

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)**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1971

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 225](#)]

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1971

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

THRONE DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): How sweet it is. Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to the early show, I am delighted to say a few words and, particularly, to so many smiling faces, which I think is great tribute to the most kind and generous hospitality of His Honour yesterday evening.

You know this premium hour is really a rare treat for a person in the Opposition....

AN HON. MEMBER: Golden hour.

MR. GARDOM: Golden hour. Golden days in your case, Mr. Premier, golden days in your case. But this premium hour is, indeed, a rare treat and I am usually allotted the time about 5:45, a quarter to six, and I've got to finish by six o'clock. I want to give the Members my assurance, right here and now, that I guarantee to finish by six tonight. Make no mistake of that. It's also pleasant...oh, Simon and Garfunkel are not in here. I was going to have a few words about them but I see the Victoria Members are not yet with us. I suppose they're still under a potted palm somewhere in the Empress Hotel, Mr. Speaker, but I will reserve a few comments for them later as they come.

The Member from Kamloops, starting at this hour, I noticed that he only has a two o'clock rather than a five o'clock shadow and, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make absolutely no reference, during my talk, by virtue of the fact that the hour is early for you, too, and you're absolutely on your mettle. I'm not going to say a single, solitary word, Mr. Speaker, about the evils of cigarette advertising or that marvellous piece of legislation, which you will find number 2 in your Bill Book.

I think all the talks so far, Mr. Speaker, have been very, very good. I think it's been an excellent debate and I don't think that we have not heard from any speaker, at least one very good and one very sincere and one very concrete suggestion. You know, I thought for a moment that, if all of these things were ever distilled into Government policy, we'd have a veritable Utopia in B.C. Perhaps, this is what we're working for, but we haven't

quite got that far. I think all of the Members who have spoken should indeed be complimented for their contributions. The Government side started with Jim the Knife and I notice they're ending with Dan the Knife, so they are being very consistent in that regard.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, there is not any person in this Assembly who's not making a very genuine effort to support that which he believes in, and that is the job of all of us. However, in some cases we have to question the belief. Of the speeches that I have heard to this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like, and this is not a partisan decision on my part, to give top credit to a very ennobling discourse from a Member who's not yet present — the Member who sits up in the corner here, yesterday, the Member from North Vancouver–Seymour. I think he gave us a very provocative discussion and he expressed very thoughtful sentiments. I think his message, purely and simply, Mr. Speaker, was that democracy is on trial throughout the world and we, who revere its continuance and feel in our bones that it is the best method that poor, old, imperfect Man has yet designed to regulate himself, have not only to keep but we've got to preach that kind of a faith and preach the preservation of the concept of the continuing dignity of the individual, the continuing quest for betterment, equality before the law and opportunity for all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me this document. This is the Throne Speech of the policies and philosophies of the Government of British Columbia in a Province that is this year celebrating its one hundredth birthday. I think this is a time that should have been the time for inspiration to meet the challenge and the excitement of the future, with a Throne Speech that, Mr. Speaker, certainly should have gone down in the annals of our history as recording 1971 as B.C.'s finest hour. What we've got here, Mr. Speaker, you should take a careful look at it — it's something that you would sort of expect to fall out of the back pew of a third-rate funeral parlour. It reads like an obituary. It's lugubrious when it should have been happy, and it's eulogistic when it should have been leaping forward. I'd say in three letters, Mr. Speaker, the best thing that I can say for it is RIP — "Rest in Peace." This is what I would have liked to have heard. This is the type of Throne Speech that I would have liked to have heard. It would start like this:

Welcome to the Second Session of the Twenty-ninth Parliament. Roll up your sleeves, you've got a job to do.

First of all, happy birthday and congratulations, B.C. You're a hundred years old, barely teetted in the time of the rest of the world but, nevertheless, a little giant roaring to get going. You've only two million people, energetic, industrious, with a twinkle in their eye and a spring in their step, and an enormous land mass with a treasure which is still barely scratched, and shorelined by a fabulous ocean with untold bounty and infinite opportunity to what once was called the Far East and is now the Near West, a Province with a beauty of climate of spirit in the future that is unsurpassed. But we also experience the troubles of our time, which are not only unto us — unemployment, inflation, environmental difficulties, the congestion in our cities, the apartness that has developed between Government and the citizens, the lack of facilities for our aged, sick and downtrodden. It shall, therefore, be our commitment to come, as best we can, within our own ability, to immediate grips with all of these concerns of nagging magnitude. It will be our job, Mr. Speaker, to ride hard not just to encounter but to overcome.

The function of the Speech from the Throne, in any parliamentary democracy, is not just as a symbol of historic formality but it is as a beacon of significance for the guidance of our people. Its responsibility is to set forth the philosophies and policies of a Government and to catalogue the measures of reform which we propose to adopt at this Session. In the debate that follows, we shall welcome all constructive criticism and suggestions in order that we may enrich our programmes for the good of the people of the Province and, wherever possible, we shall act on these suggestions from whatever side of the Floor they may emanate.

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has been invited to B.C. to participate and join with us in our Centennial celebrations. We shall extend to Her Majesty every hospitality but also see that, for once, she has some fun, a time to relax and is able to enjoy herself as any guest should. I'd say, Mr. Speaker, none of these continuing schedules where she's opening everything

that has four walls and seeing every dignity from the dogcatcher up.

We shall recognize as our cardinal responsibility the preservation of law and order, knowing that, in the furtherance of our democratic process, without law and without order, the alternative is chaos and anarchy and the subjugation of the rights of the individual. Laws that are in force shall be enforced and with fairness, equality and wisdom, and the laws that we have outgrown, or have become irrelevant, or which we've given lip service to, shall be removed, because justice results from legal respect and one cannot have legal respect for that which is irrelevant, out of touch, unenforced or archaic.

Now, irrespective of the programmes of Government, other than ours, many of which we criticize and many of which we criticize justifiably, our trust shall be to do everything which is possible in our power to infuse the economy and lessen the blight of unemployment. We shall invest in the future by furnishing jobs, today. The funds are here, we shall harness our resources and put them to work, work in the highways, work in the bridges, work in the public structures, and we shall shelter the sick and shelter the chronic and build the classrooms. As an immediate incentive to boost housing in the private sector, we shall eliminate the 5 per cent tax on building materials. We shall press the Government of Canada to also eliminate its sales tax on similar items of construction. In order that the home-owner shall benefit and not have this saving gobbled up along the line by those in industry, be it management or labour or any combination of them, we intend to grant a rebate of the tax paid on such building materials, providing the same is granted as a discount to the home buyer for his purchase price.

We heard a lot about the plight of our senior citizens. They have made possible our heritage and when a buck was a buck and not just two bits as it is today. Now, in so many cases, they are struggling on fixed incomes or none, they're lonely, they're miserable, often hungry and sick and they can't get by. So, some initial help for them. We shall start building golden age residences to enable them to spend their twilight years in dignity. For those senior citizens who own their own homes, we shall grant a moratorium on land taxes, on a loan basis, to enable them to remain in their surroundings as long as they live. This tax moratorium loan would be an encumbrance upon their property, payable either upon its disposition or upon their decease. This is merely an investment, Mr. Speaker, and an excellent one.

In the field of labour management, in the public interest, we think the wage price leapfrog should be very carefully considered and, especially, from the position of those who end up most hurt, and, with a view to establishing checks and balances in order to calm the tribal dance between management and labour and establish, once and for all, that, whenever the public interest is affected, these behemoths would be subject to public microscope.

We shall establish an independent economic council and this council shall be free from Government and free from management and free from labour. Its job will be to deal with the three sides of the issue and, if need be, throughout the complete bargaining process. Its function will be to fact-find and to make public, information that is neutral and independent in order to bring to an end the propaganda wars, the slanted figures, the embellished facts and the pad of statistics with which the public finds itself bombarded in almost every management-labour dispute, today. The cost of this council would be absorbed one-third each — one-third by management, one by labour, and one by Government, so that they would each have an economic involvement in the process. We hope this would bring some measure of better economic stability to the Province by its clinical, hard and continuing look at our whole labour management set-up. This would be five-pronged from the point of production, market, standard of living, costs and prices, and public interest.

There is absolutely no question, Mr. Speaker, in the complex and interdependent society in which we live now, that big management and big labour are no longer isolated unto themselves, and, whenever they injuriously affect their third partner, the public, it, too, shall be heard. In the final analysis, its interest shall be the one that shall prevail.

Dealing with cities and municipalities, we would incorporate a new philosophy for these things, be they, heretofore, regarded as creatures of Government, but not in the future. They will be regarded as partners, with a freer rein from the Province to guide their own destinies, for example, in planning and in taxation. We shall initiate an immediate review and revision of the whole Provincial-municipal tax structure, for we appreciate that it's neither possible nor equitable in the density situation that exists in this country to continue to place the heaviest burdens on

the property owners. It is our philosophy that our tax policy shall have to be based on the premise that services for land are to be paid for by taxes on land, and services for people are to be paid for by taxes on people.

The long-range plans of the municipalities to date have been stifled by virtue of their difficulties in the money market. In order to bolster employment and in order to make these long-range plans and projects feasible, the Provincial Government shall, heretofore and thereafter, guarantee all future municipal bonds. Each and every municipal bond issue shall receive the guarantee of the Government of British Columbia. We would also call upon the Federal Government to furnish income tax relief to the individual purchases of these municipal bonds, to the extent that the interest which they would receive from those bonds would be tax free in the hands of such individuals. We conclude that this would be very much in the interests of the municipalities, make the securities far, far more marketable and be a great incentive for the small investor, because these securities have got to be funded. This will be a good way to do it and a good way to attract the necessary investment capital and, certainly, at a more reasonable rate.

The transit needs of B.C. people have to be recognized as not merely a civic or a municipal responsibility but a Provincial one, too. The Greater Vancouver–New Westminster–Burnaby area obviously requires immediate stimulation and infusion of dollars in order to prevent a transit crisis. It is a question of either urban chaos or urban survival. We shall, therefore, plough back to the city of Vancouver one half of the motor-vehicle taxes that are collected out of that region each year, which would be approximately \$20 million and provide that as an impetus to initiate the rapid transit authority in which we intend to become a full partner.

Pollution — immediate war on pollutioning. We will say to the polluter, "Beware!" We shall institute an environmental bill of rights and establish a ministry of environment. Under its aegis, amongst other things, there will be administration of a Province-wide Clean Air Act. Our mandate will be that new industries will have to meet environmental standards or their doors will remain closed. We shall encourage old industries by depletion allowances and interest-free loans to come up to

[[Page 227](#)]

scratch. Now, of course, the conversion from polluter to nonpolluter will, obviously, provide more jobs. Dealing with the perpetual offenders, they will definitely phase out, because we view that the public interest shall be the main interest. Any industries which have Government contracts and which repeatedly pollute shall face cancellation of their agreement. Government business will be done with the clean and not with the dirty, and there's plenty of the former to be found in B.C. Insignificant fines are certainly not the answer and penalties will have to be stiffened and injunctive processes will be available against the defilers. We intend to show our teeth in this region.

One of the myths that has to be destroyed, once and for all, is the myth that the Government is the "they." The "they" — mysterious and isolated, as opposed to the "we." Whereas, in the past, there may have been some distant officials in the mythological Court of Cecil I, we shall incorporate, once and for all, a Government that is of, for and by the people. The Government, as Robert Kennedy said, will be one that will accommodate itself to the citizen rather than the other way around. That is the kind of accommodation that we'd like to see in this Province.

We'll institute a programme of legal rights to ensure and preserve the concept of the individual, the Bill of Intrinsic Rights — the same for all — the underprivileged, the privileged, the Government, the citizens, the young and the old. A fair Compensation Act shall end the iniquitous Cossack-like seizures that we have heretofore experienced, and all of these things without fair hearing, without fair assessment and, mostly, with a denial of all of the basic principles of natural justice. No longer shall the seizer be the judge, the jury and the unfair compensator.

Our citizens shall have the same rights against his Government that his Government has against him, and we shall squash, like a beetle, the hoary concept of the past — that the Crown can do no wrong, something which should have perished with the Divine Right of kings. We intend to lift that drawbridge. The Courts will be open to the people against the Government, as they are now open to the Government against its people. At long last, we shall see that those people, who are personally injured as a result of crime, get treated at least as well as the criminal. There shall be introduced a Criminal Victims Compensation Act, along the lines of the existing no-fault insurance provision. We shall shore up the law, expand the Securities Department to protect the investor, make known the

frauds, prosecute the white-collar crook, and to the fullest extent of the law. The corporate balance sheets in B.C. will become meaningful and they will show true values and not just a series of hypothetical figures whose only virtue is that they add up. These balance sheets shall be supported, upon oath, to give the defaulters pause because they would then know that they could face the penalties of perjury. A Conflict of Interest Act shall be introduced to ensure that public officials and elected representatives, who, in some cases, have difficulty making a decision themselves, are guided and governed by a prescribed set of standards and in order to obviate any conflict between their private interest and their public responsibilities.

We shall ensure that no longer will it be able to be said in B.C. that there's one law for the rich and another for the poor and we shall provide legal care, not in the universal sense, for all, as in medicare, but it shall be furnished for those who are without funds and who establish proof of need and there shall be information centres for legal assistance.

The Law Reform Committee will be instructed to expedite its research into programmes and priorities of law reform. They will be further directed to much more emphasize those branches of the law which most concern themselves with people and with the greatest frequency of matters which are before the people, say consumer protection, improvement of minimum standards, the establishment of family forums to incorporate each and every branch of family law and a review of all of the statutes of the Province.

An Office of Ombudsman will be instituted and, most important, completely free from Governmental or any form of political pressure. Its job will be to help the citizens wade through the bureaucratic snarls and the mountains of red tape.

