like to live under those type of conditions? I think that the previous government should have been ashamed of themselves the way they treated those people. Today, there's no danger of those people being evicted, and we hope to go in there following this session and settle the thing once and for all.

I'd like to say in regard to Fort Steele that it was very successful last year. They had a show in there and it was well thought of and well attended. And I hope that that show continues. In addition to that — I'm sorry the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) isn't here today — I'd like to suggest to him that we have a place in Fort Steele where a person, after they walk around in the heat, can have a nice cool glass of beer. And it should be either

by way of a beer garden, or some place where they can drink a glass of beer — because there's nothing nicer when there are tourists around to be able to have that.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** That's right. A replica of an old-style pub — make it historical, just like the place is — that's the way it should be.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** How are the horses back there?

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** The horses are fine and they're looking very good.

I'd like to say to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) — he's doing a good job in regards to parks. We've got a lot more parkland today than we had this time last year. I know that.

Automobile insurance is another question that many people will be talking about before the end of this session. Some of them will be crying about it, and others will be pleased. But the way the automobile insurance people are active in this province I don't think that anyone in this House representing the people will shed any tears for them.

When you look at a letter such as this — I've got a letter here from Ta Ta Creek — in regards to the writer's son Fred, 17 years old, no accidents and a 1968 Mercury half ton truck. It's in the father's name, valued at \$1,600 — and for six months insurance had had to pay \$340. The next year it had gone up to a total for the year of \$707; without any accidents. I think that is bad, when they try and punish the young people — to charge an insurance half the price of the truck for him to go back and forth to work once a week.

I've got an interesting clipping here. It states — this is from the *Nelson News*.

"This is an interesting situation for me because I bought a 1966 Lincoln Continental in Nelson, B.C. and had it insured in British Columbia for \$1,000 deductible. And speed restrictions are 40 miles per hour, due to being a paraplegic, and only the minimum public liability as required by all the provinces. This cost me \$285, and I had to pay for my license plates besides this. I moved to Saskatchewan where they do not discriminate against paraplegics. No speed restrictions, \$50 deductible, \$200,000 public liability, and all accident benefits. And my license plates. And all this cost me was \$127. I've had the occasion to have two claims adjusted in Saskatchewan."

Now this is the difference between public auto insurance and private insurance. I don't think — as I say — anybody will be crying for the insurance people when the automobile insurance bill comes in.

I'm rather amused at the insurance people, that they should be crying at all. Because whenever you talk to them they always tell you that there's no money in automobile insurance.

**MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey):** What about the agents and adjusters that lose?

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** Another question that I am going to touch on, and I'd like to throw it out to the rest of you....

**AN HON. MEMBER:** How about a lawyer?

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** I couldn't stand in this House without saying a few words in regard to Workmen's Compensation.

I know the Hon. Minister is thinking heavily about changes in the Workmen's Compensation, but I've been here over 20 years. I've covered compensation many times.

**MR. D.M. BROUSSON (North Vancouver–Capilano):** That's right!



**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** There's one problem that I'm going to deal with today, and that is the problem of widows, whose husbands have been totally disabled over the years and they've died. I've got a number of those widows who, because their husbands died of something else besides the accident, receive no compensation.

I'd like to say that I came upon this just the other night in thinking it over. Now I'm not a lawyer. I've

[ [Page 264](#) ]

taken it up with some lawyers and there are lawyers over there that might think about the interpretation that I am placing on the Workmen's Compensation Act at this time, in this regard. I used to attack the morality of it — a person who had silicosis for 20 or 25 years, and just because he died from a heart attack, or cancer of the heart, or cancer of the lungs, the family wasn't entitled to any compensation. I've attacked it from the moral point. Now I am going to attack it from the legal point, and I hope the Members on this side of the House as well as over there will take this in.

The Workmen's Compensation Act states that if a person is injured fatally in an industrial accident, industry through the Workmen's Compensation Board is responsible for his dependants by providing a pension for his widow for life, or until she remarries, and an allowance for each child until a certain age. The responsibility of the family in this case is in lieu of depriving them of their breadwinner, and is a recognition that the family is a unit. When a person is totally disabled, due to an industrial accident or industrial disease, industry through the Workmen's Compensation Board accepts responsibility for him and his family by a pension based on his past earnings. This pension is paid in lieu of depriving him of the ability to provide for himself and his family.

According to the present interpretation of the Act, this responsibility continues after death, only if death results from the injury or the disease. But if death results from some other cause, this responsibility to the family ceases.

I maintain that this interpretation is legally in error, and the liability to the family should continue to the same extent that it would have had the breadwinner died from the result of the accident. The compensation was given for the loss of his ability to provide for himself and his family, and whether death occurred at the time of total disability or later had no different bearing on the needs of the family, than if he had died at the time of the injuries.

Just because the person dies from some other ailment does not relieve the Board of responsibility to the family, because as far as his ability as a breadwinner goes, this had been substituted by the board at the time that he became totally disabled. His death was only incidental. Therefore I maintain that the interpretation of the Workmen's Compensation Act be changed to read that "where an injury or industrial disease results in total disability, and death results at a later date from any cause those sections of the Act dealing with dependants shall apply." This is what I want. I've given this out to find out your opinions, and I'd like the opinions of the lawyers on that side as well as the opinions of any lawyers on this side, because this is the first time that I really came up with this. I've talked to some lawyers who never looked at it in this fashion. I hope that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) when he's considering it might get some input from around the House. Dependants of these people that are totally disabled — just because the disabled dies from something else, they throw them out onto the lawn and they've got to go to Social Welfare right away. And I don't think it's right.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** I'd interpret the Act right now that it should be done.

Now I'll come to my own department. Mr. Speaker, I listened to somebody a little while ago, as Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources, and somebody criticized me and said, "Why there is a Minister that doesn't defend the industry." I'd like to say to the official Opposition and to the Liberals that I wasn't elected by the mining industry. I was elected by the people of British Columbia, a Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources on behalf of the people, and I don't intend to be a servant to the industry.

My role, I think, as Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources is to administer the resource in a businesslike



way. I've got to deal with this resource and see when I'm dealing with the resource and with the mining industry that the people of British Columbia are thought of all the time.

Mineral resources are quite similar to other resources. We know full well that wildlife resource has to be managed. And the forest resource. As far back as 1939, I remember Chief Justice Sloan when he had his first — I think it was he — had his first Royal Commission. He stated at that time that if they continued to ravage the forests as they were doing, we wouldn't have any forests for very long. We set about to manage those forests. We recognized this fact.

The land is another great resource that we've been very lax about for years now, back as far as 1950. I remember that after the flood in 1948, I advocated that there shouldn't be any subdivisions any more on the flood plains that were flooded at that time, because the people of British Columbia had to bail them out.

Nothing was done. I listened year after year about people crying about a gradual whittling away of our agricultural land in the Province of British Columbia, and how we were going to pay for it in later years. I've heard Members of the previous Government and I've heard our Members. At some stage somebody has got to take the bull by the horns and do something. And just because this Government had the courage to take the bull by the horns and do something, now they are under a lot of criticism from those very people that were advocating that something should be done, and never had the courage to do it.

[ [Page 265](#) ]

Sure, somebody gets hurt in these deals. Nobody cries about the miner that built a \$40,000 home at Bluebell or Riondel when the mine closed down and he had to leave it empty, and he lost practically all his life savings there. Nobody cries about him, and this is done because of interests. On behalf of the future of the people in British Columbia, as to actions that are taken in regards to land, something had to be done and I'm very pleased that the Government had the courage to take action at this time.

Then there are water resources. In the same way, we thought for years that we could dump all the refuse into our waterways and there were no limits, that the waterways could absorb them. Now we get worried about the waterways because we find out that they can't absorb it all, and they've got to be managed. We've got to have pollution control, ecological control.

Our mineral resources are one resource that's not replenishable. Once they're gone, they're gone forever. But you wrap up all these resources and what have you got? You've got beautiful British Columbia. Beautiful British Columbia and that's the reason that each and every one of those resources has got to be managed. I find that the resource in regards to mining has been, to a great extent, managed by the private sector. Not by the Department of Mines. The Department of Mines has been a servant to the private sector, and the information that they got was mostly from the private sector.

As Minister of Mines, I hope that we will be able to develop the department in such a way that we will manage the resource and we will tell the private sector whether or not we're satisfied that the way they're depleting this resource is in the best interests of the people or not.

There is an inventory now being taken of minerals in the province. It's an ongoing inventory and we hope to have it up to date in the not too distant future. It's been started, but I intend to speed it up so that we'll get it finished.

Right now you can't get the information that you should be getting — we need a better recording system of the work done on claims. Everybody that does any work on claims should have to record it with the department, so that when somebody stakes a claim and wants to know what has been done on that claim over the past years, they can get that information right away.

We hope to put better geologist service throughout the province. I hope to have resident geologists in different areas in the province to assist the inspectors in their work and to give better service to the industry.

We're going to have a better inspection service — and this is where some of these jobs that you're talking about are coming in that were in the Speech from the Throne. Safety will be one of the big factors in the mining industry.

I will say that safety has been practised, but I think sometimes we have been a little bit reluctant to recognize the role that the miner plays in the Province of British Columbia. A miner has got to go down in that mine and take his life in his hands, and I don't think he's been given the recognition that he deserves. It is my intention to see that he has that recognition and that he takes full part in safety regulations — to see that they're carried out. Because there's nobody more interested in the safety regulations than the miners themselves.

Employment is another area. Years ago it took so much ore to give a man a job. You had to deplete so much of the resource. Today we've got to deplete a lot more to give one man a job. And we've got to come to the point eventually where we're going to process and fabricate some of this resource in our own province.

In bringing about the changes in the department, I haven't done it on my own. I called the industry in and I've had discussions with industry and discussions with the miners in the province, to discuss with them the problems that they've got. I've advised the mining industry that we need to process these minerals and I'm rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the mining industry has failed so far to really come up with a plan.

I think this is probably due to the fact that there are innovations on the horizon in smelting such as copper. They're working on a hydro metallurgical scheme which would be more or less pollution free. I think that this is one of the areas where they've been probably a little slow to act. But it is my hope that it will not be long before we will have a smelter in the Province of British Columbia.

We as a government are willing to participate in such a processing plant. Not on the basis of donating the taxpayers' money and having no equity, but we will participate on the basis of being a partner in the processing of these minerals.

There are other changes — and don't forget you've got obstacles too in making some changes. I am sure that this has been noted before.

You know, the legal fraternity back very many years ago did the job very well for the vested interests. The vested interests got the wealth and then the legal fraternity of that day built up laws around the holding of that wealth so that nobody else could get at it. And whenever you suggest making a change for the benefit of the people today, somebody dusts off an old book in a law library and they come up with a decision that some judge made 100 years ago, and they say, "No, you can't do that. That's unconstitutional."

I think that this is one of the stumbling blocks to handling these resources. I'm not criticizing the people of the earlier days completely, because there

[ [Page 266](#) ]

was so much area, so few people, that nobody ever thought at that time that we needed to be particular about the depletion of the resource. We thought there was no limit to it — exactly as they thought about the forests when they first moved across this country.

I think that those obstacles will be overcome.

Now, I'd like to tell you more, but I'm sure if I went on too much further that the Hon. Speaker would call me to order and say, "You're anticipating legislation." And I wouldn't want the Speaker to have to call me to order. I've never had that done before to me and I don't hope to have it done now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order. (Laughter).

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** But, Mr. Speaker, in due time, when you can't accuse me of anticipating legislation,

I will tell the Members of the House the balance. For now, thank you.