Mr. Speaker, if a man wishes to buy cold beer or wine in his favourite market he shall be able to do so and bring to an end the hypocrisy of our former liquor laws. The ground rules in B.C. will be civilized drinking attitudes and convenience to the consumer. No longer, a starvation pittance granted to alcoholic rehabilitation and to education against alcoholic abuse. We shall ensure that these worthwhile endeavours are properly endowed and detoxification centres will be initiated.

Routine housekeeping amendments for the improvement of existing statutes will be placed in the hands of the Legal and Legislative Committee of this House for its perusal and advice. There shall be committees for every Portfolio and all committees will function. They will also scrutinize any legislation that is pertinent to them and long before it ever reaches the floor of the House for debate. We shall establish the office of Auditor-General, with full authority to him and to this Legislative Assembly to examine...*(interruption)*. Well, we want him here. I couldn't care whether Ottawa wanted him or not, my friend. We need him in the Province of B.C. I'm in the Province of B.C. and I'm advocating this for the Province of B.C. We would give him and the Legislative Assembly full authority to examine all public assets, liabilities and expenditures, including those of the B.C. Crown Corporations.

We'd institute a complete *Hansard* and permit television and broadcast of the debates, and the public up here would be entitled to sit in the galleries and make any kind of notes they wish. A daily question and answer period should be established and it would be our solemn commitment to bring this Legislature, not only into this century but right into this decade, for it is our philosophy that all public business means exactly what it says — it is public. It shall be open to public scrutiny and the secrecy shall end in B.C. once and for all.

The Cabinet shall be answerable and the Cabinet shall function and no more out-for-lunch, out-of-job Ministresses without Portfolio. There will be a Ministry of Environment, a Ministry of Fisheries, and an Attorney-General to administer and enforce the law, and a Minister of Labour to do just that and nothing else, and none of this two-hat stuff. These are the critical Ministries of the moment, and this half-time, part-time, 50 per cent time, is just like driving along the rockiest of roads with two flat tires.

We also recognize that the cracker-barrel provisions of our *Elections Act* are long overdue for review and we shall introduce amendments, being guided by the undeniable principle of democracy that one man is equal to one vote. In order to permit greater in-depth response and choice from the public, we shall establish a system of preferential balloting. There shall be fixed elections...*(laughter)*.

You know, Mr. Speaker, you have to have a little bit of semantic error in this House to wake everybody up.
Elections

[[Page 228](#)]

shall be on fixed and determined dates. Thank you very much. Elections shall be on fixed and determined dates and election expenses...you'd like to hear a little bit about that, wouldn't you? Election expenses, per Member, over a figure that would be determined by the whole of this House, would attract a tax levy of 50 per cent. Government advertising shall not identify any Member or Portfolio within four months prior to the time of election. Also, the Auditor-General would be empowered to bring restitution action against any violator, because Government funds are public funds and not for the political propagation of any party or any Member of this Assembly.

The forestry industry is B.C.'s lifeline and dramatic changes have been experienced since the Sloan Commission about fifteen years ago and I'd like to speak to you of some ten of them. Firstly, the ecological commitments of the 1970's were not before Chief Justice Sloan. Logging methods have altered. All procedures are now more sophisticated. There is a much more highly integrated use of wood, a change of market, a centralization of ownership, with the big getting bigger and the small getting smaller, a greater degree of absentee landlords, and the labour-management relations have become, certainly, far more disruptive today than they were in 1956. Greater, also, is our need for reforestation and research and, with all of these ten and, I think, very, very substantial differences, we conclude that there's now needed a second look at the findings adopted by the Sloan Commission, which I'll readily concur gave B.C. full value.

Hence, we will entertain a careful review of its findings in the light of today's operations and solicit particulars and opinions from all sectors, with particular reference as to whether or not there have been the best adaptations to the changes which have occasioned. Now, there's obviously a lot of questions there, Mr. Speaker, and the answers have to be obtained. I don't think there's anyone sitting in this House or standing in this House, today, who could say that he would have those.

The mining industry has very validly criticized, recently, the fact that mineral claims in the Province are being rather wretchedly processed and this seems to be pretty well staff failure more than anything else, or not enough staff, is, perhaps, the best way to express that. All necessary staff increases shall be attended to to rectify that situation. Our goal would be that the industry would, annually, generate an income impact of \$1 billion within the next five years and, to that end, it would be our responsibility and duty to extend every encouragement possible.

A fellow who's too often forgotten and too long forgotten and, particularly, now, today, in view of the fact that we are in an urbanizing trend, is the farmer. He's the last person to receive increases, he's the first to suffer cuts and he's being milked left, right and centre by each level of distribution. We would stress the more direct route — encourage farmers' markets, producer to consumer, so that each of them can have some degree of a break.

A scientific, industrial research park will start at the University endowment lands in Vancouver–Point Grey so that British Columbians can learn to process their natural products and not just cut them, dig them, catch them, bag them and then ship them away. We herald the demise of the policy of extract and run. The greatest raw materials and best supply of natural energies are ours and "Made in B.C." shall become our label. Terrific emphasis shall be placed on secondary industry, with accommodation loans and area incentives for new products and processes.

Education — it's trite to say and we all agree it's darned expensive — but it's obviously our least expensive raw material for a successful tomorrow. But we have to be sure that we get true educational value out of the educational dollar. New buildings should be integrated both in design and in function for community use as well as school use. We stress that the best teachers should teach and the best administrators should administer, believing very much in the Peter principle, in that regard, and we would encourage that these lines not be crossed. We further conclude that equal pay doesn't necessarily produce equal effort or equal result, and that there should be some type of an enriched or merit pay for the better instructors. We view our public universities as organizations, which should best complement, as opposed to compete with, each other and in-depth priority should be determined between the three major universities for the teaching of the more intensive specialty courses.

A Financial and Academic Committee shall be struck to set priorities for the distribution of Government funds for all higher education and to establish consistent educational standards. Ad hoc decisions shall be replaced by long-range planning so as to enable our universities and colleges to make a more effective contribution to the welfare and future of our Province.

A fact of life is that independent schools in this Province are relieving B.C. taxpayers of approximately \$40 million, annually, of expense and are educating about 25,000 pupils. They are filling a need and they're doing a job, but they're facing crippling expenses. I say, providing they meet Provincial standards and providing they subject themselves to a degree of school board control and inspection as mutually agreed to, that assistance would be awarded to qualifying independent schools to the extent of 50 per cent of their operational costs on the basis of existing Provincial student unit cost plus normal access, of course, to all normal and usual educational aids.

Concerning pension investments, you'll be asked to consider amendments to the pension statutes in order to provide fair and more contemporary return to all of those who have contributed. We view that the investment portfolios of all of these B.C. Government-administered pension funds should be carefully examined and that a B.C. Pension Investment Committee, once again separate from Government, be established to furnish investment counsel in order to pave the way to change that the existing Portfolios will not be based on almost total concentration of one investment but to a broader base for greater security.

We strongly support the views of the Canadian Dental Association and the Canadian Medical Association, the U.S. Public Health Service and the World Health Organization that community fluoridation is very needful. This decision should continue to be that of the community concerned but, for consistency of democratic choice, we propose to forthwith alter the plebiscite requirement from 60 per cent to a simple majority. I'd say, for reduction of tooth decay, the saving of wasteful hours of patients box-carred in the waiting rooms of dentists and for some elimination of the high dental costs, that the choice is, certainly, that of the public but it should be obvious.

In the other fields of health care, as much emphasis as possible should be placed upon prevention. Educational films of the tragic and drastic results of drug abuse should be circulated in the schools and all schools. Immunization for prevalent disease should be provided at Government cost, and speedily and without controversy, and in this regard our

[[Page 229](#)]

Minister of Health would be on call at all times. For the sick, we would have open operating theatres and have them available seven days a week. We would construct more convalescent and recuperative facilities and many small and pleasant extended care centres, evenly distributed throughout the Province, with a view to eliminating as much as possible the heretofore custodial aspects of chronic and geriatric assistance.

Dealing with our native Indians, no longer shall the book be closed on them. They are 45,000 in number and they're growing. This isn't the metal but it's the torch. We've got to grab it and make sure that this is, definitely, the era of emergence of the Indians and see that they have exactly the same services as the rest of our community, whether they are on their reservations or off.

An immediate set-off against the escalation of automobile insurance rates, and pending the effectiveness of the Rating Board, we would direct that a motorist shall be entitled to a discount to the extent of bank interest on any premiums he prepays or, failing that, that the insurers may not insist upon prepaid insurance. The interest in this money is a profit which should be ploughed back to the motorist. All new motor-vehicles imported into B.C. will have to be equipped with a proper bumper. It's an accepted fact that the automobile industry has not produced a functional bumper for over thirty years. It is estimated that last year, alone, in the United States over \$1 billion worth of damage could have been eliminated had a bumper been designed to do the job that it was intended to do — keep a car out of all but major trouble. We view that this gingerbread construction has got to stop and that the manufacture for obsolescence has been a safety and economic hoax of the worst order. B.C. may well be small but, to the car industry, it should deliver this caveat, "Get with it or keep out." To cut down the accident rate, we shall establish compulsory driver education in all of our secondary schools, and Province-wide compulsory motor-vehicle testing.

Welfare, properly called rehabilitation, requires total reassessment. It, certainly, requires adequate personnel and improved departmental morale and a completely new attitude to better enable recipients to acquire capacity, purpose, self-devotion and the wherewithal to leave its ranks. The Department shall become subject to total investigation by a committee of this House. Day care centres need help and they shall obviously receive it.

Leisure time is on the upswing and recreation has become a part of our healthy life. We'll stress the return to participating, as opposed to spectating, and shall incorporate programmes of instruction and guidance for that purpose.

Skagit shall be saved. Powder Mountain shall be diffused and Cypress shall proceed as a public park. I state great congratulations to the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition for his efforts. A few names have been suggested but, I think, it would be a little untoward to tag an area of such natural grandeur with a human label. You know, Barrett Bowl sounds a little too culinary to me, in any event, so we suggest that only certain of the runs be named after the more active participants in the affair. But, again, receiving first call for you, we're sure that you prefer your distaff side to be granted the honour. Hence, the most beautiful site will be fittingly called "Shirley's Run." The avalanche area will be called "Benguet Keep-off." The slalom will be named "The Council," after West Vancouver, which, really, took more turns in this thing than anyone else. The downhill, in view of its very, very accelerated rate of descent, will be appropriately called "Social Discredit." The jump will be "Kiernan's Last Leap." The slipperiest slope will obviously be known as "Alpine" and we're going to have two bunny runs — one is going to be called "Williston" and the other is going to be called "Won'tiston."

Mr. Speaker, I say, with guidance from above, and energies of this Assembly and the desire of our fellow British Columbians, all of this cannot only be done but shall be done.

This is the type of Speech from the Throne that I would have liked to have heard. We do have to remember one thing — that programmes for reform in this Province seem to be more in the ballot box than they seem to be in this Legislature. But the people are very slow to catch the Premier's programme for power, which is wither the force of the Legislature, magnify the power of the Cabinet, put the brakes on the people's access to information and permit secrecy to reign supreme, ram the Legislation through and to heck with the sifting and screening of any policies by the general public. This programme for power is, really, so simple and so obvious, it's somewhat odd that it's still rather obscure to some people. It's certainly not political magic. It is just political in mandarism.

This is it. Three Sessions of the Premier's programme for power. The first Session: catch the new boys, bring in a little innocuous legislation, no money, tighten the belt, build up the reserves the next year, harass the Liberals and ignore the Socialists. The second Session: all the contentious legislation, get it off the trays so the people aren't aroused at the polls, loosen up the money belt just enough to whet an appetite, harass the Liberals but, towards the end, start to puff a little straw into the Socialists. The third Session — this is the wondrous one: all of the motherhood stuff and the cornicopias spilleth everywhere, cool it with the Liberals, build the Socialists into the biggest menace since the days of Caligula, then he calls himself St. George, solicits public assistance and runs around the Province trying to tilt at the little straw dragon that he built himself. But the flaw, Mr. Speaker, is in the mould and the flaw is this — it is his capacity to self-destruct, because you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. One day, the big tent will fold up and disappear into the night — the sooner the better.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Surrey.

MR. E. HALL (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to perform this awesome job today of winding up this debate on behalf of this side of the Legislature. I want to pay my respects to everybody I've not had an opportunity to say hello or goodbye to. Everybody's looking very well. The second Session is here and, as the previous speaker said, this is probably the mid-Session. We're half-way through knowing each other, as it were, that is, those who have got a survival rate and, all in all, it's been a good start.

The previous speaker was brief. I thought he wrote his speech very well. I sensed he had a speech and he was looking for a role. The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is, and we may as well get this out of the way right off the bat, the Liberals don't have a role in this Chamber. In this Chamber, Liberals don't have a role as they don't have a role

outside, because they're frankly disclaiming the role that they've had before. They should remember that the person who they so frequently depart from these days — the Prime Minister of the country — is essentially the man who got them there in the first place.

[[Page 230](#)]

I noticed that the Member, who just took his seat, spoke of King Cecil I. I'm not one of his supporters, if, indeed, he's referring to the person I think he's referring to, but I notice he didn't mention President Trudeau and, I think, thereby hangs a tale that we should all seriously think about. One of the things he said, of course, and I picked this up because I'm always interested in debates on the Elections Act, that's our survival rope, you know. He talked about a 50 per cent tax levy on political donations.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no, no.

MR. HALL: That's what you said, Mr. Member. A 50 per cent tax levy on political donations... (*interruption*). It just means that those who get a lot now will just get twice as much as before to be where they are. We know which of the Parties the wealthy communities support and that 50 per cent tax levy doesn't appeal to me one bit.