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

**MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a great pleasure for me to rise on this occasion to participate in this debate on the throne speech, and to stand in this House as a representative of the beautiful City of Victoria.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your present position. And I would like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion that is now under debate — the Hon. Member for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson) and the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown), both of whom made excellent addresses before the assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items on which I'd like to comment. First, let me express, as others have before me, my disappointment in the flimsiness of the Speech from the Throne — and I'm not talking about the shortage of words here but rather the thinness of meaningful legislation.

I am surprised at the lack of leadership shown in the throne speech. Because I really did expect more from a political party known in the past for its vociferous criticism of government policy. I suppose it's just the difference between being a critic and being a doer that shows through.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been informed in no uncertain terms — not so much in the throne speech but before and after at the Press conferences, a method of communication our shy and retiring Premier appears to prefer — that British Columbia, in the not too distant future, will have government sponsored automobile insurance.

Let me state quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being accused of being under the influence of eastern money manipulators, that I'm strongly opposed to the creation in British Columbia of any business monopoly. I would take that stand whether the monopoly was created by government or whether the situation was created in the world of private enterprise.

For a number of years I held an insurance agent's licence to sell automobile insurance. I was in the automobile business for 20 years, and I think I experienced most of the problems facing us today — both as an agent, as the owner of my own car and as a large fleet owner. I believe I gained sufficient knowledge to view the problem from both sides.

During the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the New Democratic Party now forming the Government of this province, promised the people government auto insurance. They also promised, on many occasions, that the cost of such insurance would be 25 per cent less than automobile owners are paying today.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** \$25 a year.

**MR. MORRISON:** If the government can fulfill that promise and provide all the coverage today's driver requires, then I wish them well. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Government can do that if it assumes a total monopoly position.

I believe very strongly in the free enterprise system, and I believe that every car driver in this province has the right to shop for his insurance, to demand what type of insurance he wants and to obtain the lowest rates possible.

I believe that this Legislature should lay down very positive guidelines on automobile insurance. I do not believe that the Government should enter the field of supplying the product.

The Government has taken the position that it has a mandate from the people to supply auto insurance. I do not subscribe to that belief. But if the Government has any mandate at all, then that mandate is to protect the people of this province from the very position the Government now advocates — the position which sees all automobile

owners forced into a no-choice situation. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that such an attitude reflects the best principles of democracy.

Noting the vast difference between what is now being proposed and what was proposed from the hustings last year, I can only remind the Government to recall the full-page newspaper advertisements run last August...

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways):** How do you know what we propose?

**MR. MORRISON:** ...and to urge them to modify their present stand to conform with their election platform.

[ [Page 267](#) ]

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, order.

**MR. MORRISON:** If we must have government auto insurance — and unfortunately, I suppose, we must because on a vote in this House we know that your backbenchers, although discontented in some ways, will toe the party lines — then I submit that the following requirements must be met.

Number one, no part of the promotional advertising costs, administration and operating costs or claim liabilities charged against the government car insurance plan will be charged to consolidated revenue of the province, but shall come solely from the premiums paid by policy holders.

Two, no part of the promotional advertising costs, administration and operating costs or claim liabilities charged against the government car insurance plan will be supported by revenues derived specifically from motor fuel taxes, vehicle licence fees or driver's licence fees.

Three, no part of the promotional advertising costs, administration and operating costs or claim liabilities charged against the government car insurance plan will be derived through borrowing accounts in the name of the government car insurance plan or of the province.

Four, compulsory government insurance requiring premiums for general insurance coverage carried by (a) school boards (b) hospital boards (c) university boards (d) Crown corporations and (e) community college councils shall not be used to offset any of the above-mentioned costs for the operation of the car insurance plan itself.

Number five, the accounts of the car insurance plan shall be presented to the Legislature annually and shall be subject to the scrutiny of the select standing committee of this House on public accounts and printing.

**HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works):** Open government.

**MR. MORRISON:** The job of Government with respect to automobile insurance is surely to regulate, not to eliminate, the private enterprise automobile insurance industry. If the Government were to enter the automobile insurance field and eject the private enterprise industry, it would find itself regulating and policing its own operations and their effect on the consuming public.

If Government is itself providing the sole source of automobile insurance, the legitimate question arises as to whether or not this would hamper its role as protector of the public. Even if Government should choose to create an automobile insurance operation in competition with private enterprise, the temptations of Government as an automobile insurer and as the source of the capital and other expenditure necessary to meet public demands in this respect, might well run counter to its role of champion of the public, i.e. the consumer.

In short, in this view the public is best served by a Government which provides a private automobile insurance industry without conflict of interest — which would undoubtedly arise. Government is the instrument of the people but, while it must measure the desires of the people, it should not over-react to the desires of a vocal minority. The industry may propose but it's up to the Government to dispose. It is again surely not in the public interest that the entity with the power to dispose should also be the one providing the service with respect to which the public has, or thinks it has, cause for complaint.

The consequences of a Government take-over on the job market are self-evident. Company personnel and personnel involved in the agency and adjusting fields will find that the careers in which they have invested a lifetime have been disrupted and many will be exposed to serious financial loss.

Mr. Speaker, when I said at the outset that the throne speech was thin, I was not being facetious. I think most Members of this House will agree that the fact that the throne speech made no reference at all to the possibility of late-night or all-night ferries, which was a matter of great concern to all Vancouver Island and lower mainland candidates during the election campaign, is most regrettable. We have since heard from the Minister of Highways that, while the idea of a late-night ferry might be good, we cannot find the crews to man them.

While the absence of any reference in the throne speech to this vital communications link between the capital city and the rest of the province is amazing, the excuse put forward by the Minister is incredible. But then, maybe he's been too busy checking out new jet aircraft during the past few weeks to fully realize that there are still many bright, intelligent men and women in this province who are still out of work and who could be trained.

Although the Social Credit commitment to Vancouver Island during the August election campaign was all-night ferries, Mr. Speaker, we did not expect that this new socialist administration would be able to implement the programme overnight. Neither did we expect existing crews to work around the clock just to make it easier for people to travel between here and the mainland. But surely, Mr. Speaker, when British Columbia's unemployment figure stands, a little while ago, at 8.3 and apparently today now at 9.9 ...

**MR. CHABOT:** 9.9!

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. MORRISON:** ...surely there are men and

[ [Page 268](#) ]

women available and this Government could come up with an on-the-job training proposal in order that the ferries we now have could be used for longer periods of the day.

Speaking of highways, and I consider the ferry service to be part of the highway system, Mr. Speaker, we have an intolerable situation in the state of the highway from the city of Victoria to Sooke, where the road is far worse than the old Cowichan Lake road ever was.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. MORRISON:** He got the point.

**MR. CHABOT:** You'd better believe it.

**MR. MORRISON:** But I'm most pessimistic, Mr. Speaker, for the throne speech was completely silent on any highway proposals. I can only assume that the reason for that is because this Government and the Minister have no programmes worthy of note.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this honourable House have been forced to debate the throne speech not on the basis of what was in the speech, but what was missing from it. There was, as you are aware, no reference at all to the critical matter of public rapid transit systems. Certainly that matter has been talked about outside this House, but so far theoretically. I would like, before this session is over, to hear just what the Government has planned for the already jammed urban areas of this province. I'm referring specifically to the greater Victoria and greater Vancouver areas. Surely the Government now sitting in power can come through with a better solution than ordering more buses without tender.

Both these cities, Victoria and Vancouver, have been wrestling with traffic problems for many years. I think it is time the senior Government showed some leadership in this matter, just as I think it's time that this Government

showed some leadership in attempting to solve what has become known as the Blanshard Street Extension Folly. I'm not interested, Mr. Speaker, in how that problem came to be created. What's done is done. I am interested in hearing what this Government can come up with by way of a solution.

The extension of Blanshard Street would help relieve rush-hour traffic in the city. But it would not provide all the relief required. It may be said that the traffic problem belongs to the city of Victoria and that its city council must find a solution. But I don't buy that philosophy.

One of the greatest traffic problems in this city is created by this Legislature and the army of workers we need to administer the policies we establish. Mr. Speaker, has this Government ever explored the possibilities of parking depots away from the legislative precinct — places where workers could park their cars and be transported to and from their place or work by shuttle buses? It may not be the complete solution but it would again provide a measure of relief.

I have one other suggestion, Mr. Speaker, which, if implemented, could provide yet another relief valve for the congested traffic.

Years ago, the city of Victoria suggested that an extension of Belleville Street, which runs right in front of these buildings, through the grounds of St. Anne's Academy and onto the Fairfield area, would provide an outlet for James Bay traffic and thus break the bottleneck now existing on Government and Douglas Streets during rush-hours. That scheme was halted — and I think unwisely — when a rather bitter hospital debate flared up. Maybe the Minister would contact the City of Victoria officials to see if their original scheme is still desirable and workable.

And before I leave automobiles and roads and parking, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask, as others have before me, if we can't do something about the clutter of cars parked in the driveway of this historic and beautiful building. It seems to me that this should be a minor problem. The driveways of the Legislature surely deserve a better fate than that of a parking lot.

About the only favourable thing I can say about the continuing eyesore — and I am sure many other Members have noticed this — is the really remarkable upgrading of the quality of the automobiles now parked in the driveways as compared to the quality of the cars parked there during the emergency session last year. As a former automobile dealer, I can only express delight that socialism, with its new found wealth and power, has benefited free enterprise to such an extent. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, of all the major omissions in the throne speech, surely the greatest was the lack of any reference at all to the most serious conundrum of inflation. I did not expect — and neither would any reasonable man — this Government to come up with an instant solution. But I did expect — and I believe with justification — that it would at least make some suggestions as to how we could start to combat inflation.

I fully appreciate that with its close ties with labour, the Government would not be intemperate enough to propose wage and price controls. But I really think they could have come up with at least one proposal. Instead, in the throne speech we had a complete silence on this most pressing matter.

I would remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that a high percentage of the population in my constituency are well over the age of 65. They not only helped to build this great province but also, prudent as they were, planned their retirements on what were then comfortable incomes. But the comfortable income of

[ [Page 269](#) ]

10, 15 and 20 years ago is a mere pittance now. As a result, many of our pioneers whom we praise from time to time during celebrations for their courage and leadership, now find themselves in very serious circumstances financially.

It is with regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have to say that unless this Government changes its ways, that problem of inflation can only grow worse.



The previous administration to the one now sitting in power had one principle it stood for firmly throughout its many years in office: it believed in and adhered to the principle of paying as you go.

When I was a young man I was taught to endeavour at all times to spend less than I earned and to avoid the situation which saw me spending more than I earned. Because the latter way is the way to frustration and a treadmill existence.

When this Government took office, because of the prudent exercise of power by the former Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Bennett) it inherited a healthy surplus in the provincial treasury. That surplus isn't as great today as it was and I'm fearful that as the months go by it will be even further depleted until it no longer exists.

This Government has, I feel, already committed itself to a policy of deficit financing. Before very long we shall, as the legislators of this province, be in a position where we are taxing more and more instead of spending less than we earn. Not only will that be tragic for those of us alive today, but it will be a continuing tragedy for those who come after us.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have any right at all to make plans which in the final analysis see us passing over the financial responsibility for those plans to generations yet unborn, I do not want to settle my children with my debts, nor my immediate family, nor this House. The responsibility to leave this province in good shape for those who follow us belongs to us today. The goal for social democracy — admirable though it may sound on paper or in speeches — really comes down to a scientific feeding of the people. We are encouraged to view the ultimate goal of socialism as a state in which all men live at peace, we are well fed, well clothed, well housed and well cared for by a "Big Brother," who in his all-embracing way, removes from our lives every challenge and every care.