In summarizing this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree with the previous speaker. I, personally, and I'm speaking purely personally now, I felt it's been a dull debate. It's been sparked only on a few occasions in the last two weeks and the cause is obvious. The cause is because of the dull Speech from the Throne. I think that the previous Member summed that Speech up and I don't intend to spend much time discussing its content, rather, the omissions and the things we've heard since.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel there has been an unreal quality to the work of the total Legislature in the last two weeks and I don't want, please, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that I'm criticizing people on the other side. I'm not. I think the House has seen an unreal quality in our debates in the last two weeks and I feel that sincerely and that all Members share this feeling. It was caused, in the main, by Opening Day and the realization that, whilst those traditional ceremonies were going on a week ago Thursday, a quarter of a million people in British Columbia were barely existing on a minimal level of employment and of income, a level below that which is classed as subsistence. I think everybody in the House feels that and I want to just interject here that, in a way of a criticism, if you like, that only one Member on the Government side of the House has talked about that problem and expressed himself in the terms of the people we're talking about as individuals. I want to compliment the Member from Vancouver Centre for doing that. He was the only Member on the Government side who talked about the individual problem. For those who are casting around looking for leadership material, I've had some experience there. I would command that maybe they should be looking in that direction (*interruption*). I was successful, Mr. Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: For how long?

MR. HALL: For as long as it took you to pull the plug on the election. I don't mind admitting that, but my job was fulfilled.

Over 20 per cent of our people, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, exist below the declared poverty level and all of that was, I think, brought into sharp focus on Opening Day by the orderly demonstration that happened outside the Parliamentary buildings and, then, was brought into even sharper, tragic focus by the stupid incidents in the gallery. We've all thought about that a lot, everyone of us. We thought about it in different ways. I do want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will remember this when we think of those events, that I was the first Member of this House last year to talk about the problems outside and the growing irrelevancy and the possible confrontation. Those thoughts have been picked up by other Members in the House and I want to, particularly, commend, as I will later on, the Member for North Vancouver–Seymour, who made mention of them yesterday. I'm going to return to that point and that growing irrelevancy later.

In reporting to my constituents over the weekend and reporting to my Party Members and my family, they asked me about the Throne Speech and how it affected Surrey. I was unable, really, to tell them very much about it,

as I have said. That's unfortunate because my riding is one of the first to feel the effects of bad Government, one of the first to really feel the effects of stupid policies. Some general references in the Throne Speech will, of course, affect the good people there but there's one specific reference, and I use this to buttress my argument about growing irrelevancy and to put it where it belongs not just simply into the halls of the unemployed or the young people but all people, and this is the reference on page 3 to the Fraser River flood control programme. You know, that's a hollow joke out in Surrey, Mr. Speaker? a hollow joke. The Diking commission out there has given up long ago because they have seen no action, only these empty statements in the Throne Speech, and the empty promises in the Budget Speech, and the lack of expenditure flowing from the estimates. They discussed it at the failure of the joint programme and they've joined the ranks, those farmers, those pioneers, out in the Surrey area, have joined the ranks of the people who feel this growing irrelevancy that Members are referring to.

The other reference in the Throne Speech, of course, moving from the general to the specific, was in the matter of welfare rates. In my riding, Mr. Speaker, I've seen this cost increase over three-fold during the past three years from \$4 1/2 million to \$15 million. \$4 1/2 million to \$15 million, a burden that's caused a revolt in the Municipal Hall and in the Aldermen. The Council threatened to withhold payments. They've gone through the UBCM. They've again threatened to withhold payments and, now, they're saying that they're going to have to use their welfare money to pay for the snow removal costs in that municipality. That's how disorganized the policies of this Government have made the municipality of Surrey. That's how the silly behaviour of this Government has caused an equally stupid reaction on the part of that municipality.

In looking back over the past ten days, I think of some of the comments that have been made by some of the Government backbenchers during the debate. The Member from Delta referred to a wasteful educational programme. He's talking about the money that goes into it and the fact that we are not getting, I suppose, the delivered dollar value. Both the Members from the Peace River area talked about poor roads and the way that the Government had forgotten the North. The Member from the Cariboo was a critic of the PGE and he said they were causing pollution and he agreed, I think, with me about the absurd welfare formula. The Member from Centre said that the Government was, essentially, asleep, looking at statistics, and he wanted the public works programmes now and he complained about a dog-in-the-manger attitude over Provincial land in the city. In Richmond, the Member there complained about the signs of a police state and he believed that this Government, this Provincial Government, this little Government, had a role to play in curbing inflation. He talked about energy credits. I

[[Page 231](#)]

haven't had a letter since my television appearance last week from the Member in Prince George, who has the same idea. I think we should get you two together, then, maybe, I'll understand what you're both talking about. It seems to me that the Member from Oak Bay was talking about a wasteful health programme and then we had an interesting admission from the Member from Vancouver South, that's the Second Member, that we were told to cut back on public works programmes.

I just register these as we go past as being some interesting comments in the speeches to date. Then we had the really big admissions, Mr. Speaker, we had the admissions of mistakes by the Cabinet. We had the statement from the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, the Minister for Pollution, that they've really been doing it all the wrong way around. That's what we've been telling him for a long time. We've been telling him, since I've been in this House, that the pollution programme was the wrong way around, that the time to talk about pollution is before the development goes in not after you've done all the work. I'll return to that when I deal with Utah Mines. But, at least, he's realized that the total effect of development has to be measured in social, cost-accountancy terms and that's got to take place before the first sod is turned or the first electric cable goes in.

The Attorney-General admitted he's now realized the truth that, if the public is forced into a compulsory insurance scheme, the public must be protected and not gouged, and that the public has the right to see the justification for any increase before such an increase is rammed down their collective throats. I think we've still got a ridiculous insurance plan, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think we should be satisfied until we see a complete Government-operated, compulsory auto insurance scheme. That's been up as an issue for a long time and I suggest the Government will eventually get around to that.

Last year every single Member spoke about pollution and I want to share some experiences with you, Mr. Speaker, because I've been up in the Port Hardy area on a couple of occasions attending the hearings that were held in connection with Utah Mines. The last two times I went up there to attend hearings, I was the only Member of the Legislature there. I missed the Member of the riding, I suppose, in a personal way, and I thought that he would have been able to have got there and found out what was going on. But I wanted to tell him that the report we got from the Minister wasn't entirely accurate. The facts, as I understand them, are that the application was to discharge this incredible figure — 9.3 million gallons of effluent per day — that means, Mr. Speaker, for every year, we're going to flood an area that would be equal to 20 square miles to the depth of one foot — 20 square miles to the depth of one foot. Half of that effluent, half of that incredibly sized area that will be flooded to one foot, contains in it by weight suspended solids with cyanide, zinc and other reagents.

Now, the Minister said that there were no scientific facts, really, presented at the hearing. Well, I was there, and he wasn't. I want to tell you that, if ever the young people of British Columbia should have been proud, it was the day a young fellow, called Mr. Moore, stood up at those hearings and presented real hard scientific facts to that hearing, ruled and chaired by Mr. Venables. He presented facts after facts after facts of the most abstruse and esoteric nature about tides and currents and layers. To say that there was no real scientific evidence presented there is a lot of nonsense.

The hearings themselves were held up in Port Hardy and everybody who attended the hearings had to fly into Port Hardy or get in somehow or other because nobody living in the area attended the hearings. No hotel accommodation. The Mayor, for instance, put up a number of press men. I slept in the house of the editor of the local paper. It was ridiculous. Every single hotel room was full and then we held the hearings in a hall out of town, six or seven miles out of town, having to get taxis to get there, a mile away from the nearest place where you could only get a cup of coffee, let alone a meal. The temperature in the hall must have been close to freezing, Mr. Speaker, and they lasted from 8:30 in the morning till 8:00 at night, 8:30 in the morning till 8:00 at night. The most absurd way of doing the people's business I've ever seen in my life. But interestingly enough, when we were in Port Hardy the night before they started, we were told that there was an announcement out by the Director of the Pollution Control Board that the permit was going ahead anyway, that the permit was going ahead anyway. And this was printed in the newspaper and at noon the following day after all the people in that building, in that Lions Gate Hall, I think it was, or Lions Hall, trooped a mile or so to the airport to get a cup of coffee, the *Province*, that grand newspaper... (interruption). No, no, hit the area. I watched the Director of the Pollution Control Board read this very article while sitting on a stool in the airport restaurant: "Utah Mine Go Ahead Obvious. B.C.'s Director of Pollution Control says it's obvious that the Utah copper molybdenum mining project will be allowed to go ahead." I don't know why I spent the \$72 to go up there, really. I don't know why those people went up there. The night before, when I was in the Port Hardy Hotel, I saw a fellow I knew who's in the electrical energy business. I asked him what he was doing up there and he said, "Oh, I'm doing the preliminary work for the 32 megawatt cable that's going in for the mine."

But the hearings are still on. A mockery, silly, absolutely silly, but it's true and now we've had what we understand to be a reversal of policy. Let me say, before the small group to my left gets too exercised about this, that their Minister, their pollution fighter, their brave Cabinet Minister Davis, who wants to declare a park in the Georgia Strait, he's approved it. He's approved of this scheme, so, I think, it really means that the role that the Liberal Party has to offer in this House is having the very support cut right from underneath it.

You know, we can go into Buttle Lake...and before the Liberals start applauding the news and the speeches of the people who opposed that, remember where they stood on Buttle Lake, remember where they stood. Their leader said that Buttle was beautiful, Buttle was beautiful. All the warnings have come true. Every warning this side made about Buttle Lake has come true. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the lake may become the richest ore body in the world (laughter).

I was interested in the announcement made by the Minister about the incorporation of another Cabinet Minister in this Environmental Committee, this ecological committee. They've recruited the Minister of Health. I was surprised about that, because we've been calling for the Minister of Health to be in the pollution fight for a long time, even though he was seated only a couple of years ago. But I found out why they wanted him on. He's passed his test. He's passed that rigid test for all the pollution fighters. He passed it in Trail when he wouldn't allow the

public or the public health officials to know what the real readings were about smoke emission in the city of Trail... how he moved the

[[Page 232](#)]

machines that registered the pollution in Trail and they can't get them back. Once you've done that, you're a natural to be on the Pollution Control Committee (*interruption*). You're a natural. No reports allowed and the public health office is not to announce or to see the readings. The policy on pollution and environmental defense has got to be fairly simple. It's got to be tough and, most important, it has to be backed up by some desire. That's really, all we're asking for. The mechanics of the thing aren't that difficult. It's the absence of desire that bothers me. A number of principles occur to us. One is that the rate of return to people measured in social as well as economic terms must be the guiding principle of any development. That's simple, it just needs some desire. We, on this side of the House, reject the concept of growth for growth's sake. You can't condense that down into any fewer words, Mr. Speaker. All it needs is some desire and commitment. We must insist instead.... I'll start that over (*interruption*). That's right. That's like a Social Credit Caucus meeting — sterile atmosphere.

Establishment of this principle calls for, instead, that we should insist on development policies that will improve the quality of life and to eliminate unjust economic conditions. We've proposed the establishment of an Environmental Control Department or Council, independent of Government and industry. If we provided such a Council with funds, they would have the general responsibility of mobilizing the best scientific and social knowledge about the state of our environment. They could identify and plan the needed research and they could provide the Government and the public with information on the problem. We suggest that the Government really do what they said they were going to do and, that is, to build a central planning agency of the Government which will, as a continuing function, assess the long-term environmental effects of all the Government programmes. We should require that all the new large-scale developments, as well as the new chemical and technical innovations, be evaluated for their effect, their overall effect, on the ecology before their introduction. We should set up a monitoring system and we should leave it to measure, to analyze and to report changes in the environment and provide early warning. We should establish and enforce the standards of those permissible levels that that technical committee tells us are safe.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, about unemployment. We had a debate one evening on unemployment. I mentioned, at that time, the kind of debate I would like to have seen. I think we can all agree on the Federal failures and there's no point in just kicking them around forever and ever. Their failure is complete and total and a shocking disgrace. I expect the Minister of Municipal Affairs to follow me to canvass well that particular aspect. He'd be less than the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if he didn't. But there is a Provincial role, Mr. Speaker. Funnily enough the Minister of Agriculture, an awfully silent Member of the House, admitted that there is a Provincial role. So did the Member from Vancouver Centre. The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is not that they haven't done anything about it but that they can't see that they should and could. That's the tragedy.

Their role is, of course, to prime the economic pump by public works to encourage and to guide — and they can bring pressure. We have seen the pressure this Government can bring on anybody it wants to bring. They can guide and they can encourage by pressure on the private sector. They can do what some of their antecedents did during the wars, where we saw mobilizations of effort. I don't need to spend much time on how that can be done. There should be some fact-finding going on. The Labour Committee, Mr. Speaker, should be called into action.

I regret to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that this morning we attempted to get a motion into that committee, that would have seen the Labour Committee moving forward, that would have said that the Standing Committee on Labour should meet each week, in accordance with long-standing practice, to hear representations on matters concerning labour which the public may wish to submit, that we invite representations from employer and employee organizations concerned with collective bargaining, that we get down to some work, that we find out what's going on.

From 1930 to 1935, there was 14 1/2 per cent unemployed. We're fast approaching that figure, fast approaching that figure, and I share the concern of the Minister of Industry and Trade Developments over truthful figures. He said he doesn't know what they are but thinks they are inflated. I'm sure he's right. I'm sure he's right. I

don't want to casually toss figures of 99,000 about, but I feel we should know. I feel we should know what kind of unemployment, what skills are being underemployed, what age groups are involved.

I'm told, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that over 13 per cent of the under-twenty work force is unemployed. That's a tragedy. How can the Minister of Education go around building schools, opening schools and saying what a wonderful Province it is and what a future you've got, when 13 1/2 per cent of the people under twenty are unemployed? I joined with the Minister, I praised him, I think, six months ago, for opening new schools and seeing the new things that are going on. Schools that are too late, I might add, but, nevertheless, they're there. How can we look those people in the face when 13 1/2 per cent of them are unemployed?

There's an increase, Mr. Speaker, a 60 per cent increase in the number who have been unemployed for over six months. Now, it's one thing being out of work for two weeks. It's one thing being out of work for four weeks. You can make do, you can borrow a buck from your uncle, you can cash something in. But when you are unemployed for over six months you're down the tube. This Government should be finding out what's going on and we're not doing that. The Minister of Labour is adding fuel to the flames every time he stands up and opens his mouth. By continuing to tackle organized labour in this Province he is adding fuel to the confrontation. I don't mind him privately getting up-tight. I'd get up-tight, too, if I were him, but he's got an extra role to play. Leave the hatcheting to your backbenchers about organized labour, Mr. Minister of Labour, and you play the role in the middle — the neutral role. Have your private thoughts but not your public utterances, because the day is coming when the goodwill of this Government is going to run out if you're not careful, Mr. Minister, and your continued attacks on organized labour in this Province are doing your Government no service whatsoever. Similarly, the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources can't resist getting into the act every now and again. Six months ago, he told the IWA, "Don't bother asking for any more money, it's not there." What right has he got to say that and how does he know? Now, he's told us, a week ago, that the cut is down, the inventories are up, look for short time working. You might not have said it in that many words, Mr. Minister, and I don't accuse you, of all people, of insincerity, but I do say that your role as a Cabinet Minister demands that you refrain from that kind of statement. Take advice from your Leader,

[[Page 233](#)]

who doesn't make that kind of mistake (*interruption*). That's right. I might come to those later on.

There was a \$64 million surplus and we drew back on public works. Public works were halted, yet the surplus was supposed to be for a rainy day. All the pension funds were in Hydro, none of that magic bookkeeping, none of that transference last year, none of those magic fingers in the till moving and ladling the money around so we could do the work. Just static. The borrowings, the school borrowings went from \$76 million in 1967 to \$70 million in 1970. That's cooling it off. That's Trudeauism and the Premier did exactly the same thing as the Prime Minister of this country. The hospital boys went from \$20 million in 1968 to \$6 million in 1970. That's cooling it off. The NHA housing — and maybe we'll hear something about housing from the Minister of Municipal Affairs — NHA Housing, the last full year, 1969, we've picked up half a million dollars from Ottawa, half a million dollars, and Ontario picked up 8.8 million dollars. That's hardly doing our thing.

The morale of the people who are unemployed is important and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that you're not going to improve the morale by having headlines in the paper that says ten thousand jobs and then having them find out that it's a myth. When asked about these ten thousand jobs, the Member of the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen said, "It was statistically relevant to say that ten thousand jobs existed." What on earth does he mean by "...statistically relevant to say?" Were they there or weren't they there? What an answer to a guy with qualifications that goes for a job to say that, "There are ten thousand jobs but they're statistically relevant." He went on to say that they existed when the turnover, through retirements and promotions, was taken into consideration. Then, when he left the PAB office, he said, he realized that he was being offered a hypothetical job. That's a lovely thing to do to the morale of the unemployed in this Province. You know, ten thousand jobs rings a bell somewhere. Weren't we going to lose ten thousand jobs one time and something happened? That figure seems to be stuck in the Ministers' craw.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, instead, like Manitoba, we put into the pot our 10 per cent share for housing, like they

have done, \$55 million — that's what they've done to build, in their case — and we can match it for 3,650 housing units. I propose, like Manitoba has done and that's not one of those half Provinces that I hear about so much, to put into the kitty for municipal works programmes \$6 million. Surely, we can find \$6 million over there somewhere. That's what Manitoba did.

Another idea I might suggest to the Minister of Education and to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Labour is to open up the education system right now for the unemployed. Open it up. Fix it up through agencies or night schools or adult education or the universities, get some task force going so that, at least, those people unemployed can learn during this period of forced idleness. Many of them will want to do that. I see no signs you even believe that they exist out there. There should be a ban on overtime. We should accelerate the public works programme, we should use the Labour Committee and, I think, we should have an immediate conference on housing. I know that sounds like a typical politician's statement — a conference on housing — but I've got some confidence in that Minister because he's really on the campaign trail. I think he could share a conference and come up smelling like a rose, having the decisions made, and make himself the hero of the hour, the hero of the hour. Get the decision-makers in one room, Mr. Minister, and we can get some housing going. All the lumber in the world at the cheapest possible price, with most of the carpenters in this Province unemployed, with lots of Crown land and we can't build houses. You've got to be a genius to do that, a genius to do that.

The side effects of unemployment though, Mr. Speaker, are welfare and I've illustrated the effects in Surrey where there are other problems. I just want to mention one because it's more than a passing interest. I understand the Minister without Portfolio talked about it — it's the question of deserted wives. I just want to say, and I've lost the Minister of Labour and the Attorney-General, again. I guess he's gone. I want to see that this problem is solved because the pattern of prosecution of husbands who have deserted wives and *vice versa* is so varied, so incredibly different from one area to the other that suspicion is aroused in the minds of both parties involved. My suspicions are aroused, too, in terms of the efficiency and strength of the family courts. I will refer, I guess, to that when the Attorney-General is up for estimates.

We've had the problem in Surrey, Mr. Speaker, of the private hospitals. I want to be careful what I say because, I understand, that there is still a lawsuit going on. I do want to say this — that the municipalities won't pay the rate that the private hospitals want, that the Welfare Department won't pick up the difference, the Council that I am involved with, naturally, the Surrey Council, has lost one case, won another and now it's gone further up the lists. In the meantime, they are not paying the money. Now, I appreciate that there may be legal reasons why they don't want to pay the money, but I'll tell you what else is happening and that is that the people on social welfare in the private hospitals in Surrey aren't even getting their comfort money. The Council and the Social Welfare Administrator are so wrapped up in this silly, legal problem that the elderly people who are trapped, as it were, are locked into those special nursing homes, those rest homes, aren't even getting their \$10 comfort money. That's pretty grim. I raised this over and over again with the Department and with the doctors involved who have put patients there, and it's a sad case of bureaucracy just running rampant over innocent people.

I think we're still due an explanation, Mr. Speaker, about the tax proposals of the Minister of Rehabilitation. I suppose we may have to wait until the Budget Debate for that, but I'm sure we're all curious to know the full details of the way he's managed to take one part of the Carter Report and one part of the White Paper and mix them up and come up with another report so that apparently a dollar is a dollar only when you are on social welfare, only when you are on social welfare.

I want to turn my attention for a second to education. In Surrey, we're now the third biggest district, according to the last report. Our problems are those of a growing municipality and the main problem it faces right now is the whole question that surrounds the assembly of land for these schools. In Surrey, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the acquisition of fifty school sites in the next six years. Fifty new schools in six years. That's got to be on today's prices, I suppose, in terms of land acquisition costs and building — somewhere in the order of \$40 to \$50 million. Yet, in the north end of the riding, where the crowded area is, already, I am hearing people, taxpayers and officials and so on, say that we can't afford the price for the land, that maybe we should build up, maybe we should cut off playing fields and so on and so forth. I can see the beginnings of the kind of decision

that must have been made years ago that saw two-storey schools built in Vancouver without playing fields. The east end getting the dirty end of the stick, or the pointed end of the stick, and the good schools going on the west side. I don't want to see it happen in North Surrey because I believe that a child in North Surrey is entitled to exactly the same as the kid in South Surrey and I want to impress upon the Minister of Education the problems of that growing area. The Surrey-Delta-Coquitlam area is the fastest growing in the Province. We all make that claim but the facts are in on that area, to the north of the river and to the south of the river. The problems there are going to bedevil this Government over the next year until, perhaps, there's a chance for a change of Government. I want to make sure that you're well aware.

I was going to deal at some length, Mr. Speaker, with the finance formula. I believe it's got to be changed. I think it's had a levelling down effect but I'm going to leave those comments to another debate, perhaps, the educational estimates.

May I just say, however, in passing, that the disaster that's been caused by Bill 86 will haunt this Government and the record of this Government for a long time.

Well, the Minister's shaking his head so I'm tempted to go on with my analysis of the financial formula. The fact of the matter is, that if you do go over 110 per cent, that's one thing, and all seven referendums that have gone up to now have been turned down, but the insidious thing about it is the budgeting of the school boards to make sure they get nowhere near that 110 per cent in the first place, that's a debilitating effect even before the budget's in.

We're starting to get education on the cheap. That's the *modus operandi*. We've seen "lighthouse" districts go down as disaster areas. The school boards aren't fighting the referendum defeat. In West Vancouver, and mind you I admit I'm not from West Vancouver so I guess I can say this with a great deal of freedom, I think that some fat could have been trimmed off. That's right, I think you'll agree with me. But then, when you've trimmed the fat off and that's fine, when you see probationary teachers have lost their jobs, that teacher aides were fired, that experimental science programmes and language programmes were emasculated, that audiovisual services were curtailed — that's not trimming the fat off, that's cutting the legs off, that's gutting it, Mr. Minister.

I submit that the arbitrary formula has had a devastating psychological effect on the school boards, which now tend to budget below the 110 per cent and to reduce their provisional budgets to a figure within the 110 per cent. How many kindergartens have been introduced since Bill 86? Class sizes have increased, teacher aides have been reduced in number, pupil transportation has been cut, educational leave has been denied and teachers and supplies have been reduced. Those are facts.

Another weakness in the formula is the fact that grants to school districts are based on the average expenditure of all districts in the Province and the averaging takes no recognition of the very real differences that must occur between school districts. Some rural districts have transportation costs, urban districts have got special educational costs, yet the grants treat everybody the same. The worst effect of the average grant is that the "lighthouse districts", which have had the courage to introduce educational innovations, educational experimentation — and I believe we should control educational experimentation, I really do, we should have measurement programmes — but the fact of the matter is they are being punished by being forced to budget down to an average.

The philosophy behind the formula, Bill 86, two years ago, is the philosophy of keeping expenditures down rather than the want of providing the best possible education. The Government brought it down in a bookkeeping, cool it, save the line, sort of mood. They wanted to arrest the alarming rate in the increase of spending in educational function. I will say this, I believe that was your motivation and you've succeeded. You really have. The gross operating cost per pupil increased by 10 per cent from 1967 to 1968, but it only increased by 8.6 per cent from 1968 to 1969. So you held the line. You really did, but at what a cost! I submit that that cost is too great to pay in an effort to hold that kind of line. There have got to be better ways of doing it.

The last thing, and this may be construed as some personal criticism — I have some reservations about the discretion that's afforded the Minister of Education in setting out the size of the instructional unit, because I feel that

the Minister is too busy bookkeeping, he's busy averaging the formula instead of getting down to the real analysis of what's going on in the school districts.

The group on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, this year, have allotted me a new task and, as a non-lawyer, I'm to investigate and look into the activities and the programmes and the bills and the acts that surround the Attorney-General. I believe it's a blow for freedom for the non-lawyers. I have just a couple of points for the Attorney-General during this debate and one is, maybe, a question couched in ignorance. It's this, "Why is the Law Reform Commission taking so long to do what essentially seems to be a simple job? What are the Law Reform Commission's priorities?" Another question, "Mr. Speaker, are they examining any of those dusty reports that are in the Attorney-General's office?"

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, too, and, through you, to the Attorney-General, why the House can't address itself to the problem of young offenders instead of leaving it to the lawyers? I believe that we should have, this year, a special committee of the House set up, a select committee, I don't know what the names are, to go into the whole problem of young offenders instead of leaving it to the lawyers. I admire and think that lawyers have a great deal to offer in this connection but, I contend, that as practicing politicians, as parents and as citizens we might have some better ideas than those that have come forward so far.

Again, to the Attorney-General, on page 4 of the Throne Speech, there is reference to motor carriers and safety. The fact of the matter is that, this last year, the rate of accidents that have involved large vehicles has climbed to such an extent that it's a National and Provincial disgrace. We have killed more truck drivers this last year in this Province than you can shake a stick at. Truck after truck has gone down a canyon. We've hit railway crossings — three of them in my riding alone. The police in the units that the Minister of Highways knows well, 401, 499, can tell you of case after case after case where truck drivers have been asleep at the wheel, through long hours. The Federal Legislation that was passed is a mockery, I'll tell you that, a mockery. And, again, I want to implore the Attorney-General to get down to some brass tacks on the question of the size of the vehicles, the speed of the vehicles, the safety programme of the vehicles, the hours the men work and the regular inspections. We're going to go the same way the States has gone in terms of size,

[[Page 235](#)]

without following their route in terms of inspection. I was pleased to have the Minister of Commercial Transport tell me that they've refused the CPR application to go for triple trailers. I hope that refusal is current for this year. If it is, Mr. Speaker, to you, Mr. Minister, you're the first Minister that's ever refused the CPR anything in its life. I congratulate you for it. I've been trying to arrange an appointment with the Attorney-General on this. I'm not criticizing him. He's had some problems these last six months and I hope to see him during the Session.

The Speech from the Throne, and I refer to that document again, Mr. Speaker, you realize, of course, was read by a tenant. His Honour, the tenant, said that all was well in the field of landlord-tenants, that there has been a tremendous improvement in relationships between them. If that's so, Mr. Speaker, how come there's a special magistrate in the Small Debts Court handling all the problems? How come Mr. G.R. Levy is doing nothing else but handling landlord and tenant grievances in the Small Debts Court? I want to make some suggestions and I will do, at a later date, to improve the *Landlord and Tennant Act*. I want to make sure that the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province gets the full protection of this Act so that when the tenant makes his Speech next year he will really be able to say that he's protected against landlords.