Such a state we are told will leave all men free to pursue their own artistic or creative ambitions. Comfort and security without challenge — these are targets that do not appeal to me. They are targets and principles which convince me more than ever that social democracy, with its strong yearning for boring complacency, will never be able to generate, motivate or drive towards a better and more vibrant life.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the municipalities of any province are the "children" of the provincial government. If that is so, and the municipal governments are our "children," why do we treat them so badly? Confined as they are to raising revenues from land and improvements, only the municipalities must of necessity turn to their parent body for assistance to meet the pressing problems of the urban crisis.

This government must not fall into the trap other governments — not only here but across the country — have fallen into. It must find ways and means of providing the municipalities with finances, in order that they can provide their citizens with the basic requirements of a modern society.

It is true that each year this provincial government hands out to the villages, towns and cities per capita grants. That isn't enough, Mr. Speaker. We must, as responsible legislators, find a way of getting more money to grassroot governments, in order that they can build sewage treatment plants, purchase land for parks, build hospitals and schools and improve their immediate surroundings.

We can no longer expect every municipality to continue that unacceptable role of the enforcer when it comes to annual budget time. Property taxes are high enough unless we eventually want to compel all of our people to live in state-owned housing.

I appreciate the fact that this is more than a British Columbia issue. But I admit, Mr. Speaker, that we can at least make a start here and loosen the purse strings to enable the people we represent to at least meet the issues of the day.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I must say it was a matter of regret that no mention was made in the throne speech of the serious problems facing every property owner in British Columbia.

This second session of the 30th Parliament of British Columbia is still young. It may well be that I have been



unwisely critical of what will surely go down in history as the "empty throne speech." But it may well be that this Government, playing coy on opening day, really has great things in store for us. I hope so.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some of the \$85 million in profits from liquor this year will be siphoned off — if those are the right words — and used for the benefit of all the people.

I can suggest a few areas within a stone's throw of this chamber where a start could be made. This Government could and should be pressing the City of Victoria to upgrade the entrance to the capital city from the ocean and offering to the city all the expertise it can — plus some of the money needed to prime the pot.

I'm sure that such a move would be welcomed, not only by the people of Victoria, but by the many, many thousands of British Columbians who visit their capital each year.

This old lady is still very beautiful — but not so beautiful that a bit of face lifting here and there

[ [Page 270](#) ]

wouldn't hurt.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on the unfortunate experience our school children have been subjected to in the past three weeks. What an unsatisfactory way for them to learn firsthand of the impossible ways of settling what should really be a minor dispute, Mr. Speaker, I have at this point a number of other items which I wish to discuss concerning the school strike. But in view of the fact that our Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) has made a statement in the House, I'm going to skip them at this point. But I would like to suggest one alternative which, if nothing happens today to settle the strike, might be a suggestion for those parents who are quite concerned — the parents of those 31,000 pupils whose education is at stake. There is another way; it's a last resort. I suggest that tomorrow all those students affected demand their rights to an education and apply for correspondence courses.

Last week I met with some residents from Gabriola Island, Mr. Speaker, These same residents were told last summer by the NDP candidate for Nanaimo that there will never be a bridge to connect Gabriola to Vancouver Island unless 80 per cent of the islanders want it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Oh, oh.

**MR. MORRISON:** Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that "never is a very long time."

Webster's dictionary interprets "never" as being "not in the least; not under any condition; not ever; not at any time; at no time;"

I find the Minister of Highway's (Hon. Mr. Strachan) actions in regard to the total ferry service absolutely appalling. His high-handed announcement of, last week must raise some pretty searching questions in the minds of all those Gulf Islanders, ecologists, environmentalists, all British Columbians who agree that the Social Credit commitment to keep the Gulf Islands as prime recreation land was just good ecological sense.

This high-handed use of power by the Minister of Highways, these decisions without consultation with the communities that ill be affected, is another demonstration of the socialist NDP hypocrisy. On the one hand they tell us that there will be open government. And with their left hand they arbitrarily fly in the face of all the commitments made even by their own Members. Some Government, Mr. Speaker, some open Government.

Mr. Speaker, may I thank you and the Members of this House for your patience and consideration. I have by no means run out of the topics on which to speak. But I shall save those for other times and other days. For I am sure that if the throne speech is any indication, we, the Members in the Opposition, are going to be required to compel this assembly to face the issues the Government appears reluctant to face. Thank you.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Mackenzie.

**MR. D.F. LOCKSTEAD (Mackenzie):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on behalf of the people of the Mackenzie constituency. And it is my privilege to extend to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor our congratulations on his most gracious and encouraging remarks from the Speech from the Throne.

Let me comment first on some of the measures he has asked us to consider. I am particularly pleased to see top priority being given to a provision of a British Columbia bill of rights. In this time when the world is moving from a period of industrialization into super-industrialization, in a time when new ways of living and thinking are being ever more rapidly thrust upon us, the future is often with us before we have had time, Mr. Speaker, to adjust to it. Great pressures are being generated for changes and governments at all levels are reacting with a sense of urgency to provide new laws for an increasingly new future.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has stated that "...administrative and legislative programmes will be carefully designed and will be based on the clear necessity to plan our future so that we may live in harmony with our special environment and at peace with our fellow men, and to depart from the acquisitive North American values that has seen ... waste on all sides."

This is an admirable and bold statement of principle which I support. Clearly, we must legislate to protect our environment and our natural resources to provide for the orderly development of trade and industries; to provide better services to our people. It is imperative, however, that we, in our earnest desires to provide the best possible future for the majority of the people of our province, do not neglect our minorities and do not fail to protect the rights of the individual who finds himself at odds with the system. Even if it is our system.

Therefore, let us make the provision of a British Columbia bill of rights one of our first commitments and with it, let us provide for an ombudsman. Let us consider most carefully the rights of our minority groups whether they be senior citizens and pensioners whose standard of living is constantly threatened by inflation and a developing society; or whether they be the native Indian people whose way of life has been altered most radically and who are therefore most urgently in need of those kinds of assistance which will ensure their full participation in the promising future of this province; or whether they be groups whose problems and requirements have not yet been fully identified and understood.

[ [Page 271](#) ]

In the Speech from the Throne it is stated that we will be asked to consider, among other things, amendments to the *Land Act*, amendments to the *Park Act*, and amendments to the *Constitution Act*; and to reflect new thrusts and priorities of this Government.

These are some of the areas of major concern in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Those who are not familiar with the area known as the Mackenzie constituency might find it difficult to believe how great a potential lies in these hundreds of miles of beautiful rugged coast — much of it still unspoiled by the heavy hand of human development.

This area has a vast potential for recreation which is just beginning to be realized but which will unavoidably become one day one of the top-ranking tourist attractions of the world. Those who are familiar, as most are, with the beauties of the Sunshine Coast need only visualize this area multiplied one hundred fold and reaching for many miles up the fjords among the almost uncountable islands between Vancouver and Bella Coola to realize something of this vast potential. To date, only a tiny fraction of this beautiful heritage is being used by the people of B.C. Many hundreds of foreign speculators are discovering its attractions and these foreign investors, realizing the riches that must some day result in its exploitation, are moving in and have already bought great sections of our coastal property. Now is when we must move swiftly to protect the interests of our citizens and preserve for our children what is rightfully theirs, Mr. Speaker. With all the best intentions in the world, if we are too slow or too timid in our legislation, control of our heritage can slip away.

I would like to suggest that careful studies be made to determine the best use of each front of coastline, each mile of inlet, each island and lake; and that legislation be prepared to guarantee that the best use be made out of the coastal property. Land which is obviously best suited for home habitation should be zoned residentially; and in cases

where prime residential areas are being held by speculators, a tax structure should be developed which would make it uneconomical for long-term speculation or for sleazy development, rip-off schemes.

We must preserve our precious and limited agricultural areas. Potential farmland must not be covered with concrete or given up to urban development.

We must carefully preserve those wild habitats which are essential to the existence of our endangered wild species. Let us now set aside more acres, more hundreds of acres, of wildlife parks in such places as Texada Island and the Bella Coola Valley. If we find that we have overdone it, some of these areas can be released in the future. But we can never get back a species of bird or animal once it has become extinct.

There are not many areas of this beautiful province so favoured by nature as is the Sunshine Coast. In recent years, the communities of Gibson, Sechelt, Pender Harbour and Powell River have experienced enormous growth. I am certain that this growth will continue and accelerate in the future. We must therefore plan and in our planning, we must involve those who are now living and working in these communities.

In the years that I have worked with the people of the Sunshine Coast, it has become clear to me that there are local organizations, city councils, regional boards, ratepayers' associations, community associations that are exceedingly well-informed with regard to their own areas. Their proposals for development of their communities make good sense. We must keep our lines of communication open.

I must congratulate the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) on his plans for improvements to health care and ambulance service. These have been matters of great concern to residents of my constituency. I would like to thank those Ministers, particularly Mr. Strachan, for the effective manner in which they have handled these problems that I have brought to their attention.

However, I look forward to much improvement to the road and ferry service in Mackenzie for the future. Transportation is one of the greatest problems and greatest challenges in an area such as this where land and water intermingle so freely. Yet transportation through the waterways of our coast may some day be one of our most envied assets. Just as in the islands of Greece today, travelers the world over are attracted to the Mediterranean coast — so will B.C. be justly famous.

A long-range plan for the development of coastal transportation must now be formulated. Steps should be taken immediately to upgrade the existing ferry services. Transportation should not be merely a means of getting from one place to another. Transportation on the B.C. coast should be a memorable and rewarding experience.

Ferry terminals where people will necessarily spend considerable periods of time should contain all possible amenities, so that instead of this pause in the day of driving being a nuisance and unpleasant, it could be a time of recreation. Supervised playgrounds, park-like surroundings, good food and even entertainment should replace the dreary surroundings on today's typical ferry landings. The ferries themselves should be as comfortable as possible and should serve good food at a fair price.

With transportation we must face the problem of pollution. Endless streams of oversized, nearly-empty automobiles must be discouraged. Instead, let us encourage the use of public transportation by whatever possible means. Let us encourage those who travel in private cars to carry passengers. Here is an example of what could be done in this respect.

[ [Page 272](#) ]

If a \$2 fare, for instance, were to be charged for car and driver with a 50 or 25 cent reduction for each passenger carried we would have fewer near-empty cars on the roads, or on our ferries.

I believe that we should consider much higher vehicle license fees for cars with big polluting engines. It is time we took a lesson from those areas like Los Angeles and move to restrict air pollution while we can still breathe.

We are moving in B.C. into a form of decentralized government by regional districts. Our party approved the concept of regional boards from the onset, and I believe the concept is a good one. However, I find it disturbing that in some cases citizens are not aware of the growing importance of this form of government, or the extent to which their lives are being increasingly affected by it.

In some cases there have been very little advertising and virtually no campaigning for regional board elections. We must see that people are made more aware of their democratic rights and duties with respect to these elections. It must be mandatory that every election be widely advertised. There should be a government campaign to educate people with respect to regional government.

It should be realized that there is a problem with regard to the balance of power between city people and country people in most regions, and we must guard carefully the rights of the minority groups. The rural man chooses to live in the country because he is not a city man. Decisions made by city man are not necessarily the right decisions for him.

At present there are many cases of conflict between the interests of people who live in a relatively urban area and interests of those living in the adjacent countryside. In most cases cities have their own governments and make their own regulations. But we must guard against the unjust extension of their right to pass regulatory by-laws which determine the way of life or seek to regulate the lives of their rural neighbours.

I would suggest that the opt-in provision, promised originally when regional boards were first being set up, should be restored. Consent of the government should be an important criterion with regulatory by-laws as much as with money by-laws. After all, we must surely consider the human rights to be more important than money.

I have been greatly encouraged to hear the stated views of the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) and I feel certain that she, working with educators and local governments, will be able to do much to upgrade the education system in British Columbia.