A passing note about protection and safety, Mr. Speaker. I noticed, because I happen to live near a ferry terminal, that all last fall and this winter, in the Tsawwassen area, we've experienced interruptions in the ferry service. More interruptions than I can ever remember before. My memory I don't present to you as fact, but I can't remember as many interruptions in the ferry service, particularly with the stretched ferries during high tide and high winds. I can only assume that the ferries that have been stretched have presented a problem to the crew and to the docking crew that is just insoluble at times of high tide and high winds. Perhaps, the good Minister will share with us the reasons for that and also acquaint the House of all the factors, the recommendations and the rules which may or may not, which should or should not, have been instituted since that tragic collision in Active Pass.

The use of our resources in our land is a subject, Mr. Speaker, that's going to be debated continually in this House because the difference between the Parties in this House is never quite so marked as it is during debates on resources and land. The Member for Dewdney castigated Ottawa. He likened the Province, that is, speaking through Liberal eyes, as a goblet to be drained. The fact is that British Columbia, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is a goblet that is being drained by anybody who comes along the road and meets the Minister of Recreation and Conservation or his colleague from Lands and Forests. The two policy speeches by those Ministers at the Social Credit Convention are documents of simplicity. They spelled out their policy. I'm not going to read them. I can't bring myself to read them. They simply adopt the posture that all is for sale on the customer's terms and if there's any problems about licenses, about boundaries, about fees, claims, access or competition, they'll fix it up for you, they'll fix it up for you. The same goes, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, for some of the things that the Cabinet does in terms of zoning and interference with regional districts. Much has been mentioned of that. I wish the Ministers involved would leave some of these districts alone and leave them to make their own decisions. I simply ask, again, in reference to that, why won't the Premier keep his promise made two years ago regarding highway development, regarding the public lands along the highways, with public bidding on that type of land that's been made more valuable by expenditures of public money? It's a simple statement of principle and we expect the Premier to keep that promise.

The Member for Cowichan-Malahat stunned the Minister of Recreation the other day, causing him to leap to his feet because he read out an old letter, a letter from the British Columbia and Yukon Chamber of Mines. Well, I got a letter yesterday from the same organization and, I think, it is another one of those gems that we'll be hearing about for a long time to come. They sent me a letter. It's a carbon copy, or at least a printed copy, of the letter they sent to the Minister of Mines. Here's the B.C. Chamber of Mines complaining because the B.C. Wildlife Federation and the B.C. Federation of Agriculture have asked for revision of the British Columbia *Mineral Act*. They accuse these associations of seizing upon a controversy between the mining and park interests in the East Sooke area in an effort to promote their own interests. Here's the B.C. Chamber of Mines accusing the B.C. Wildlife Federation, and the B.C. Federation of Agriculture have accused them of going before the Government in an effort to promote their own interests. That's a shocking thing to do. I've had more stuff from the B.C. Chamber of Mines promoting their own interests than any other single group. If I filed all I've got, complaining about taxes and all the rest of it, from the B.C. Chamber of Mines I could fill one of their holes. It goes on to say that it is presumptuous of these two associations, which are not knowledgeable in mineral exploration and mine development, to recommend to the Government changes in an Act that only indirectly involves them. It's presumptuous, according to the B.C. Chamber of Mines for the Wildlife Federation and the Agricultural Federation to talk about mineral exploration. Obviously, any recommendations that these associations make, it continues, will be biased in their favour. Now, I know the B.C. Chamber of Mines is a real fair outfit, a real fair outfit. They've no bias. It finishes up, later on, by saying that damage done by mining to the environment of British Columbia and, especially to agricultural wildlife, is of a minor and temporary nature. I don't know. That's from one of the most incredible letters I've ever received as an M.L.A. (*interruption*). Of course, they are. It's the language that they use in it when they talk about other people. It's the most remarkable document I've seen — to suggest that it's presumptuous of other associations to interest themselves in the parks of this Province, in the agriculture of this Province and the things that go on, having seen the record of this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss if I didn't make some mention to the House of the Minister who follows me today, because, of course, I can't speak after he does. I find him congenial. I find him helpful, a keen debater. I have, as I mentioned, spent a little bit of time in his riding, recently, and I learned how industriously he's seeking special status for the north end of the Island, how industriously he's seeking that definition of a depressed area — the kind of thing they did for the Okanagan a while ago. He's learning from his Leader, and he, no doubt, seeks the same kind of bonanza that we've seen in the Okanagan. He's seeking the same kind of bonanza that we've seen in the Okanagan and his role, perhaps, isn't that of Mr. Cartwright, perhaps, it's Hoss, but, more probably, Little Joe. I had prepared a motion privately, Mr. Minister, today, based on a motion of nonconfidence, as it were, based on our lack of confidence in

the Attorney-General. As I'm the last speaker, I need a seconder and I wondered if you'd indicate whether you'd sign it or not. The Minister used to be fleet of foot. But since the Buttle Lake disclosure, he's become leaden-footed but I

do wish the Minister well. I am looking forward to his speech. If he requires any advice on his leadership campaign, he has only to ask. I've got some experience that might be of some use to him. I look forward to meeting with you later on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish up by saying and returning to a most serious note, a note that...*(interruption)*. You're reacting well, you're reacting well.

Mr. Speaker, seriously, I want to return to the question that was raised last year and, again, this year. We had an eloquent address yesterday. An eloquent address from the, I suppose I've got to call him the small 'I', Liberal Member from North Vancouver–Seymour. During that address, he denounced his Federal counterparts and he's assumed a more individualistic position. But, before we become too sympathetic towards him in his loneliness, we should remember that he has been joined by a large group of young Liberals who win vote the following way. Five per cent of them will vote NDP Federally, and 13 per cent of them will vote NDP Provincially. So, before we get too sympathetic, he's got a lot of company, Mr. Speaker *(interruption)*. There won't be 13 per cent *(interruption)*. I don't know, I have it here. It's printed in the paper *(interruption)*. Oh, the editor here. The editor — Mr. Rick McGeer. It's a Rick McGeer *(laughter)*. We'll have to find that out. It will be interesting. We heard a week ago about referenda on everything but it seems to me there had better be another referendum on the whole existence of the Provincial Liberal Party.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, and I want to return to my...*(interruption)*. You'll have your turn when he speaks. You've to get after him, you know. He's running ahead of you.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I first uttered the part about irrelevancy and what was essentially contained in that good Member's speech. I want to applaud him for it. Seriously, we can joke about some of the other things but I'm as concerned as he is because of what we observe all the year round. We know of the growing pressures that are outside this Chamber, the pressures in society. We know of the calls for change and the hoots of derision and, let me say, just as a matter of record, that the hoots of derision that I got on Opening Day outside from many of those demonstrators, were because, I think, they felt that my person represented an elected Member who was irrelevant, as we all are irrelevant in the system as they see it today. This charge of irrelevancy, this charge of derision, these calls for change come from people, unfortunately, whose ranks are growing and they're growing, Mr. Speaker, because they see a vacuum developing in the Province. They really do see a vacuum developing in the Province. The Premier used to be able to spot these forces. He used to be able to observe these forces and make the adjustments and the changes to accommodate and to gather them unto himself. But he doesn't spot them any longer, when he puts his faith in his wiring system. He says, Mr. Speaker, that he's plugged into God.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. HALL: The Premier of the Province.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (South Okanagan): I never said that.

MR. HALL: You're reported as saying that, Mr. Premier. That must be why the native peoples of Athabasca....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member will accept that statement.

MR. HALL: I accept it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Don't keep repeating it. He's not repeating it.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly withdraw that statement. It's been current for a year. If he wants me to withdraw it now, that's fine. I withdraw it. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Premier and the Cabinet are falling straight into the occupational disease of long-lived governments and that is, namely, arrogance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: oh, oh, oh.

MR. HALL: You've been there too long. When you realize what's happened to the native people of Athabasca and you read in the paper that the damage to their environment, to their hunting and to their livelihood has been done by an act of God instead of by the Bennett Dam, the connection becomes rather obvious. The Premier has lost his touch, in my view, and his forgetfulness is now obvious. You should listen to some of the people who go out in the constituencies, Mr. Premier, and you'll observe those vacuums growing, with the touch that you have.

Seriously, I believe what the Member said yesterday about hate. I think the Premier, too, applauded that statement, yesterday. I reject the concept of hate, Mr. Speaker. It's too often shown itself over the last two weeks, but I can describe my feelings about the Government without that kind of excessive language. It's not hate. I want to describe my feelings about the Government to you, Mr. Speaker, as I close this debate — on what I feel. It's not hate, but it's anger at the opportunities that have slipped this Government by. It's not hate, Mr. Speaker, but it's despair at their lack of understanding of the problems of the day. It's not hate, but sorrow at what they continue to do to the rights and practices of this House. And, lastly, Mr. Speaker, it's not hate, but determination to sweep them away before they do any more irreparable damage to this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret we will have to support the Speech from the Throne on its merits.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. D.R.J. CAMPBELL (Comox): Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be able to take my place in this debate after having waited patiently for some time. I'm delighted to follow my good friend from Surrey, who managed to put together an hour and twenty minutes of an unserious speech and then mentioned that he was going to be serious for the last five minutes. That's not surprising, Mr. Speaker, because a great deal of posturing, during the last couple of weeks, has been a sham from Opening Day. The Speech from the Throne was an expression, first of all, of hope, of optimism, of forward-looking into the next decade of our Province. It's not unusual because I can remember, long before I got into the House, the main contribution to debate from the benches opposite was doom and gloom, and the black crepe paper

[[Page 237](#)]

has, certainly, been out, once again, from day one. No mention of now being a time for, psychologically if nothing else, when no other Government in the country is putting its best foot forward, a lifting up of the spirits of people in the country, something that the Federal Government, certainly, should be doing and are simply shrugging their shoulders or ignoring any questions or arrogantly turning their heads from the people of this country. Surely, it is time for a Speech from the Throne whose very description can be summed up in terms of hope and optimism. But, on day one, the sham which has followed us from that day, in terms, particularly, of the Official Opposition in this House, that Speech from His Honour — that was day one, my friend, if you don't know anything about... *(interruption)*. Were you not here? That Speech from His Honour and we had the legal adviser of the Official Opposition sitting down on the far end of the table to help the Leader. They were going to put in a little bit of effort, a little bit of a resolution that day. The legal adviser was down there to help the Leader put something on the Floor while His Honour was speaking, or after he spoke. Of course, that was not considered the politic thing to do that day. So, of course, the next day, Mr. Speaker, the legal adviser was moved from the right hand of the Leader of the Opposition down to his current position so he could help the Member for North Vancouver in his legal manoeuvrings on the Skagit Valley, because, as the Member for North Vancouver said, he couldn't trust his own legal advisers who were sitting on the Liberal benches — and that's understandable.

Mr. Speaker, on day two, once again, the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition came to his feet and he wished to interrupt the debate. Once again, he had an urgent matter of public importance. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you, in your usual way, were wise enough to tell him that he would have an opportunity at an early date to pursue this question of unemployment. In your usual helpful manner, you told him when he could do that. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you'll recall, because your memory is excellent, that the Leader had an opportunity on the first day of the week following. After two days of reflection, surely you were still of the opinion, Mr. Leader, that unemployment indeed was worth more than sham tactics and was, in fact, a problem for the individual person in British Columbia. But did you, in your wisdom, Mr. Leader, stand in your place at the earliest opportunity? Did you take the advice of the Speaker, so helpfully given, and stand in your place and do anything about it when you had the first opportunity?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, no.

MR. CAMPBELL: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker...*(interruption)*. Continuing the sham position at another date, another day comes along, and the Member for Lillooet is the person who's speaking on behalf of the NDP. What did he do, Mr. Speaker, about this very important motion that was supposed to have put forward some ideas on behalf of the unemployed in the Province of British Columbia? What did he do? He finished his speech, sat down and forgot about it, until somebody tugged his coat and said, "For goodness sake, get back, get back up." *(Applause.)* That's what he did. So, Mr. Speaker, let the people of British Columbia know that, from day one in this Legislature, the NDP Opposition in this Province has carried out a political game that can only be described as sham, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a bet with somebody that it would take me 60 seconds to get you people over there up and get lippy when the Member for Comox is speaking. Don't call me the Minister of Municipal Affairs, today. I'm speaking for the people of Comox *(interruption)*. I'll come to that, too, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some interesting things said during the speeches and, because this is a debate, I'm certainly going to mention some of them. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party is an interesting chap, when he's here. One of the interesting things that I happened to notice about his position 48 hours before the House was to come into sitting.... I suggested that the position of the NDP Opposition in this debate has been sham *(interruption)*. S-H-A-M *(laughter)*. But 48 hours before the House was to hear His Honour's Address, the Leader of the Liberal Party, on the twenty-sixth day of his effort to produce 26 mimeograph letters for presentation of the Liberal Party's policy, was delightfully on a radio broadcast saying, "On the very first day, I shall rise in my place and I shall ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs how much money the Government has put out on sewage treatment plants." Well, there's at least two things wrong with that position of the Leader of the Liberal Party. He's been in the House long enough to know, first of all, that he's asking the wrong Minister. That has nothing to do with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. But the second thing that's wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, is that he didn't do it and not only that, Mr. Speaker, *(interruption)*...not only that, Mr. Speaker, he never in the course of his address, this friend of municipality, he never mentioned municipality once. A complete *(interruption)*...a complete case of sham — S-H, for the benefit of the Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey S-H-A-M spells sham *(interruption)*. But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, there were some delightfully interesting things uncovered and, perhaps, discovered, during the course of the debate, as to the position of our friends' offices and I'm not going to uncover the whole catalogue because we all were here and listening, I know, carefully. But, I think, you'd like to be reminded of some of those positions because you may wish to repeat them later on.

Well, interestingly enough, the Member for Lillooet started things off by telling us he was going to set the coal in the Elk Valley on fire to produce power. Of course, their position on pollution is well known. I know that the Member for Kootenay took the first opportunity, because he spoke after the Member for Lillooet. The Member for Kootenay, I would have assumed, would have disabused this House of the notion that the NDP wish to set the Elk Valley on fire. I can only assume now...