I do not attempt to be an expert in the field of education, Mr. Speaker. However, as everyone else does, I would like to take this opportunity to advance some ideas with regard to the upgrading process. I feel, as do many people with whom I have talked, that there is a great deal of waste in the present system of education facilities. At the same time we are faced in many places with a serious problem of overcrowding which results in substandard education situations, and often prevents the setting up of experimental projects.

Obviously schools cost money and a lot of the new schools cost more money than we want to spend. Should we not then be looking very carefully at the possibility of modifying our present prescriptions with regard to the length of the school day, the number of days schools must be in session, and the two months summer recess?

This complex question of changes must be thought out very carefully before being undertaken. Let us not be endlessly or needlessly bound by tradition. I believe we should question whether it is necessarily true that children should come to school for five hours a day and five days a week for ten months of the year. Present regulations prescribe 192 five hour days per year for a total of 960 school hours for each child. Clearly there are alternate possibilities which would provide the same amount of instructional time and would release school buildings for various purposes for a period of each school week.

It is even possible to come up with a schedule which would allow double use of our existing facilities. Why should we not, in some selected districts, try out some of these alternatives? A school district where children attend school for 3 1/2 days a week over a 12 month period, with suitable holiday periods, could I believe provide perfectly adequate education and double the potential use of the school building.

This could mean that building programmes for these areas could be devoted to the provision of alternate facilities such as community and recreation centres, libraries and this type of thing. On the subject of education I would like to see this Government do everything in its power to encourage and assist those young people who are travelling abroad and to encourage schools to institute travel programs for their students. I believe we should consider strongly the establishment of a new kind of B.C. House in countries like Britain — establish establishments

which would assist the travelling young Canadian in a variety of ways.

B.C. House and Canada House in London are fine examples of this type of assistance, but they do not go far enough. There should be B.C.-operated hostels where young people can go for accommodation, advice and help. These hostels could also serve as organization points for school groups travelling abroad. As one who has participated in the supervision of a large group of students travelling across Canada, I feel that this is a type of educational experience which is worth supporting.

[ [Page 273](#) ]

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the Speech from the Throne. It is not a blueprint to be followed slavishly. It is a broad statement of aims, the details to be worked out by us, the Members who are directly responsible to the people of this province.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has directed that we must plan so that we may live in harmony with our special environment. He has not said that we should have provincial recycling depots in every regional district, but I say it. He did not say that we should have auto-body crushers serving the regional districts and assisting to clean up our cluttered environment. He has left it to us to prescribe these specifics. It is up to us to say "no" to the use of defoliants by B.C. Hydro as we have already said "no" to their use in forestry and I commend the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) in this regard.

We are directed by the throne speech to see that appropriate amendments must be made to the *Medical Act* and the *Mental Health Act*. The details are left to us. It is up to us to see that the retarded children schools and training centres should not have to beg from the public to achieve their programmes. It is up to us to see that follow-up programmes for released mental patients are instituted to help with their rehabilitation and to prevent tragedies deriving from undetected deterioration.

One more topic before I close, Mr. Speaker. There are a great many salmon spawning streams in my constituency, and our Government has made a start in preserving some of these streams. However, I feel that we should be considering a provincial department of fisheries.

I think that every other maritime province in Canada has such a department, and for good reason. Several thousand people in British Columbia make their living in the fishing industry and I feel that not only should their interests be preserved, but improved. People in this province, Mr. Speaker, are looking to our Government for leadership and direction and we intend, Mr. Speaker, to provide just that. Thank you.

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

**MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me to be representing the riding of Shuswap in this debate. I would like to take the opportunity of inviting the people of the House and all other MLA's to come to the beautiful area of Shuswap and see for themselves what a wonderful place it is.

I am finding being an MLA in the heart of Sacred country quite a challenge. You know, the former Member for Kamloops had everyone convinced in that area that if the Social Credit Party was defeated the Thompson River would dry up. But I would like to assure everybody here that this is far from the truth — that we have an MLA in the Hon. Member from Kamloops (Mr. G.H. Anderson) there now who will be doing an excellent job, and both planning and seeing that the river is protected. There are also a lot of people in the South Okanagan that were amazed that their fruit still ripened in the fall when their Social Credit Government went down to defeat.

Well, I would like to assure them too that their fruit will still continue to ripen, and the Government will be taking steps to help the farmers realize a realistic price for their products.

Yes, the South Okanagan will continue to prosper, even without their MLA sitting in the House where he should be.

You know, while writing my speech I got to comparing our past Premier and our present one, I'm told that our past Premier was an intelligent, creative man, who was exceptionally sharp with figures. Now, I was never completely convinced of this, but I am completely convinced that our present Premier is an intelligent man, he's creative, and he's sharp with figures.

I have a few worries, because I'm quite convinced he's not plugged into God, and I saw proof of this the other day when I saw him walking through a water puddle. I would like to say that now that we have a Premier and a Government that are down-to-earth and who realize that they must get on with man-made problems, that we are not going to get help from above, we are going to get some progress in this province.

We have a cabinet in this House and there's been lots of rumours that there's been conflict. Well, there's been no conflict as far as I'm concerned.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. LEWIS:** No. I'd like everybody to know that we have a chance in caucus to view our points. And if we all agreed, we'd be a bunch of dunces. I think that it's necessary that we have dialogue in the caucus.

I'd also like the House to know that there are many areas of concern within my riding — and I'd like to point some of these out to our cabinet Ministers. I'm not laying any blame on them, but I'm letting them know that I expect some action in these areas.

The first Minister I'd like to deal with is not in the House at the present time — the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams). His department is of great concern to me due to the fact that we have one of the most beautiful lakes in the province — a lake that I want to see retained.

I'm asking the Minister to take a very constructive look at retaining the balance of the Crown land around that lake and creating parks and picnic areas

[ [Page 274](#) ]

that all people in B.C. can use.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** What is that — Maples?

**MR. LEWIS:** No, Shuswap.

I would also like to bring to the Minister's attention a problem that we have with the flooding of a river in my riding. It's called Ross Creek, and in the winter time it lives up to its name. But when summer time comes this creek becomes a raging torrent. It paralyzes the community often and many people spend sleepless nights.

There have been many, many attempts in the past to get this problem solved, with representation made to one department — that department says, "Take it to the Water Rights." Water Rights says, "Take it to Highways," and the list goes on and on.

Last summer during the flood, while the bulldozer operator was fighting the flood situation, he was drowned. I say this is a terrible price to pay due to bureaucracy. And I'm asking the Minister to take a look at this situation and see that it is corrected this year.

I would also like to deal with other areas. We have problems with our friends Crown Zellerbach in my riding. I know that they're a reliable and a good company, but I think that some of the methods that they've been using to make a profit aren't to the liking of myself and my constituents.

They shut down sawmills in the Monty Lake, in the Falkland and the Enderby areas, regardless of what it did to the communities that the sawmills ran. I am asking the Minister to take a really good look at the cutting rights of this company.



I for one feel that as the resources are within my riding some of the processing also should be within that riding.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring the House up to date with the proposed diversion of the waters from the Shuswap Lake into the Okanagan water system. I for one for the last five years have fought this, and I'll continue to fight it regardless if I'm fighting against my own Government or not. I absolutely refuse to go along with this aspect; I think it will be disastrous to Shuswap Lake.

At this time I would like to turn my attentions to the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly). I'd like to point out that I'm most pleased to see that we have a lady cabinet Minister in this Government and I for one am proud. And she didn't get there through the women's liberation movement, either. She got there with her qualifications.

I say for one that women in most cases have every right to proceed along with everybody else in this society. If legislation is passed that they are treated equally as far as wages and other conditions like this are concerned, I for one would have to oppose a Ministry for women. If we have a Ministry for women then we must also move on to a Ministry for men.

In regard to the Minister of Education, I would like to bring to her attention the Okanagan College situation, and I would like to familiarize the House with the troubles that have plagued this college since its inception.

This college was brought in with what I would call an underhanded method with a vote that deceived the people in regard to how it was going to be paid for. It got a conflict going in the Okanagan that's still rife.

Penticton refused to go along with this at all. Salmon Arm, Revelstoke and Vernon said that they would go along with the college concept as long as it was removed to a community college concept with divisions in each community.

In my opinion this has worked well and the people in my riding are most happy with it. But I'm asking the Minister of Education to take a really close look at this situation to see that community colleges are retained in my riding.

I know that it's a whole can of worms and it's something that's going to be rather clouded when we get digging into the situation.

The college council in the last few months has taken the stand that they're going to phase out these local facilities and centralize them in Kelowna. Well, Hon. Minister, I for one am opposed to this. I have found from living in the Okanagan that throughout the past years everything has been centralized in the Kelowna area. And with this new Government I'm hoping that there's going to be a new attitude.

I have a few points that I would like to direct at the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan), and it's unfortunate that he's not in attendance at this time because I would have liked him to have heard them.

I for one am not too happy with the structure of the Department of Highways. I'm very concerned that it's set up in a bureaucratic manner that is often to the detriment of the people who reside in my constituency.

There have been many actions that have been taken in the past by the Department of Highways that verge very close to blackmail. Government rights-of-way are gazetted and set aside as the government right-of-way for years, and when somebody wants to build along that right-of-way — such as a case I had happen in my own riding where two young fellows bought seven acres of land and wanted to split it in half and then had the road built in there by the Department of Highways — the Department of Highways tells them, "Before we'll give you a deed to that property you must slash all the brush off the right-of-way and build the roadbed up to the standard for gravel."

These young men proceeded and built the road up



to their standards. And when they went back in, they said, "Oh, we didn't understand it was going to be a subdivision. You split that property in half and now you're in a position where you must gravel that road, too."

I say this is blackmail. We've got a Department of Highways, and they had better live up to their responsibilities. If they want to be a bunch of office boys in Victoria, that's fine. Let them classify themselves as that.

I'm very disturbed about the reduction in the number of employees in the Highways department in my riding that's taken place February 1. We had a reduction of eight employees, and this was a staff that was already depleted to the state that it could hardly function. It's very disturbing for me as the MLA who stood up and said that we're going to upgrade the systems within my riding — to find that we're going the other way and that the highways department hasn't even got enough crew to snow plow the roads.

I would now like to move on to the Department of Agriculture and the controversy that has been building up around the land freeze that's put on at the present time. I would like to say that I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) for having the foresight and the intestinal fortitude to take this problem on.

I would also like to say that I don't agree with the manner in which it was done. I never have been in favour of orders by order-in-council — not on a major decision like this. Something that is ordinary, everyday work that has to go through, I certainly would support it. But not an order-in-council on something that the people of the province should have a say in.

I agree that farmland has to be retained and I think that we would all have to hang our heads in shame if we didn't take some steps to see that it was done. I'll be doing everything I can to see that this legislation is brought into the House in a fair manner. And I promise that I will do everything I can to work without using the farmer as a political football.

I think the farmer is

In one instance that I remember the research director in the office where I was employed decided to work at home, and he dictated a large brief into a recording machine. The typist worked for two weeks trying to decipher what he was saying. She finally threw the partially finished manuscript at him with the tape and a strongly worded suggestion that he transcribe it himself. It was then that we discovered that this erudite, highly educated young man had been dictating the brief, full of esoteric economic jargon, while eating an apple, watching the washing machine cycle and supervising his two small children at play. These are the hazards of our profession.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Members look good in *Hansard*, they can thank the transcribers downstairs who take out all of your "ahs", your repetitions, polish up your sentence structure and resuscitate the verbal victims of your assaults on the Queen's English.

an unprotected citizen within our country. I don't blame anybody else other than the farmer because he's had a role of independency that nobody should have, as far as I'm concerned. In our society you have to organize. I'm asking the farmers today — not in just B.C. but in Canada — to become organized, to get into the same bracket as everybody else in our society. If you want to survive, that's the only way you are going to do it.

If you are depending on protection from legislation, I would like to remind you of how many farmers are in this House. The way the proceedings go is according to your interest, and I think this is quite evident in the past. So, I'm urging them to get on with their job and get organized so that they speak with a solid voice — not a voice that is fragmented from one end of the province to the other.

I would like to point out that in the past we have had laws that have protected society against cheap imported labour being brought in from across the border to undermine the labour movement — and I support this wholeheartedly. But we have no laws whatsoever to protect against the cheap food products that are brought into this province and undermine the farmers' position. I for one say that this has been supported by business and the labour

movement alike because it is a real good move to have cheap food in the province, regardless of where it comes from. Now, I don't agree with this concept — I say that the farmer has a right to survive, and the only way that he is going to survive is if he receives realistic prices for his product.

I also know that a lot of these problems don't lie with the consumer or the farmer — that they lie with the wholesaler and our supermarkets. I don't know how many of you know the type of tactics that went on just last spring in regard to lettuce when the crop of lettuce in the Fraser Valley here was ready for market. Supermarkets gave the order to their chain stores to bring in the product from California because it was in abundance down there. Well, I say this type of thing can't go on. If the people in this province want to have a fresh product that's on the market at a realistic price, they have to support the farmer. I also say that they have to work in conjunction with the farmer — that the farmer isn't going to do it on his own. He's too weak at the present time.

I have every confidence in the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) and I'm sure that he's going to be working towards goals that will see the farmer have a decent return, or I certainly wouldn't be supporting this legislation in this House. I have misgivings about the legislation and I'm sure it's going to be worked out. But I for one will have to say that if it isn't worked out, and a further burden is put on the farmers' shoulders, I'll be one of the first ones that will be standing up in this House and screaming my head off against it.

I would like to say a few words on the past 20 years that we have had with regard to agriculture in this province. I think that the Government should hang its head in shame. That Government lost two very good farmers from this House in the last summer — one by the name of Mr. Don Marshall who saw fit to have to cross the floor to the Conservatives, due to the lack of a farming policy from that Government.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** He's a newspaper publisher now.

**MR. LEWIS:** I would also like to say that I realize the position that Mr. Shelford was in — that he was trying to do a good job for the farming community — but had no support from the cabinet or his Government either. Consequently he went down to defeat

[ [Page 276](#) ]

and I'm not unhappy about it. We have a very good man in the Member from that area, and actually I'm rejoicing.

I'd like to say a few words to the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) that quoted me so aptly in the House the other day. It's not exactly the words that I used but it more or less has the same intent. I would like to ask her what she was doing during the last 20 years.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Fighting for the farmer.

**MR. LEWIS:** You know, during the Hon. Members' campaign last summer she had an ad in the newspaper that said, "I work for the farmer." Underneath this ad it showed the Hon. Member sitting on a tractor, pulling a manure spreader. I submit to this House that it appears to me that she had the right piece of equipment. (Laughter).

**MRS. JORDAN:** I know how to work it too.

**MR. LEWIS:** Well, I'm not ashamed of pulling a manure spreader. I've put in more manure than you have ever seen.

**MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay):** You're getting into some right now.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** You know manure when you see it.

**MR. LEWIS:** I would like to just fill the people in on some of the abuses that have been taking the farmland in the past. I'd like to use my own parents as an example. They worked many years in the Fraser Valley building up a farm, doing it by hand and with horses. Do you know what that farm is being used for today? It's a race track covered with black top. My father would turn over in his grave if he had known that he had put all those years of

work into that type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank you for bearing with me. I ask that this House, in its deliberations, be fair with the farmer.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Hon. First Member for Vancouver South.

**MR. J. RADFORD (Vancouver South):** It is indeed a great pleasure for me to take my place in the legislative assembly to represent the people of Vancouver South. I want to first congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I would also like to thank the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) who brought it to the attention of the Speaker that there was a stranger in the gallery yesterday. The Hon. Member has put me in my place many times in the past and I thought that was over when we became elected as Government. But apparently it wasn't.

During the last spring session we heard from the Opposition the hue and cry that there was going to be a great exodus from the province of B.C. — that the stock market was on the decline — that thousands of people were losing money. I go back to the *Hansard* and it was October 18, I think, where the Hon. Member for Columbia River said that, "It's already been said today that millions of dollars have been lost by investors and there are small investors as well. There have been millions of dollars lost by these statements of takeovers."

The Hon. Member for North Vancouver—Capilano (Mr. Brousson) said that we're sacking the economy. Well, I'm not one to watch the stock market, but I became a little interested after those remarks. It appears that today the market is higher than ever. Some of the wood industry, some of the stocks — the B.C. Forest Products — have reached a high that have never been reached in the last few years. I hate to use that as a barometer because many people have been frozen out before. I don't think we should measure our economy by the stock market.

However, there has been very little said during this session about the removal of the mediation commission, the Labour Minister's power to inspect — these were the big items in the last session — the hours of work, this was a long debate — collective bargaining for civil servants, and yes, even the car insurance which was mentioned in the throne speech. It wasn't until earlier this afternoon that I heard too much from the Opposition on the intent of our car insurance coming in. I was beginning to wonder whether the Opposition was in favour of our implementation of car insurance.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** We're waiting for the bill.

**MR. WALLACE:** It depends what it is.

**MR. RADFORD:** My colleague, the very capable Second Member for Vancouver South (Mrs. Webster) has mentioned many of the things that are going on in Vancouver South. I don't want to dwell on those things too long. I want to mention a couple, though.

I want to mention our East Indian population in Vancouver South. We have approximately 3,000 to 4,000 new immigrants in Vancouver South. The history of the East Indian people goes back a long way in B.C. They've always been known to be hard workers and they are an asset to any constituency or any part of B.C. They've had their problems with immigration. Unfortunately, the federal government has been kind of wishy-washy in its way of handling the immigration policy of these people. Consequently,

[ [Page 277](#) ]

they are living in wonderment in many cases.

They also make the statement that very few are on welfare. I think it's an asset to have these people in the community. I'm only too proud to represent them. However, there are some problems. They do have problems, unfortunately, with discrimination. I've dealt with quite a few of the problems on the work level and problems of the community. The Hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) mentioned yesterday that he was thinking of having a

store-front human rights situation in Vancouver East. I was hoping that I might change his mind and swing it down towards Vancouver South. However, that remains to be seen.

I'd also like to bring a message to the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) from the patients at Pearson Hospital. It appears that the patients at Pearson Hospital in the previous Government received a comfort allowance, it was called, of \$10 a month. A very small pittance. This was used for any sundries — cigarettes or anything that they had. I'm pleased to announce that that has been raised, almost doubled. They also now receive a clothing allowance. That may seem like a small thing to us here in the assembly but to those people it's a really important thing. I could go on and mention about the increase in the fire prevention. There was quite a bit of money spent since our Government came in on that area.

I'd like now to move on to the private hospitals and nursing homes. We have approximately 12 to 14 private hospitals and nursing homes in Vancouver South. We should all know the situation in the past as far as private hospitals go. When an elderly person or anyone who is classed as terminal is left to be in a general hospital, after 30 days in many cases they are classed as chronically ill. They are then tunneled off into private hospitals in many cases because many of the families cannot look after them. Many of these people are forced to pay \$400 to \$500 a month.

I know of cases where some elderly people have been in private hospitals up to 15 or 20 years. If they have any assets, the assets have to go to pay for their stay in the private hospital. They are allowed to have \$250 remaining in their possession and then they can go on welfare after they get down to the \$250. Consequently, thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent by these people. Really, what incentive is there for elderly people to save for their old age under this situation? Also, under the private hospitals, Mr. Speaker, during the last election day, I took it upon myself to be a scrutineer for the private hospitals. I always had suspicions of what went on in that area so I thought I would find out for myself. I was appalled at the way some of these senior citizens were treated.

I was witness to situations where many of these people didn't even know if it was a municipal election, a federal election or what it was, yet some of them were coached into voting. Many of them were denied a vote, although they were on the voters list. I didn't say too much as this went on because I didn't want to expose too much at the outset. But I did tell the returning officer about this and we did lay a complaint. I do hope that our Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) will look into this matter under the Elections Act and do something about it, because I don't want to be party to anything like that under our Government.

We get on to the private hospitals. Ontario's Medicare plan provides free hospital and medical service to all persons over age 65. Also, an important development in care this year in the Ontario hospital insurance plan will pay for that portion of the hospital bed services in a nursing home which exceeds \$3.50 a day. I see the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) smiling. I'm not putting a plug in for that government but I do say that anything that Ontario can do, we should be able to do a little better.

**MR. WALLACE:** Good Tory government up there.

**MR. RADFORD:** I will say, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to find out that our Government and the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) will be moving in that direction.

I'd like also to talk at this time about the senior citizens. Despite Mincome, they are still having their problems in the constituency of Vancouver South and, I guess, the same problems throughout Canada. These people are on a fixed income and really have trouble making ends meet. In the past, I think, these people were the forgotten people in our society. People before me have mentioned that these are the people who have really brought us to the affluence that we have today. These people, though, in the past 20 years have been caught and trapped in the web of that so-called dynamic society at that time, I hope that we can remedy that situation.

The senior citizens really were organized in B.C. as far back as 1930. The senior citizens number about 9.3 per cent of the population of our province. There are something like 205,000 over 65 years of age. There's a real problem, as I've said. They have a problem in the food area. Have you ever seen an old age pensioner going into a store and shopping? They have problems finding a small enough amount to buy. They have problems in shelter. They have problems of keeping their homes up. They also suffer from loneliness in many cases, where they have to vacate

their homes. For many, and especially those on low incomes, the aged must sometimes put up with housing which is both costly in maintenance and of poor quality. For many of them, shabby housing coupled with infirmity leads to a dismal existence.

I'm going to say one thing under Mincome. It isn't

[ [Page 278](#) ]

so bad for those people that are married. They get the minimum of \$400 a month coming in. But for that widow or widower, they still have to exist on \$200 a month and that's not too much to live on and to support a household. It's for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I'm asking the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Lorimer) or it could be the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) to investigate the feasibility of bringing in legislation for a house repair assistance programme for senior citizens owning their own homes in B.C.

Now the trend, I think, with people that are working with elderly citizens of this province is that we should be keeping the elderly people in their own environment as long as we can. We should be doing that because their friends are around them, they're used to those surroundings, they may have a garden or whatever. They're used to that situation. I think it's wrong to move these people out and put them in a home of any kind. It's well known that many of these people really deteriorate very fast when they leave their own surroundings.

So that's why I'm urging our Government to really look into the feasibility of the homeowner's repair assistance programme.

It really won't be that costly because people, if they're not going to remain in their own environment, will have to go into another place and that involves money — it involves housing at another area.

Manitoba already has this legislation, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like at this time to relate to you a little bit about their legislation. The new extended home repair programme provides: a basic grant of up to \$150 towards cost of home repairs for those receiving old age security only; a sliding grant of from \$200 to \$400 for those in various levels of partial guaranteed income supplement; a grant of up to \$500 for those on full guaranteed income supplement; a grant of up to \$1,000 — and half this cost is borne I think federally — for those in receipt of the provincial social allowance.

This programme is designed to help increase their winter works programme. We could also train those on welfare to be involved in that kind of programme.

Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of ineptness and gobbledygook from the previous Government, there are many challenges facing the new Government — our Government. And one of the most serious challenges, I think, is the challenge of unemployment.