AN HON. MEMBER: The Hat Creek coal.

MR. CAMPBELL: ...You want to burn the Hat Creek coal, now. Is that your position? *(laughter)*. That's interesting, too. Thank you very much, Mr. Member, for your position. This is understandable — fair is fair. The Member for Lillooet is going to burn the coal in the Member for Kootenay's riding and the Member for Kootenay is going to burn the coal in the Member for Lillooet's riding *(laughter)*. Thank you, Mr. Member. Mr. Speaker, there's one thing that the Member cannot resist and that is that he goes back to my description of them last year. "Yours truly," you know, "Me, too."

Mr. Speaker, I was really critically amazed at the former Leader of the opposition, the Member for Cowichan

Malahat. I counted, Mr. Member, when you were on your feet and it's unusual for you because you very often have such a broad view of things.... But, Mr. Speaker, you'll recall as he went down the catalogue of his position on such

a great variety of things, what did he do? He put it right on a personal basis and said, "I want, I want, I want, I want, I want." Now, I'm not going to tell you...(*interruption*). I'm not. Oh, no. You went far beyond that, Mr. Member, far beyond that. You know, Mr. Member, how many times you said, "I want" — 23 times. This, Mr. Speaker, is the new personality cult from the Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

AN HON. MEMBER: He still thinks he's the Leader that's why.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then we have the delightful position by the Member for North Vancouver—Capilano and, of course, he described the Skagit Valley in very detailed terms. I listened with great interest, because it's the first time, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature, that I've heard a problem described in such detail. Then the Member, and I have his exact words, "We have no problem on the Skagit because it won't happen." That's the first time I've ever heard a Member speak for half an hour and describe a nonproblem. Then, Mr. Member for Kootenay, you delighted us with the simple explanation for the disturbance in the gallery and I thank you for that. You said that the reason for the disturbance in the gallery and the demonstrations outside was power (*interruption*). Power. P-O — I'm having difficulty with the Members. I'm having to spell my speech. P-O-W-E-R, Mr. Member. I would...(*interruption*). You certainly did, Mr. Member. Then we had some delightful ideas from the Member from North Vancouver—Seymour, yesterday. He was upset that the Legislature is a place where there's talk, talk, talk, and he described himself as a "small 'I'... Liberal. It's kind of interesting that he should find it difficult to listen to debate in this Legislature. That's why we're here. A very famous "small 'I'" Liberal...(*interruption*) during the time of the difficult days of the beginning of the Third Republic in France was a chap by the name of Clemenceau. What did he have to say about parliament? He said, "Parliament is sometimes a very inconvenient place but silence is much worse." But, perhaps, the most incredible thing of all that the Member had to say yesterday, was that he has his understanding of parliamentary democracy in the concept that he or I or anyone else in this Legislature is here by appointment — that he's appointed to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Legislature belong to a very exclusive club, because all 55 of us, including yourself, Mr. Speaker, are elected by the people and not appointed. His understanding of parliamentary democracy and the constitutional type of monarchy is far different than mine. I'll tell you that, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting, as well, during the course of the debate, and I compliment them on their speeches, in particular to hear the discussion from *Mrs. Cocke* and *Mr. Dailly* (*laughter*). They were both delightful. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it was a time for confession, as well, during the course of the Speech from the Throne. I was delighted in the confession by the Member for Atlin and, of course, that's not the only confession that's been made as to the real position of the NDP in this Province during the course of the last year. The Member for Surrey was good enough to talk about people in my area, so I don't want to disappoint him by talking about some of the people in my area and some of their views. The constant association of the NDP with rioters, dissenters, Black Panthers, liberation groups, Friendship to Cuba, to China, always engaging in criticism of our judiciary system, never failing to hold in suspicion our police departments, always concurring in any suggestion that the police acted with brutality, feeling and voicing the suggestion that any vilification of the police is humorous and acceptable, the constant praise in the *Pacific Tribune* for the actions of the Federal Leader and the 16 Federal MP's and the Provincial Members, welcoming and accepting from any source criticism of the United States, failure to recognize them as our friends and neighbours, failure to do more than set out as the conscience of various Governments, refusal to permit provisions for veterans in our policy decision.... All of those were interesting confessions in the last year, Mr. Speaker, and, perhaps, more clearly than anything else, illustrate the position of the NDP. I'm glad you asked the question (*interruption*). Well, Mr. Speaker, the person who said that was the president of the Comox-Alberni NDP Federal Riding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to just two subjects this afternoon. The first one, Mr. Speaker, has to do with this old question of environment and pollution control. I was delighted that the Member for Surrey spoke about it. I wasn't too delighted by the way he did speak about it because he, certainly, I know, unwittingly, misled the House as to what happened at the hearings (*interruption*). Is that right? Well, Mr. Member, I know that you were good enough this afternoon to talk about the position of importance of regional districts. I know that you will be delighted to share with the House the position assumed by the chairman of this particular regional district in which this hearing was held. I'll read it to you, Mr. Member, through you, Mr. Speaker, so that you will be advised that, in giving the story to

this Legislature, and I'll have something to say about another Member who was giving stories to this Legislature, I think you should tell the whole story. I'll read you the full letter and it's addressed to Mr. Venables. "I wish to thank yourself and your staff...." (*Interruption.*) The date is January 8, 1971. It's on the letterhead of the Regional District of Mount Waddington. "I wish to thank yourself and your staff on behalf of our Board for the enjoyable and informative meeting which we had with you on your recent visit here." The Member from Surrey left the impression that there were no local residents there at all. This is completely false and the Member knows it. "Meetings, such as this, help in so many ways towards a better understanding of our mutual objectives. I also wish to express our appreciation for the manner in which the public hearing on the Utah application was held. We certainly agree with: (1) your policy of holding at least one hearing in the involved area; (2) the policy of allowing anyone to attend, even though they are not officially on the agenda as applicants or objectors to ask questions; and (3) the policy of keeping cameras and microphones out of the hearing. With best personal regards. (Signed) G.F. Fernie, Chairman of the Mount Waddington Regional District."

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of pollution is an issue which, certainly, some people have some things to say about which I consider quite intelligent, and others, certainly, have done very little to advance the public understanding of this most complex question. I know the Member for Surrey, probably, is aware of some of the views expressed by a former Minister in the Labour Government when we've been talking about unemployment. His name happens to be Mr. Anthony Crossland and, I know, that the Member for Surrey,

[[Page 239](#)]

having fairly recently come from that part of the world, would have an appreciation for the intellect and intelligence of this particular man who happens to represent a constituency which is largely a working-class constituency. His views on pollution control and environmental management are exactly the same as my own. This idea that there is a possibility, first of all, that there is no growth possible or desirable, of course, is intellectually dishonest. It's the position of the elite and it is a form of elitism which is not going to do very much for the Province of British Columbia.

It is obvious, and I'll quote some of the statements made by this particular Minister. "It may well be," Crossland conceives, "if it is uncontrolled and stupidly managed, that growth is undesirable." I would agree with that. "But the real problem is to improve the environment already polluted of the poor as well as of the rich and this can only be done with the resources of an expanding, much more productive, economy." He goes on to say that his own constituents want better housing, lower housing densities, better schools, better hospitals; they want washing machines and refrigerators; they want to relieve themselves of domestic drudgery; they want cars; they want weekends in Majorca, they want the freedom they can have in terms of holidays and weekends; and they're not, as he indicates, Galbraith-sy, the bouncing-around, economist who has suddenly discovered a new world; they're not brainwashed about having these tastes; they're normal individuals who have these tastes because those things are desirable in themselves. Mr. Speaker, the idea that we can have a British Columbia without growth is intellectually dishonest, but the idea, Mr. Speaker, that we can have a British Columbia with growth and the same protected environment, at the same time, is not intellectually dishonest. That is the policy, that happens to be the policy of the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that worry me in terms of achieving that, not the least of which is quite often the studied attempt being made on the part of many people to misconstrue, as the Member for Surrey, certainly did, and others, to misconstrue the real thrust of the statements made in the Speech from the Throne, in terms of co-ordinating the activities in this complex area of the environment. Because we've already had a very clear-cut indication of how wrong it is to have resource departments of Government which don't inter-relate one to the other, or to set up environmental czars as we see happening at the Federal scene, setting up environmental czars who have already indicated that their relationship with some of their brother Ministers is either nonexistent or not wished for, in the first instance. I refer to the obvious battle going on between Mr. Davis and Mr. Greene on the Federal scene.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have gone into the communities in British Columbia, by design, and I have gone into courthouses in British Columbia, by design, and I've purposely gone down the halls of those buildings and I've asked the district agriculturist if he happened to know the forester, who was four doors away from him, and the

answer, unfortunately, was, "No." I've asked the parks superintendent in these communities if he happened to know the name of the fisheries officer of the Federal Department of Fisheries, who was down the block, and, unfortunately, the answer was, "No." I've gone in and asked the land inspector if he knew the name of the district agriculturist, who was four doors down the hall in that particular Government building, and it was not just one, it was more than one, if he happened to know his name and, of course, again, the answer was, "No." The reason for this is very simple because there's been a compartmentalization approach to pollution control and environmental management, not only in this Province but all over the world. We see the Federal people going down this foolish, foolish road, because that's exactly what it is, Mr. Speaker. When you consider that the complex problems of environment affect responsibilities within the orbit of resource departments and, certainly, the Department of Health and the overall financial management of the Province, then you begin to understand that any attempt to meet the problems of growth plus the maintenance of environment is only a sham unless you co-ordinate the activities of all those Government departments.

Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you this. This Government does not intend that our approach to pollution is a sham and a simple window-dressing or wallpaper on the wall, in terms of statutes that either won't work or there is no attempt made to study the administrative machinery that's involved in the set-up.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not just talking here in terms of the administrative apparatus and the thrusts of Government, I'm talking about the attitude of the people who have had a lot to say about environmental management and pollution control in this Province and outside. Anyone examining the speech by Mr. Davis at the University on May 29, 1970, could not help but have been struck by the seriousness of what he had to say, if he meant what he said. He's talking about several things. He's talking about the bad location of the pulp mill at Houston. One of the facts, Mr. Speaker, before I go on to say what Mr. Davis said the very next day.... The facts are that consultants were working with his department from October 19, 1964. "There is not enough water at this pulp mill," and these are exact quotes from the Minister's speech. "In the collection of data the company sought and obtained the assistance of the Federal Department of Mines, Energy and Resources, and the Department of Fisheries, starting in the fall of 1964." I won't read it all because you'll get the idea of what I'm getting at from what he said the next day. "Such a disaster," he's talking about the impact on salmon spawning; "such a disaster," he's talking about spills; "such a disaster would be simply intolerable," he said, "considering the Federal Government has just pumped \$10 million into building artificial spawning grounds on Babine Lake upstream from the proposed Houston plant." Now what's wrong with that statement? I'll tell you what's wrong with that statement, Mr. Speaker, and, particularly to the Liberal Members, through you, Mr. Speaker. It just happens to be geographically inaccurate. The hatcheries are located on the Fulton River which flows into Babine Lake which, in turn, flows into the Skeena. Surely the Minister of Fisheries, as he was at that time, should have known that simple fact before he spoke deliberately and positively on this question at the University of British Columbia on May 29, 1970. There's more. The Minister goes on to talk about the Houston Pulp Mill. Oh, if you don't want to listen, Mr. Member, you go on outside (*interruption*).

We are going to take a good long look. What did he say on May 29? "We're going to take a good long look at the site of the Houston Pulp Mill." What would his own department have done, Mr. Speaker? Well, here's the answer. "The Department of Fisheries has been kept fully informed of these developments for six years and had formally adopted the proposal for the pulp mill on April 29, 1970." Mr. Speaker, you know, when you make speeches like that,

[[Page 240](#)]

somebody's liable to ask you a few questions, particularly people who are serious, Mr. Speaker, about pollution control. Is the Minister pulling the leg of the Canadian people? Is he serious about environment or is it political charity? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence is clear and concise that the statements being made by the new environmental czar in Canada are the very kind of statements I'm talking about when I say they're intellectually dishonest. The very next day, Mr. Speaker, what happened? He had to back up, retract and tell it the way it was and, incidentally, not only tell it the way it was, tell it the way it is (*interruption*). Both. That's the point I was making (*interruption*). Both. You finally got it, Mr. Member. That's good. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, one day after this speech at the University of British Columbia...(*interruption*) I said 1970. "Mr. Jack Davis said today that he is hopeful that special problems due to the low and variable flow of the river at the Bulkley Valley Forest Industry complex at

Houston will be resolved. The company is aware of the difficult proposition they have on this site and have gone to extreme lengths to head off problems due to the river flow. Already the company is planning to do a number of things that are exceptional in the industry, such as ten-day biological treatment ponds and an extremely high measure of recycling," Davis said. Davis said the company had always worked closely with his department. "With this cooperative attitude on the part of the company, I feel we will work this thing out," Davis said. "Of course we will continue to watch the project very closely. We cannot afford mistakes on a salmon-spawning river."