Statistics Canada came out today with a report that one person in 10 is unemployed in B.C. Although I don't go along with some of the headlines that were in today's paper, I think that when you really look at it and analyze it you'll find that it says that Statistics Canada has calculated that the unemployment rate adjusted to reflect severe unemployment trends stood at 8 per cent in January. That is really the true figure.

There are many types of unemployment. Seasonal unemployment and what I think the economists call structural unemployment — and that is defined as "unemployment that cannot be cured by expansion of overall monetary demand but is attributable to the lack of power skills." In other words, there is unemployment because we do not have trained people to take over certain jobs that are open.

Location and attitudes amongst youth. You know, is it any wonder that our youth is really uptight when they can't get a job, when they've had plenty of education? There's 23 to 25 per cent of our youth under 25 that are unemployed today.

There's also under this structural unemployment — which covers most of the types — there's the aged, the

illiterate, minorities, the residents of depressed areas and the technologically displaced. These all come under the different types of unemployment.

Now there are many causes, many causes. And really anyone with a smattering of knowledge about economics in the area of unemployment would know that the real responsibility lies in the area of the fiscal and monetary policies of the federal government. Sure, there's some responsibility to the provincial government — and I'll mention some of those later on. But the federal fiscal and monetary policies are the main inputs that can change our whole economy.

What really should disturb us is that our current unemployment problem has been artificially created. It is not the result of natural business recessionary conditions. It is the direct result of the coldly calculated policies of the federal government, whose sole objective was to induce unemployment in order to combat inflation. The federal government's anti-inflationary programme, based for a long time on very tight fiscal and monetary policies, has been primarily responsible for the fact that we have hundreds of thousands of unemployed Canadians.

The Liberal Government's strict adherence to conventional economic wisdom in attempting to deal with the inflation situation — which was largely external in its origins — is perhaps the most incredible phenomenon we have yet seen on the economic front in Canada. Never before, Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this country did a Prime Minister state before a national audience that it was his government's intent to allow unemployment to rise if necessary to 6 per cent to combat inflation. Never before did a federal government knowingly, consciously, with all cool, detached deliberation, sentence hundreds of thousands of Canadians, and their families, to hardships of unemployment.

What are some of the things that we as a government in B.C. can do to take that burden off those who are unemployed? Well, Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned earlier for a start, our Premier will not

[ [Page 279](#) ]

leave an empty chair in Ottawa. Our Premier will be there trying to solve the problem.

It was mentioned earlier that research and development was an important aspect to the economy of Canada — the economists called it R and D. It's a proven fact, I think, that at present very little is spent on R and D — research and development in Canada. And it's not spent because really we are a branch plant economy in Canada and the new innovations that are brought in are brought in by the parent companies which are not only in the States or not only in Japan or any of these other countries, but we are the last to receive any new innovations.

Many times the workers here are blamed for low productivity. You know, they are looked upon as different human beings than those elsewhere, but really the cause of some of our lack of increase in productivity is because management and the federal government are reluctant to spend money on research and development.

I'd like to read to you a report — or a comment — by Science Minister Alastair Gillespie, and also the Senator Maurice Lamontagne, who is on the Senate Committee for Science in Ottawa. They go on to say — and this is their finding, and this is their report of last January 18 — that

"Canada has a lower proportion of research and development done in industry than any other country. 37 per cent in 1969. Compared with 60 per cent in Japan and 70 per cent in the United States. Research and development are fundamental to the growth and future well-being of our primary and secondary industries — which we have very few of — and the service industries. These are fundamental things."

He goes on to say that "the policies for government spending on research and development are essential elements of industrial strategy." These are his very words.

I think this is what the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) was talking about a little bit on the provincial level earlier today.

In research and d



In one instance that I remember the research director in the office where I was employed decided to work at home, and he dictated a large brief into a recording machine. The typist worked for two weeks trying to decipher what he was saying. She finally threw the partially finished manuscript at him with the tape and a strongly worded suggestion that he transcribe it himself. It was then that we discovered that this erudite, highly educated young man had been dictating the brief, full of esoteric economic jargon, while eating an apple, watching the washing machine cycle and supervising his two small children at play. These are the hazards of our profession.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Members look good in *Hansard*, they can thank the transcribers downstairs who take out all of your "ahs", your repetitions, polish up your sentence structure and resuscitate the verbal victims of your assaults on the Queen's English.

development in the United States, I think their budget almost equals the amount they spend on education. But in Canada, as proven by the federal Liberals' own committee, hardly anything is spent on research and development.

In B.C. we have primarily a branch plant economy. New innovations concerning technological changes are last to appear in branch plants. I know. I worked in a branch plant for about 17 years.

Branch plants in most cases are first to close when a large multi-national corporation is having economic troubles in its own country. I'm not against foreign capital coming into B.C. We need foreign capital. We need it. But what we do need is more control of that money on the loans that come into the province. We should have more say, more control on our own economy.

There is no excuse to give away resources like we have in the past, no excuse at all. It is very easy to become hysterical about domination whether it is Japanese or American or any other country. Usually it is the United States we have become hysterical about. But sometimes we become hysterical to the point where nothing Japanese or nothing American is any good, and, Mr. Speaker, I reject the saying that many of us make, that B.C. has been raped. As many of the lawyers here know, there cannot be rape when there is invitation and consent.

Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest that to curb some of the unemployment the Hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) consider curtailing permits where excess overtime is being worked in this province.

In the past, permits for working overtime were issued blanketly. They were blanket issues. Many of them went on for a year or two years. Companies got blanket permission to work excessive hours of overtime. I am going to read to you, Mr. Speaker, the Act as it reads.

On limiting hours of work. section 3(1) of the Hours of Work Act says:

"Subject to the exceptions provided under this Act the working hours of an employee in any industrial undertaking shall not exceed 8 in the day and 44 in the week, and subject to the said exceptions, no employer shall cause or require any employee to work, nor shall any employee work, longer than 8 hours in one day and 44 hours in one week, "

Now, section 3(3) says:

"Notwithstanding anything hereinafter contained in this Act, where the Board is satisfied that extra working hours are necessary to overcome emergent conditions that may arise from time to time and that such extra working hours are not inimical to the interests of the employee, it may by permission in writing allow the working hours of an employee in industrial undertaking to exceed the limit prescribed in the section."

That is the section where the companies and the employer can get exemptions from emergent conditions of overtime. However, many, many companies are working excess overtime. Many of them are working their employees overtime. Now we have a situation in the north where there are many people that go up there to work overtime, many of them. They like it, they want to make a stake. But it is quite ironic that there are some unions that have written letters to the Department of Labour asking that the Government reconsider handing out blanket approval for overtime.

I have one such letter here from the United Pulp and Paper Makers and they say in this letter: "As you are



aware the pulp and paper industry has for many

[ [Page 280](#) ]

years enjoyed an exemption from section 3(l) of the Hours of Work Act. We have made several written submissions requesting that this exemption be eliminated but what in fact has occurred is that the industry now appears to have this exemption in perpetuity." They go on to ask for this to be brought in. So it appears that there are many pulp mills that have really been abusing this overtime privilege.

I got some information today, Mr. Speaker, from Prince George from Northwood Pulp. In that pulp mill the 21 man department of millwrights in 1972 worked a total of 7,824 hours.

**MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca):** Shame.

**MR. RADFORD:** Or I guess it works out to about 372 hours per man per year. Some employees in that operation worked 112 hours a week. Some companies are working overtime while people are being laid off in that same company and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is one area where we could help the unemployment situation in B.C. It seems highly unfair to me that people should be working hundreds of hours overtime while we have so many unemployed in this province.

I would like to make it clear though that there are many situations where companies have to ask their employees to work overtime, these are emergency cases. As it says in the Act, under emergency conditions these requests should be granted but I would again ask the Minister of Labour to really consider this in light of the unemployment situation in B.C. as it is today.

In another area, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read an article out of the *Daily Colonist* of February 3, and this is a quote by Mr. Bennett, the absent Opposition leader. It says, "The farm industry should be encouraged to stay in the farming business through the use of incentive bills such as the B.C. Development Corporation Act and the guarantee of loans to the beef industry." Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty evident that the Leader of the Opposition and also the Opposition is not aware of the situation of the beef industry in B.C.

Only two years ago the packing house industry in B.C. laid off from 800 to 1000 people. They shut down their killing floors in Swift Canadian, Burns and Canada Packers. It was cheaper for them to ship the cattle to Alberta and do the killing in Alberta. This was due to the cost of the shipping of wheat out here and probably the high cost of land in the Fraser Valley for feeder lots. The Government at that time didn't see fit to help the farmers out to bring in feed lots. They didn't do it. Consequently 800 to 1000 people were laid off, many of these constituents of Vancouver South itself.

So this is what the previous Government didn't do, Mr. Speaker. They didn't help the unemployment situation; they created it in certain areas. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned earlier by the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King) that what we need to do is really prepare ourselves for secondary industry. We need to turn people out of schools that are trained for jobs, for technical skills, and I suppose you know we are on that track. This is why we are spending so much money in our educational system, because education is the real basis of how an economy moves.

And economy cannot move with people that do not have skills. It was only two or three years ago that we had to bring people in from Europe — technicians and these people — 20 or 30 people. I forget the name of the company, but we had to bring them in because we didn't even have trained people to do certain jobs here in Canada. It is no secret, I think, that we are going to have to retrain people four or five times in the near future for jobs, because jobs are going to become obsolete.

This is what is happening really now under the structural unemployment that I was talking about. Many jobs are being lost due to automation. There is nothing wrong with automation. But it should be brought in to help people. And when it is brought in, it should lower the prices, which has never happened. It is no secret that in many industries the unit per man hour into a product has really declined, and it has been cheaper and less costly for many

products to come on the markets, but instead of products dropping in price they've gone up.

I want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources and Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Williams). I'd like to congratulate him for his enlightened programme in increasing the park acreage. It was announced earlier either by the Premier or the Hon. Minister that the park acreage in B.C. would be increased from 6 million acres to 8 million acres. We need more parks in B.C. We need more parks all over Canada, I guess, because leisure time is going to be a problem. We're going to have more leisure time. We're going to have less hours per day and more vacations so it is in this area of recreation that we really need to spend some thought and, I suppose, money. It's gratifying to see that this Government, since it has come into power, has created parks in the area of Harrison, in the area of Porpoise Bay — quite a few other parks, marine parks.

We need more parks close to the Vancouver area. I know I do a lot of camping with my family and when we go to Cultus Lake, you've got to be there on a Friday to be able to get a spot. There's just no room. It's not everyone that can get away on a Friday or a Thursday night or whatever, to get there on time. Many people have to work right up to late Friday night and consequently they lose out on the privileges of parks.

Really I hate throwing accolades to the Opposition

[ [Page 281](#) ]

but the past Government's policy on parks wasn't too bad. I think the Minister of Recreation in that area tried to do a fair job, although I don't think he was able to do the things that he really wanted to. In the last few years of Socred government, parks were forgotten about. It was probably because they didn't have enough money to really deal in that area.

I also, Mr. Speaker, wish to commend the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources on his orders of halting the logging operation on the Indian River on the west coast of Vancouver Island. I think the sportsmen of B.C. are looking for some hope from this Government, even from the Hon. leader of the Liberal Party. I hear that he's a fisherman. I haven't heard him talk on anything about conservation or anything yet. I was very enthused and glad yesterday to hear the Hon. Member for Omineca (Mr. Kelly) and the Hon. Member for Nelson-Creston (Mr. Nicolson) get up and talk a little bit on some of the problems of wildlife.