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister, the new environmental czar for Canada, had stopped there that would perhaps have been excusable. But, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to make an intelligent attack on pollution control in this Province and we are, I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, particularly the Liberal Members in this House, we're going to need the cooperation of that particular Minister and a number of other Government departments at the Federal level, and it won't be for fun. It's going to be based on a proper co-ordination of activities between the three levels of Government, because it was this Minister, and the Minister who's responsible for Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, together with the Member for Alberni, who went to the first conference in Canada on environmental management, when everybody was fussing around and fiddling around with the problem, and that was in Montreal. The fundamental outcome of that conference was that it was absolutely necessary to have a co-ordinated attack on the environmental problems as between local government, Provincial Government and Federal Government. That's still our position, Mr. Member. I'm glad you're nodding your head because that doesn't appear to be the intellectual position of the present environmental czar for Canada. Here, we have some further statements, Mr. Speaker, about the closing out of B.C. pulp mills. Great, grandiose pulp closures are going to be immediately forthcoming from the Minister and "...every pulp mill in British Columbia is tomorrow morning going to be meeting certain standards," says the Minister. Of course, if the Minister says something like that, I think the people, Mr. Speaker, in British Columbia are entitled to take him at his word. Now if he's going to close the pulp mills anywhere, why doesn't he do just that? I'll tell you why he's not going to do that — he hasn't got the position. He has not taken that position, officially, in writing, as he does when he's talking to this group or that group or the other group, or he doesn't have to back up his statements, or close out a town, or work out an arrangement with pulp mills. He said, very clearly — I'll give him credit for that — that before the pulp mills that we're talking about in the Interior, and he had grace enough to say that they are the best in the world (*interruption*).... You You don't think Mr. Davis said that, eh?

AN HON. MEMBER: I didn't say that I don't think they're the best in the world.

MR. CAMPBELL: They are, my friend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the environmental czar for Canada really say? Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what he says. He signed this letter. It was written on December 18, 1970. He says as follows, "My stand is purely and simply that it is prudent to expect that all activities in this country which generate pollutants provide the highest degree of control of such pollutants as is practicable with current technology. Shortly I will be in a position...." For over two years, this Minister has been bouncing around talking about the standards in British Columbia pulp mills, inciting all kinds of weird and wonderful statements and doubts and anything you want to name, the very reverse of what proper planning should be. What does he say? This, incidentally is December 18, 1970. "Shortly...be in a position to review, with industry, the limits which we are proposing as best practicable with current technology." Get this, "With new plants, of course, I would expect the highest standards." Now, isn't that delightful? "With the older plants, of course, I fully appreciate that each mill is unique and the rate of abatement action must be negotiated over some time, mill by mill." Now, isn't that amazing?

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make crystal clear here this afternoon is: number one, there is going to be a real desire on the part of this Government to carry on, in an effective and in a co-ordinated way, the necessary technical study and research and cooperation, with not only the Federal Government but all the regional districts in this Province and it is, in no way, Mr. Speaker, helpful to that position of this Government to have these foolish and poetically-based diatribes coming from the environmental czar. Now, I want this House to be particularly clear that this is the kind of issue which gets illustrated in a very clear way in terms of the Skagit. I'm not going to talk about that at any great length here this afternoon. But we have a Member for North Vancouver-Capilano, who, I'm sure, has a connection or should have with his Liberal friends in Ottawa, and for the Minister, the environmental czar, to

assume the full responsibility for what he considers is happening in the Skagit... fine and dandy. There's great cooperation between the Province of British Columbia and that Federal Minister. He has already assumed the role and far be it from this Government to stand in his way.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment because there is a motion on the Order Paper and my friend, the Member for Surrey, in passing, talked about the importance of regional disparity legislation in my particular area of British Columbia, suggesting that I was trying to get the north end of Vancouver Island declared a depressed area. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, in British Columbia, and this was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, there's been a lot of jobs created in the last little while in the Province of British Columbia and a good many of them are in the instant towns of British Columbia, a good many of them are in the northern part of Vancouver Island, a good many of them are along High-

[[Page 241](#)]

way 16 and many of them extend up into my friends' country, who have a motion on the Order Paper having to do with the application of regional disparities to areas of fast growth.

We were talking, Mr. Speaker, about legitimate aid from the Regional Disparities Department of Mr. Marchand for areas which have proven to be of high job-generating capacity, where the immediate requirement for capital in schools, in hospitals, in sidewalks, in sewers, in water systems are immediate, and you have to telescope that capital investment into a very narrow period of time. Surely that's an understandable position. But you cannot telescope the revenue — and it's substantial the revenue that comes from those newly developing communities — into exactly the same period of time when so much of it is skimmed off long before the local authority or the Provincial authority... it's skimmed off to the Federal Treasury, Mr. Speaker, and these quickly developing communities are the very foundation for the high job-generating capacity of this Province. Mr. Speaker, the reason why we have been able to absorb more than our fair share, far beyond the natural birthrate prospects of British Columbia, why we've been able to provide jobs in British Columbia is because people who first went into those communities put the money on the line right away without a nickel's worth of Federal help. I can tell you they put an awful lot of their own money on the line and they put an awful lot of Provincial money on the line. The point I was trying to make was that the Federal Minister of Regional Disparities should make a contribution to the fast job-generating communities of the Province of British Columbia. What does the Leader of the Opposition do? He visits these communities in Northern British Columbia and I doubt very much whether it's possible to have put together in a ten-minute speech as many mistakes as that Member did. He was in the town of Houston...*(interruption)*. Let's just take a few of them, Mr. Speaker, because this is one of the high job-generating capacity areas that we've been trying to get special attention for, in terms...*(interruption)*. Special attention, not privileges, my friend, because the Federal Government will take more in revenue from those places and it will put more Canadians to work than any single thing than that Minister is doing now. And I'll prove it in a few minutes *(interruption)*. I'll prove it *(interruption)*. No, you sit down. Not one stick *(interruption)*. Mr. Speaker, the Member said, and I quote...*(interruption)*.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if the Member will be quiet I'll give him a lesson in what he should have known before he said what he said. Outside interests have come in to take away the resources but appear not to be paying adequate taxes. What are the facts? The facts are that it was at the insistence of this Department of Municipal Affairs that the pulp mill to be, and the forest complex, were brought within the municipal boundaries of that community and they're to pay full school tax and full municipal tax. Those are the facts...*(interruption)*. "Houston's Town Council is controlled completely by Bulkley Valley Forest Industry." Mr. Speaker,...*(interruption)*.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? Well, the facts are that there are seven aldermen on the council: two are appointed by the company; two are appointed by the Government, one is a senior official in my Department; and three are elected and were elected. The two people, my friend, who supported you at your meeting when you had twenty up there, were not elected in the elections in December. But, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? The facts are, and we've looked at the Minute Book since my friend was there...get the Member's statement,

"Houston's Town Council is controlled completely by Bulkley Valley Forest Industry." Do you deny that you said that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask the Government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that on the Minute Book of the Houston Council never once have the elected members of that council been outvoted. Never once. Mr. Speaker, the Member said that, in order to get jobs at the Bulkley Valley Mill, people are forced to leave their homes and surrounding areas and rent company-owned housing in Houston. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are, and this is incredible because the Member, I'm sure, doesn't know what he's... *(interruption)*... the facts are that the company owns no housing.

Mr. Speaker, the Member went through the town and he examined the situation and he came to this conclusion and I quote, "The Member was appalled at the conditions in Houston that have resulted under instant town planning." That's the statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is this Member?

MR. CAMPBELL: Who do you think has been doing all the questioning here? Who's up off his seat the most, Mr. Premier? It's the Leader over there. Mr. Speaker, did the Member in his visit speak to the Mayor? The answer is, "No." Did the Member speak to the aldermen? The answer is, "No." Did the Member speak to very many inhabitants at all? The answer is, "No." How many people, Mr. Speaker, do you think he had at his meeting? He had twenty, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, he said there was instant town planning in Houston. What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? The facts are that, as a straight gift to that municipality, there was an expenditure on engineering and town planning and the adoption of an official community plan. I wish more communities in British Columbia had an official community plan because there aren't very many that have it. But what are the facts? Bulkley Valley Forest Products produced \$200 thousand Mr. Member, for free town planning for that municipality.

Mr. Speaker, if there's anything I've done as Minister of Municipal Affairs that I'm more proud about, it is the fact that resources are being developed in British Columbia and, where they are being developed on site, young people are entitled to the same kind of schooling, my friend, in those northern communities as they are anywhere in British Columbia. They are entitled, Mr. Speaker, to go and have the same kind of access to health care as they are anywhere in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to live in housing which are not shacks, which is not the kind of shack town — which I stood up in my place, before I was Minister in this Department, and accused the forestry company in this Province, namely, at Kelsey Bay, of operating on a natural resource in this Province and providing shack accommodation for the people who worked in the industry.... Mr. Speaker, I

[[Page 242](#)]

tell you that community is no longer like that. That community no longer has shacks in it. That community has first-class housing for the people who live and work at Kelsey Bay. They have first-class accommodation at these new instant municipalities of Mackenzie, of Gold River, of Port Alice, of Port McNeill, of Fraser Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I said that there is a case to be made for regional disparities on behalf of some of these municipal areas that have been created in resource communities. They have contributed much to the fact that the Government has been able to say, as it did do in the Speech from the Throne, that this Province has created more jobs in the last ten years than any other part of Canada, bar none, if you take it on a per capita basis. Even, Mr. Speaker, if you don't take it on a per capita basis, this Province has created more jobs in the last ten years than the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, all put together.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Surrey suggests that it is a wrongful position to try and make a case for these job-producing areas in the north end of the Island. I'll tell you, Mr. Member, as long as I'm the Member for Comox I'll be making that case. Because, Mr. Speaker, in this country there's been mismanagement of capital at the Federal level on a colossal scale. The Member for Dewdney gave you some inkling of the depths of the problem and he was

only touching the tip of the iceberg, I'll tell you that. The Liberal Members in this House, as apologists for the Federal Government, should hang their heads in shame.

Mr. Speaker, apart from what my colleague, the Minister without Portfolio from Little Mountain, had to say about municipal spending through this particular department, recently, there was announced a Canadian development corporation that's going to pump a lot more capital and mismanage a lot more capital. Look at some of these arrangements that are being done in the name of regional disparity. When we ask on behalf of communities such as Mackenzie and Fraser Lake, and communities, such as Port Alice and Port Hardy, which have job-generating capacity...and what's happening across the country? I won't go through the list. There are sheets of the stuff from this department. Get a load of some of the companies that are getting special incentive treatment from this particular department. In Newfoundland, the aluminum Company of Canada....

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. CAMPBELL: \$218,000. The Atlantic Brewing Company, in Newfoundland....

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. CAMPBELL: \$170,000. Bowater — comes to British Columbia. One of the great international paper companies in the world, Bowater Newfoundland Limited, Newfoundland. Canadian Industries, C.I.L. The Canadian General Electric Company, \$5 million. Union Carbide of Canada. Nova Scotia, again. Even Stanfields Limited — heard of Stanfields? They make underwear. They're strong, in giving money to the distilleries and the breweries and they really need it, don't they? — because they have such a tough time making the market. Acadian Distilleries Limited. Michelin, the great French tire company. Gulf Oil Company Limited, \$5 million. Then we swing over to New Brunswick, the St. Ann—Mackawick Pulp and Paper Company, \$5 million. Then Irving Refining Limited, and K.C. Irving already owns a good part of New Brunswick. C. Simple, \$5 million. Another brewery in New Brunswick, Moose Head Brewery. The Irving Pulp and Paper Company, again, \$5 million. We move to the Province of Quebec. Consolidated Bathurst Limited, \$5 million. Canadian International Paper Company, \$2.6 million.

Mr. Speaker, we make a case in the Province of British Columbia for special consideration for those high job-generating communities in this Province who, on their own, have put together more jobs than the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, all put together, and what's the answer? And the Yukon, I'll throw in the Yukon. I'll tell you what the answer is, Mr. Speaker. The answer is silence from every M.P. in British Columbia, including the NDP, not just the Liberals. Silence. What is the answer, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister himself? Silence.

Mr. Speaker, we've been talking about unemployment, we've been talking about job generation, we've been talking about putting people to work and these aren't statistical people, these are real people. These are people who have jobs to do in these resource communities in British Columbia and are doing a good job if they were just given some kind of a chance, some kind of incentive. What's the matter? With an intelligent investment of capital on the part of the Canadian Government instead of these foolish hand-out policies to people in industry, who are the *Who's Who* of not only Canadian industry but international industry. It's so stupid you have to see it in cold hard print to believe it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, finally I want to say something about my annual report on the financial position of the municipality which I know the Members are most anxious to hear. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I know the Members opposite would be disappointed if I didn't observe that once again the municipalities in British Columbia have rung up the best record financially of any municipalities in Canada. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite would be most upset if the Minister of Municipal Affairs did not make his annual challenge, Mr. Speaker — if what I have said is not a fact, I'll resign (*interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, not having any intention of resigning or quitting, I want to give the Members the benefit of a little of the tail of the tape of the financial position of the B.C. municipality. Yes, it's also

the roll of the tape, too.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, B.C. taxes are considerably lower than the municipal tax picture in other parts of Canada. I have used a very simple calculation here, and to preserve the validity of these statistics that I'm going to use, I didn't dream them up myself, I had the department phone each of the Departments of Municipal Affairs across the country so I am using their figures as given by them. Of course, we're not using those prepared by the staff of our own Department. We're taking them as they are presented by our own municipal people, which is only fair.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why didn't you write?

MR. CAMPBELL: Because I wanted the information quickly for this afternoon. I knew that you would be disappointed if I didn't give it to you. On the basis of an assessment of \$10,500, the median tax mill rate in British

[[Page 243](#)]

Columbia is 60 mills (*interruption*). All purpose. The average home-owner, and it is considered to be the same in all Provinces. I'm not comparing apples and oranges — Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland — would have a total gross tax of \$630 per year. The home-owners in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, they have a kind of a *quasi* home-owner grant of \$50, but their net tax would be \$580. Ontario, which also has a *quasi* home-owner grant of \$60, the residential tax in that Province on that property would be \$570. In British Columbia it would be \$470.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, I know the Members would be disappointed if I didn't say that, insofar as capital budgeting is concerned, municipalities in British Columbia had a capital budget of \$118 million last year. This was financed: \$36 million out of current revenue; \$7 million out of reserves; and \$5 million out of direct grants from either the Province or the Federal Government. Ninety-eight per cent, Mr. Premier, from the Provincial Government (*interruption*). Two per cent, yes. Well, they are two per centers, anyway.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, \$48 million of the capital requirement of British Columbia municipalities last year were financed out of essentially current revenue or surplus or direct grants. No other area in Canada could come close to making that kind of a statement. All British Columbia municipalities are on five-year capital budgets. Ninety-eight per cent of British Columbia municipalities do not use the tax roll at all for their sewer or their water systems, but use it on a consumer basis on a self-liquidating debt basis and 98 per cent of the sewer and water systems in British Columbia are not on the tax roll, at all, but are on consumer charges.