But again, the protection of our streams from careless logging has long been neglected in the past. The practice of logging river banks is common to all parts of the province and so is the resulting damage to our system of waterways from erosion. Lakes also come into this area. There have been a lot of problems with the lakes. I've fished in most of the rivers and a lot of the lakes throughout B.C., right from the north to Vancouver Island and all over. I've seen lakes where the inlets and the outlets have been jammed up with fallen timber and nothing has been done about it. In most of the rivers that I'm talking about, the important thing is that they've become clogged with debris. It's the tributaries where the spawning fish go. This is the area where the real problems are. I only wish that many of our Members here could go and see some of these areas. I will say it was in the north that most of these problems did occur. This is where the past government really mutilated the land that really couldn't be seen.

Mr. Speaker, greenstrip regulations — I don't want to say legislation because I think it can be regulated by regulations. Greenstrip regulations are needed. I think we all know what the greenstrips on the streams are — a layer of forest down those streams that run parallel, right next to the banks, to stop erosion, to protect the over-influx of water and also protect the stream for spawning and give the spawning fish shade. These are important things, Mr. Speaker. While the greenstrip regulations would not solve all the problems, it would nevertheless be a first step in preserving and really expanding our fisheries.

We are not really utilizing the potential of B.C. when it comes to wildlife and fish. We're not — we are just not utilizing it. I think the federal government — and I'm giving accolades also to the federal government again. I think that they've done a fair job in the past few years on fisheries. I had an opportunity to fish in the Babine River and Babine Lake area and their project on the Fulton River for spawning is really sensational. They've done other work in Qualicum and other areas.

Also, Mr. Speaker, many fish and game clubs would like to see a closer liaison between the fish and wildlife branch and the B.C. forest services and the federal fisheries. As you know — the Minister isn't here — but as he well knows, and I think he realizes by now that that cooperation and liaison did not exist in the past Government. There were situations where the forest branch were cutting timber in the parks unbeknownst to the park branch and the fisheries people were fighting with the forestry people. I hope that that situation is curtailed.

I could go on and mention other areas of damage which are causing a lot of damage to our streams and lakes, such as gravel removal, where gravel is being removed from streams that hold spawning salmon. The problems of herbicides and their type of dispersal, road construction — these are areas where our fisheries are being damaged also. There's a problem in northern B.C. that probably a lot of people haven't even heard of. It's called Pinchi Lake. It's about 120 miles north of Fort St. James — way in the wilderness, lovely area. There are people that have hunting lodges and fishing lodges on this lake. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, this lake has been closed for over two years now because it is contaminated with mercury.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Why?

**MR. RADFORD:** Why? Some people say that it's a natural fault that causes the mercury. But one of the shore lakes of the Cominco has a mercury mine and Cominco claims that the mercury is from a natural fault. This is a large lake. There are people that made their living there with fishing lodges. A lovely lake, in a real wilderness area. This lake drains into Stewart Lake, which drains into the Nechako River system, which drains into the Fraser River. Did you know that there is a run of sockeye that spawn in Pinchi Lake? So really somebody is eating that fish anyway.

The whole idea of my comments is that here is a lake hundreds of miles north and it is being contaminated. I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for an end to the past practices of the destruction of our streams. There's a need for a new sophisticated type of management — and plans that include all resource users of our forest area. That's another subject all in itself.

I'd like at this time to go on and discuss the wildlife situation in B.C. I've got another part of a speech prepared here and I thought I'd close it off because that's another area altogether. I'd like to discuss that during the budget because if there's one

[ [Page 282](#) ]

area that needs some new life, some new management ideas, that's the wildlife department of our province.

Just to mention a couple of things — I'm having trouble staying out of it. There's been a study done for the first time on the economics of hunting and wildlife in B.C. And again, it was the Social Credit Government which instituted that study. I don't know if it would have come out or not if they had still been in power, but it shows conclusively that \$39 million is derived from just the hunting in the Province of B.C. That's never been realized before by the past governments.

And do you know what the budget was? Less than \$3 million for the hunter and wildlife department of B.C.

**MR. G.H. ANDERSON:** Shame.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. RADFORD:** Well, I hope it's more.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Or is the Premier keeping it a secret? Another secret!

**MR. RADFORD:** Well, those remarks that I just made probably were never made by the Opposition before because they had a dictator type of Government. As a matter of fact there are still some holes over here where the

strings used to go through where the people went up and down. You'll find out that we don't have a dictatorship style of Government over on this side. You'll find that out. For the first time you may see real backbenchers in a Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), in his latest report on the summary of economic activity in B.C., shows that the gross provincial product rose from 11.5 per cent to reach \$11.9 billion, compared with \$10.6 billion in 1971. Will that trend continue? Will it continue?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No.

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Read tonight's Vancouver *Sun*.

**MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert):** Get somebody to read it to you. (Laughter).

**MR. RADFORD:** Can we still afford to rely on a primary resource based economy in the province? We in Canada are an export nation that relies heavily on exports. And in B.C. we also are an export province; we rely heavily on our exports. Our economy really relies on the economy of other countries.

If in Japan, for instance, their economy gets into trouble or the United States puts a surcharge on exports what happens to our economy? Down it goes. We need a more diversified economy in B.C. We need a secondary industry. That won't come overnight because the inputs that go into changing an economy are not immediate. But we really have to seriously look into the area of our economy and just realize how dependent we are on the economies of other countries.

There is a need, I think, for research in our international markets. There's never been too much research on the international scene of the needs for our primary and secondary industries. Many secondary manufacturing companies in Canada, and particularly in British Columbia, will starve to death if they don't partake in markets outside of Canada.

I'd like to read to you a comment by a business consultant, Norman Bedford, who has travelled more than 50,000 miles during the past year in southeast Asia and Latin America sizing up the market potential of the products of secondary industry in B.C. and elsewhere in Canada. He goes on to say that, "It is my observation that the relatively few B.C. secondary manufacturing companies that have entered into international business have done so on an opportunity-by-opportunity basis without formal or overall planning. It would be interesting to make a survey of B.C. firms involved in secondary manufacturing to see how many have made the total commitment to international business. One might say 5 per cent, but I would imagine it is less than 1 per cent."

So again, it takes all kinds of planning to bring in secondary industry. It takes market research — as was just related — you have to go through all these measures. You just don't go and plunk down a secondary industry and then look for your labour to come in and then look for the markets. There has to be a real cohesive move to bring industry in.

We don't believe in the old "band-aid" approach of the previous Government — the old facade of PR and the whole bit.

**MRS. P. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Oh yeah?

**MR. RADFORD:** You know, the policy of the past Government, Mr. Speaker, was "roads for the sake of roads; progress for the sake of progress." And I'm not going to deny that they brought progress to the province, because they did. But really, I think any other Government would have brought the same Progress, or a little more — even the Liberals or Conservatives. Progress is a natural phenomenon. It's a natural event — progress. I guess the Socreds just got caught up in the swim of progress. Progress at any cost. "Give them the things that can be seen." Progress at any cost.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that cost was too high.

That cost was too high.

What about the Columbia River Treaty? The cost was pretty high there. The Williston dam. The great Williston dam. You go and talk to the natives in the north and ask them about Williston dam. Talk to the natives in the McKenzie delta and they'll tell you what they think of Williston dam. They'll tell you what they think of progress.

What about Ootsa Lake? Has anybody here seen Ootsa Lake? I could do a song on that. The Hon. Member from Omineca (Mr. Kelly) yesterday related to you about Ootsa Lake.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** A beautiful lake.

**MR. RADFORD:** Yeah, beautiful. They're good at dodging the snags in the lake. They're very good at dodging those snags in the lake.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. RADFORD:** The Socreds had a new scheme of cutting the logs in Ootsa Lake. They were going to devise some way that a skin diver would go down with a pair of scissors and cut them off.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** That stretches your imagination.

**MR. RADFORD:** The Hon. Member for Omineca yesterday related what they were doing — just sawing it off under the water. Things that can't be seen. This is the old way of the Socreds. I was going to say the word d-a-m but really it's a shame, Mr. Speaker, to go into some of these places in the north and see what's been done to our province.

Duncan dam is another one. It's the same situation. What about the Cypress Bowl situation? Progress at any cost, eh? You ask about Commonwealth Trust and see what they think about progress. And the latest, I guess — Horseshoe Bay. A lot of money spent there, too.

What about the very inept handling of our resources? What about the pulp harvesting licences? We brought companies in here and got them to take pulp harvesting licences and they had to build within certain times. What about Columbia Cellulose, Kaiser, Bowater Bathurst? What happened to these companies. They went down. What about the investors who invested in those companies? Nothing was done to investigate and see that the companies that came into the Province of B.C. were companies capable of running a capable firm. No, down the drain. And if we hadn't been elected, Mr. Speaker, what would have happened to the intended programmes of the Socred Government — the Moran Dam — you know, they say they were just thinking it.

Up in the McGregor River, word was already out to Northwood in that area to clear the land. You've got so much time to bring the timber out. They built a bridge. This was all in line. They were going to bring in the Moran Dam.

What about the Skagit Valley if we hadn't come into power? What about the Morris and the Bulkley River system where a pulp mill was going in and was going to use the water out of that river that really couldn't sustain anything from leaving it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we believe in growth. I believe in growth. The party believes in growth, but not at any cost — not at that cost that I just mentioned with the cost to the citizens of this province.

You've often said, what's your philosophy in the NDP? I can size it up in two lines — long lines. I think part of our philosophy in the NDP is that we really believe in striving for social and economic planning. That's what our

party is all about.

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

**MS. P.F. YOUNG (Vancouver-Little Mountain):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Second Member for Vancouver-Little Mountain (Mr. Cummings) gave an excellent description of the needs and the problems and the goals of our riding, that I could not improve upon. Therefore, I'd like to bring up some other points that may be of interest to this House.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a couple of erroneous impressions, perhaps inadvertently made by the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan). On January 29, she referred to me as secretary of a well-known organization. Mr. Speaker, I don't know in what way she was referring to me — whether as an official of an organization or in the clerical sense of secretary. But if it were in the official sense, I can only say that the largest organization to which I have held the position of secretary was my constituency association, which numbered about 280. Perhaps the problem lies, Mr. Speaker, in what is the definition of a very large organization?

Further on, she is quoted as saying in reference to me, I believe, "You are closely aligned with the union, a very powerful union in this province." Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is an error in fact or a compliment because the labour organization to which I belong is the Office and Technical Employees Union, Local 15. Local 15 has approximately 1,000 members and, while it is composed mainly of clerical workers in all classifications, there are also industrial designers, draftsmen and researchers such as myself. Local 15 is very flattered to be called powerful, and will endeavour to live up to that accolade now that the Hon. Member has established it for us. In fact it

[ [Page 284](#) ]

will come in pretty handy during contract negotiations.

I was most interested in the remarks of my colleague, the Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) who gave this assembly a shopping list of the needs of all the Members of this House. Very high on that list was the call for more secretarial and research help. Oh boy! Do you find that you need us now! A great many of the new Members have suddenly discovered that they have no office skill. When first confronted with the huge pile of correspondence they encountered on this job, they borrowed or bought typewriters, and used what we in the clerical profession call the Christopher Columbus method of typing — that is, find a key and land on it. (Laughter). And ours is a profession, Mr. Speaker.

We must take formal training and spend long hours to acquire our skills. Take the matter of typing. The inventor of the typewriter gave no thought to the layout of the keyboard. He composed it without rhyme nor reason. He did not take into consideration that most people are right handed and that some fingers, such as the ring finger and the small finger, are more awkward and weaker than the others. As a result, we have a keyboard that has the most frequently used letters on the left hand side, and other very frequently used letters that require being struck by the most awkward fingers on the hand. A better keyboard has been devised, but it's too late to reverse now because most typing schools and typewriting manufacturers are not about to change a system that's held sway for some 50 years.

In the matter of shorthand, many of the Hon. Members may not be aware of the fact that learning shorthand is the same as learning a foreign language. And how many of you know another language? Perhaps not more than half a dozen in this House. Sir Isaac Pitman got his idea for shorthand from the written Arabic language, language that uses symbols for sound instead of a combination of letters. In Arabic, a dot below a line indicates "B". A dot above the line indicates "T". Two dots above a line indicates the "the" or "th" sound. So, a stenographer or secretary must first learn to break alphabet word combinations into a series of sounds, and convert these sounds into symbols. She has to learn to do this at a minimum of 120 words per minute.

After she has attained this skill, no mean feat, she must then in transcription convert the symbols back into alphabet combinations. That's why you frequently hear a stenographer say, "I can't stop now, I have to type these notes before they get cold." She means that she must rely on her memory a great deal because, if she delays a day or



two, she may forget what old mushmouth said. (Laughter). I'm only beginning!

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MS. YOUNG:** Now we come to the pet peeve of all stenographers — the dictation machine. Now there's nothing wrong with the machines, Mr. Speaker. They're fine. It's the dictators that gum up the works. And you belong to them.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MS. YOUNG:** Most dictators, and I mean that in both senses of the word, cannot dictate a coherent letter. They have a cute habit of changing tenses in mid-sentence — and sometimes even subject matter. So, the stenographer must type out a first draft of your gibberish, straighten out your tenses, put in all the punctuation you left out and line up your subject matter so that the final copy makes some sort of sense. My first boss did not know that the period existed. And every letter he wrote, the first paragraph was one sentence long. He was incapable of using punctuation. A secretary's sweetest revenge against an overbearing boss is to send out a letter precisely as he dictated it. If he looks like an idiot to his clients or the head office, that's his tough luck. He dictated it, he's stuck with it.

In one instance that I remember the research director in the office where I was employed decided to work at home, and he dictated a large brief into a recording machine. The typist worked for two weeks trying to decipher what he was saying. She finally threw the partially finished manuscript at him with the tape and a strongly worded suggestion that he transcribe it himself. It was then that we discovered that this erudite, highly educated young man had been dictating the brief, full of esoteric economic jargon, while eating an apple, watching the washing machine cycle and supervising his two small children at play. These are the hazards of our profession.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Members look good in *Hansard*, they can thank the transcribers downstairs who take ou

In one instance that I remember the research director in the office where I was employed decided to work at home, and he dictated a large brief into a recording machine. The typist worked for two weeks trying to decipher what he was saying. She finally threw the partially finished manuscript at him with the tape and a strongly worded suggestion that he transcribe it himself. It was then that we discovered that this erudite, highly educated young man had been dictating the brief, full of esoteric economic jargon, while eating an apple, watching the washing machine cycle and supervising his two small children at play. These are the hazards of our profession.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Members look good in *Hansard*, they can thank the transcribers downstairs who take out all of your "ahs", your repetitions, polish up your sentence structure and resuscitate the verbal victims of your assaults on the Queen's English.

t all of your "ahs", your repetitions, polish up your sentence structure and resuscitate the verbal victims of your assaults on the Queen's English.

Which brings me to another point, Mr. Speaker, made by my colleague, the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown). I wish to endorse her call for a ministry for women. One of the criticisms made against the 'ministry for women' idea is that it would require a ministry for men and that would not be desirable.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are already numerous ministries for men in this province. The Ministry of Agriculture deals in matters almost totally male-oriented; as does the Ministry of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce; the Ministry of Mines and Petroleum Resources. Another is Lands, Forests, and Water Resources — almost exclusively male dominated. The jurisdiction of the

Attorney General's department is not exactly swarming with females. Until the advent of the new Government, the



Departments of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, Education, and Health Services and Hospital Insurance were in the same category. I'm happy to say that things have changed.

In the field of labour — in the field covered by the Department of Labour — we have both male-dominated labour unions and management organizations. Labour decries sexual discrimination publicly and practises it discreetly. Management is no better, as was proven last year by the exposure of a confidential report put out by the Vancouver Board of Trade in which wage rates for male and female employees were vastly different. The job descriptions were identical but the differentials were startling. I'd like to quote a few of these differentials. The job descriptions are the same for both jobs. The least differential was between the tabulating machine operator (senior): 5 per cent differential in wages. The worst was a material order clerk. The differential was 46 per cent between a male and a female material order clerk. One of the most incomprehensible to me is the wage difference between a male cashier and a female cashier: 39 per cent. Payroll clerk: 44 per cent.

In the opening paragraphs of the confidential report from the Board of Trade was this paragraph:

"The summary of reports

In one instance that I remember the research director in the office where I was employed decided to work at home, and he dictated a large brief into a recording machine. The typist worked for two weeks trying to decipher what he was saying. She finally threw the partially finished manuscript at him with the tape and a strongly worded suggestion that he transcribe it himself. It was then that we discovered that this erudite, highly educated young man had been dictating the brief, full of esoteric economic jargon, while eating an apple, watching the washing machine cycle and supervising his two small children at play. These are the hazards of our profession.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Members look good in *Hansard*, they can thank the transcribers downstairs who take out all of your "ahs", your repetitions, polish up your sentence structure and resuscitate the verbal victims of your assaults on the Queen's English.

received in 1972 presents a good annual guide, as it reflects the experience of a variety of firms in certain areas of employment."

In other words, this is the way it goes, boys.

In both cases, squirm as they might, labour and management cannot deny, when the facts are there, that they discriminate in pay and job opportunity between men and women. Thirty-two per cent of the labour force in this province is composed of women of whom only about 29 per cent are organized in unions. Most of the industries in which the majority of women work are the service industries and they are notorious for paying the lowest wages.

Who comprises the bulk of welfare recipients? Women — deserted wives and mothers.

These are only a few of the reasons why we need a ministry for women. Perhaps as an interim measure only, but the needs of women demand a ministerial level of importance and consideration at this time.

To become a politician for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the male Members to recall their campaigns. Who did the fund raising? Who manned your campaign offices — or should I rightfully say "womanned" your campaign office? Who organized and held the coffee parties you attended? Who volunteered to be your scrutineers on election day? I'll bet the answer in most cases is "women".

Well, don't be a bit surprised if they're not there to do the Joe-jobs in the next go-round because they're beginning to get the message. The women make the sandwiches and the men make the decisions. They've had it. They want in — in on the decision making and in on the right to be considered as candidates.

I'd like to point out that the NDP ran more women candidates than any other party in this province.

I'd like to turn to another topic now, Mr. Speaker. I was very greatly impressed with the remarks of the Hon. Member for North Vancouver—Capilano (Mr. Brousson) yesterday in reference to the scandal in the mortgage field. I

think he made some excellent points and illustrated them very well. I think he deserves credit for bringing it to the attention of this House.

It is the policy of our party to upgrade the consumer affairs office in this province. The former Government passed the Consumer Protection Act, created the office of Consumer Affairs, consisting of one man and a secretary, and then buried the whole operation. The former Attorney General is quoted in the *Vancouver Province* in April, 1972 as saying in this respect, "Our approach is to provide the best legislation possible to give as many rights to consumers as possible but not to look over their shoulders as they sign their contracts. In other words, we're not going to perform a policing function in consumer affairs."

In other words, along with the *Pollution Control Act*, the *Human Rights Act*, the *Consumer Protection Act* was meant to be eyewash legislation and to be totally ineffective. On January 20, in the free-time CBC provincial affairs broadcast, I spoke on this issue. I told people of the existence of the consumer affairs officer and how he could be contacted. I asked viewers to write me with any suggestions they had on consumer affairs, consumer legislation.

In the past 2 1/2 weeks since that speech, I have received a total of 31 letters, 29 of which were consumer complaints and they came from all over the province.

I have just a few here to give you an idea of what some of them were: hearing aids, from Kaslo, a VW camper, from Vancouver; can't settle moving damages, from Terrace; farm equipment, 100 Mile House; furniture, Richmond; the food freezer plan that we heard so much about on the radio, from Terrace; mobile home, in Sooke; duplicating equipment, Prince George; used car, Kitimat; magazine sales, North Vancouver; washing machine, Prince George; burial plan — which is a real rip-off, that one — Vernon; travel plan. And it went on and on and on.

As a result of these responses that I received in the past 2 1/2 weeks, I contacted the consumer affairs officer and asked him what his experience had been. It seemed, as a result of the broadcast, his cases had jumped more than 100 per cent for the month of January over the previous monthly average in the

[ [Page 286](#) ]

previous year. He also told me that seven out of eight of the complaints he received were valid complaints.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we must disseminate information about this Act. We must send out lecturers into the communities to speak to all kinds of groups. We must teach consumerism in the schools. Because the more people know about their rights, the less they're going to need a consumer affairs officer and lawyers and whatnot.

Caveat emptor — let the buyer beware — is no longer permissible. It should be — and it must be — let the seller beware.

In a similar vein, Mr. Speaker, let's mention some food costs. When people see apples being burned and buried in the Okanagan when the price of apples in urban centres is so high that most people pass them up, there's something wrong somewhere. We know the farmer is certainly not getting much of a return on the sale of his produce. Yet why are the retail prices so high for it? Why such discrepancies?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** They're not high.

**MR. KELLY:** Too many middlemen.

**MS. YOUNG:** I'm inclined to think you're right. I'd like to cite a couple of examples of which I have personal knowledge. About two years ago, in order to get at the root of this problem, I attempted to do a survey in the month of February. My plan was to compare one supermarket chain against another, one area of the city against another, an isolated supermarket as opposed to a supermarket that's competition was right across the street. Also to cover the day and time of the month — in other words, I wanted to see what the prices were on Tuesday after the weekend as opposed to, say, the 15th of the month, which is a payday, and the 28th of the month, which is the day

when the old age pension cheques come out.

Previous to making that survey I went shopping for my personal use, and in the supermarket near my home there were green peppers for 69 cents a pound. Now nobody in their right mind is going to pay 69 cents a pound for peppers. Down the street, in a neighbourhood greengrocer, the same quality of peppers was 49 cents. Naturally we bought them there.

But I used that particular supermarket in my survey, and consequently returned throughout the month of February three times. And every single time those peppers were 69 cents. I watched those peppers rot at 69 cents a pound. Now that's got to be mad! Just to recover their investment why didn't they put them down to 39 cents? But no, they let them turn to slime on the shelf before your very eyes. There was another case — a beautiful illustration — that I recently heard about on a TV show — wherein it was demonstrated that a particular brand of canned salmon that was caught in British Columbia, processed in British Columbia and shipped from British Columbia; yet that very same salmon, in the very same chain supermarket, was more expensive in Vancouver than it was in Montreal, some 2,000 miles away. Now you try to figure that one out — and we get all this business about freight rates.

Another thing as a city dweller, I'd like to see something done in reference to marketing boards. Now a lot of people do not understand marketing boards — what they are, how they function, what their purpose is. It's unfortunate, because it is my understanding that their goal is to create orderly marketing of produce with a fair return to the producer. But the city dwellers don't understand this. They hear all these things about the marketing boards, and some of them are half-truths. We don't often hear the whole truth. And we get very suspicious — we just wonder what that marketing board is really up to.

In a report on the agricultural forums that were held in 1971, one of the reports suggested that a food council be created, composed of producers, processors, retailers and consumers. That is a council I would like to see formed. Because I believe that the consumer member on that board could act as an information officer to the rest of the consumers in this province and explain to them precisely where their food dollar, or their furniture dollar — but in this particular case food dollar — is going and how it's going. I wonder, however, if we would see the processors, the wholesalers or the retailers concur to such a board?

Those are all the remarks I have to make today, Mr. Speaker. I hope to make more on the budget debate. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Lorimer moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Lorimer files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Cocke files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Levi files the annual report of the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement.

Hon. Mr. Strachan files answers to questions.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