British Columbia municipalities, and I know the Minister of Finance will be interested in this one, Mr. Speaker.... British Columbia municipalities together, and it represents an increase over the year previous, enjoy reserves and surpluses of \$94 million. Even in the face of the tight money policies of the National Government, British Columbia municipalities, in effect, added \$5 million to their reserves and surpluses last year. They were \$89 million. I'm giving the Budget Speech of the municipality.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing about that revenue surplus, because I know the Leader of the Liberal Party doesn't understand the use of a surplus, that happens to be 29 per cent of the total revenue requirement of municipal governments in the Province for any year. I'll challenge anyone in this House, once again, to find any municipal jurisdiction in this country that shows the revenue surplus position and the revenue reserve position of municipalities to be 29 per cent of the total revenue requirements of the municipality and, in addition, still have the lowest tax rate in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, there is a long, long way to go because municipalities in British Columbia are facing a growing understanding on the part of the local taxpayer that it could be even better yet. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the reasons why there is a beginning of a trend towards what I can only describe as the taxpayer revolt. Municipal politicians should watch this trend very closely because there's a fundamental reason for it, and that fundamental reason is that, in recent years, from 1965 to 1969, for example, just a portion of delivering municipal services, that is, the administrative wing of municipal services, grew, in a five-year period from \$8 million to \$18 million. Now, that doesn't represent an increase in the quantity of service, that's simply the structure that delivers

your fire protection, your street lighting, your street cleaning, your sewer systems and water systems, your road work and so on. The cost of that has gone up in five years from \$8 million to \$18 million, strictly administrative. Now, that's a total administrative structure but, because the Members opposite accused me here a little while ago of never naming names about some of these statistics, I'm going to name names today, because we have some very excellent examples of this in a very specific case.

Here in the Greater Victoria area, we have four municipalities not very far from this Legislative Chamber and, to be fair, I've taken a similar municipality because so much attention has been paid to it recently — Burnaby. I know the Members for Burnaby will listen attentively to these remarks. Mr. Speaker, I did not take the substructure, the subforeman level, the subsuperintendent level, I just took the basic cost of the bureaucratic brass, if you like, or the bureaucratic structure in the four municipalities in the Greater Victoria area. It happens to be \$875,300. In the city of Burnaby... (*interruption*), the-soon-to-become-city of Burnaby, Mr. Speaker, the corresponding administrative costs are \$384,100. Now those are the broad structural costs but, to be fair, let's break them down a little bit into the per capita cost of delivering some of the services, which are common to all municipalities, on a per capita basis, on a percentage of total expenditure basis, and on the cost per parcel basis. In every one of those, in a general way, there is far too great a disparity between the delivery costs in those four municipalities in the Greater Victoria area and in terms of Burnaby, either taken individually or collectively (*interruption*). I will. Yes, I will table them because I don't intend to give them in complete detail. As soon as I finish my talk this afternoon I'll table the whole shebang.

Mr. Speaker, just take the per capita costs alone on things such as waste removal. The total average cost in this area is \$7.05; in Burnaby it is \$5.68. Public works in this area cost \$15.02 per capita; in Burnaby \$7.86. Fire protection is cheaper on a per capita basis in Burnaby. Police protection is all of \$2 cheaper in Burnaby than it is in the Greater Victoria area. Administrative costs are slightly higher on a per capita basis but, then, when you take it as percentage of expenditure, Burnaby is lower in administrative costs, lower in police protection, considerably lower in police protection, it's considerably lower in fire protection, it's a great deal lower in public works expenditure and it's significantly lower in waste removal.

On cost per parcel, Burnaby is somewhat higher in administrative costs, again, for the same reason, parcel and per capita-wise, but, when we come to police protection on the cost per parcel service, Burnaby, and I'll give you these as final figures, \$44.88; Greater Victoria, in total, \$51.65. That's significantly higher. Fire protection \$46.46; Burnaby \$42.15, significantly higher. Public works \$48.34 per parcel in the Greater Victoria area; \$25.12 in Burnaby. Waste removal \$22.70 in the Greater Victoria area; \$18.15 in Burnaby.

Mr. Speaker, faced with figures like that, and in spite of the fact that British Columbia municipalities have a significant record of financial achievement, there can be no real question that a lot of the chatter about the need for more money could be corrected at home. There is a significant case to be made, Mr. Speaker, for saying to municipal governments, "It's all very well for you to talk about transfer payments from the Province and from the Federal Government, but put your own house in order, put

[[Page 244](#)]

your own house in order." I say that this is not the case, and, Mr. Speaker, it is not even the case as to the application of funds in municipality, when we start talking about municipal revenues and municipal expenditures. I'm not going to give all these, at the present time, but I'm going to give you some and I'll file the rest.

Here's a typical municipality. Municipality A, in this case. I won't distinguish their bookkeeping by naming them. Municipality A received per capita grant for roads, \$400,832; spent on roads \$155,000. Received for tourism, ambulance and industrial development, \$66,531, spent \$34,000 (*interruption*). Provincial Government, Mr. Premier. Municipality B received for roads, \$244,272; actually spent \$110,042. Municipality D, roads and streets per capita grant, \$105,700; actually spent \$86,974. Municipality E.... Oh, there's more. Settle down. Municipality E, roads and streets Provincial grant, \$289,008; actually spent \$213,472. Municipality G — here's a dandy — Municipality G Provincial grant, \$654,208; actually spent just under half, \$315,000.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Member, and I think you understand what I am suggesting, I'm suggesting, first of all, and I thought I made that clear, that when transfer payments go from either the Provincial Government or the

Federal Government, both those levels of Government can expect the municipality to put their house in order. That was the first point I made. The second point I made, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Cowichan-Malahat, is that when Provincial monies are distributed, as well, or monies from any other source they should be clearly indicated in the municipal budget so that the taxpayer can get a fair show as to what the story happens to be. That's the point, because to make the case anywhere else, to make the case on any other basis, is simply not telling the taxpayer the way it is.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must express my real disappointment that the Member for Vancouver East is not in his seat this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, while it disappoints me, it does not surprise me, because, Mr. Speaker, he has shown himself in the past to be a hit and run driver. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to read the press reports that the speech of this particular Member had been presented to a hushed House, as I recall the description. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that this House was not hushed at the time because of anything of importance that the Member had to say. This House...(interruption). Oh, I was here, Mr. Member. This House was sitting in silent disgust. Mr. Speaker,...(interruption). I've already had my crack at you for misleading the people of British Columbia, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the Members opposite, if you have any appreciation whatsoever for the parliamentary system, I ask you to prevail upon that Member opposite to apologize to this House (*applause*). Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go right through that sorry muckraking exercise that we had here the other day but I'm going to show, in just exactly the same way, how the Leader opposite was misleading the people of British Columbia in his little safari up north. So was the Member for Vancouver East. Sorry, the Second Member for Vancouver East. What was he doing? Let's look at some of the facts. He talked, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Vancouver East, he talked, about an industrial park in Kelowna. He tried to tell the people of British Columbia and implied that the municipality of Kelowna has done a good job on the park, and that's a fact. It is a good park, and that's a fact. So, what is the real story, Mr. Speaker? Well, the real story, Mr. Speaker, is that Kelowna didn't have the money as a municipality to put that industrial park together. The first name, Mr. Speaker, on that note of the municipality was Mr. Tom Capozzi's and the other people on that note were the Bennett family, Mr. Speaker. Here, in this Province, we get people raked and mucked around on the basis of that kind of presentation in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. I say that's got to be an abuse of Parliament, that's an abuse of Parliament.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, we heard the...(interruption). Mr. Speaker, this Member, who is a professional planner, made a point of telling this House that he was a professional planner. Mr. Speaker,...(interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, this professional planner knows the Municipal Act, or should do, as well as anyone in British Columbia, but, Mr. Speaker, this Member attempted to try to tell the people of British Columbia that there was an undercover rezoning done with respect to property in Kelowna. He told the people of British Columbia that this was done at the time of a Provincial election. He told the people of British Columbia that it was done under the table. Mr. Speaker, that is a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Minister withdraw the word, "lie."

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I will withdraw the word, "lie," Mr. Speaker. I'll just present the facts to the House.

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? The facts are that this property in question was put to public hearing, advertised public hearing, on July 2, 1969.

AN HON. MEMBER: He left that out.

MR. CAMPBELL: You had better believe it, he left that out. He not only left that out, Mr. Speaker, he left out the fact that, at that public hearing, there were, first of all, no objections. The second thing he left out, Mr.

Speaker, was that at that public hearing people representing the city of Kelowna were there. But he left something else out, Mr. Speaker, he left out three other people who happen to be the elected representatives of the particular area he's talking about. The two Members from the electoral area in which this particular property is; the other person, the Chairman of the Regional District Board who, my friend from Surrey suggests, should be listened to by this Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: You broke your word.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I gave my word to no one. I'm telling the people of this Province the truth, my friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll tell you this. As long as I'm in this Parliament, I'm going to give the people of this Province the truth. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of that regional district was at that hearing and there were no objections. Then he went on to say that there was something fuzzy going on about a

[[Page 245](#)]

water and sewer system in the area up there. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be up there in December, this past year, 1970, but even if I had not been, it wouldn't have made any difference because what are the facts? The facts are easily found out. The facts are that this particular piece of property is negotiating openly and had been doing for quite some months, long before I got there and long before the Member got there, too. Openly negotiating, not with the city of Kelowna, in terms of the water system and the sewer system, but with the Regional District of Central Okanagan.

Mr. Speaker, the Member talked about pollution in the Calona Wines and I know Mr. Capozzi, and I don't refer to the one in the House, can speak for himself. I just dislike this kind of use of Parliament.

On January 30, Mr. Speaker, the Senior Public Health Inspector for the Central Okanagan, who happens to be Mr. Fred Alcock, was on a television appearance and he was specifically asked the question about Calona Wines. What did he say? "Calona Wines Limited has made great progress in utilizing waste to the point that almost all of it is recycled in the plant." (*Interruption.*) At one time...(*laughter*).

Well, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members opposite will still continue to drink what is a very good wine, I had better explain the...of course, the Premier can speak for himself. Mr. Speaker, actually they take this stuff out, you know, when it's recycled. In any event the Senior Public Health Inspector said that 99 per cent of the problem, if there were one, had been corrected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Member who, once again, called himself the professional planner, was talking about the boundaries in Kelowna. He talked back about 1965, 1966, and all that kind of thing and, of course, what he was really saying was that the NDP have a policy for pushing people in the municipal boundaries. But, quite apart from that, if the Member had done any homework at all in Guisachan, there was a plebiscite on the question of boundaries in Guisachan in 1965. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was a very good turnout in that particular plebiscite. Mr. Speaker, the vote was 900 to 170 odd in that particular decision on boundaries.

What, Mr. Speaker, upsets me more than anything else is that the Member goes on to say that some of these things which I've mentioned and he mentioned are the worst in British Columbia. I say that, since that Member has come in here, what he has to say in this Legislature is the worst that can be said about the British Columbia Parliament. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite should prevail upon that Member to apologize because he owes an apology to the Members who sit in this Legislature, today, and he owes an apology to all those who made the parliamentary system what it is today. He owes an apology, Mr. Speaker, because this is a place for honest debate. He owes an apology because this is a place which puts fact before falsehood and he owes an apology, Mr. Speaker, because this Parliament is a place that puts integrity first. Mr. Speaker, if his Party won't do it for him and his Party won't take a message to him, I'm going to tell you as I sit down that, if he'd been here, today, my last words

would have been, "I sit down. The Member should apologize forthwith."

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that "We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, in Session assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has addressed to us at the opening of the present Session."

The motion was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS — 37

Messieurs

Wallace	Tisdalle	Wolfe
Ney	Bruch	Smith
Merilees	McCarthy, Mrs.	McDiarmid
Marshall	Jordan, Mrs.	Capozzi
Wenman	Dawson, Mrs.	Skillings
Kripps, Mrs.	Kiernan	Chant
Mussallem	Williston	Loffmark
Price	Bennett	Gaglardi
Vogel	Peterson	Campbell, D.R.J.
LeCours	Black	Brothers
Chabot	Fraser	Shelford
Little	Campbell, B.	Richter
Jefcoat		

NAYS — 15

Messieurs

Brousson Hall	Strachan
Gardom Clark	Dowding
Cocke McGeer	Nimsick
Hartley Williams, L.A.	Barrett
Lorimer Macdonald	Dailly, Mrs.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Premier and Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and that this Order have precedence over all other business, except introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to her Majesty.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. BENNETT: I ask that we call for Resolution number 4 on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution number 4. The Honourable Member for Alberni.

MR. H.R. McDIARMID (Alberni): I move, seconded by the Member from Delta, the Motion number 4, standing in my name on the Order Paper: "That this House expresses to the Federal Government their deep misgivings over the ecological disaster which will engulf the coast of British Columbia following the construction of a trans-Alaska pipe-line and attendant supertanker transport of oil off the coast of British Columbia. We ask the Federal Government to use every available resource at their disposal to persuade the American Government to use alternate methods of transport

[[Page 246](#)]

ing crude oil from Alaska to the United States."

Mr. Speaker, this question of the transport of large quantities of oil via supertanker from Alaska to the continental United States, in my opinion, poses one of the most dreadful threats to the ecology of British Columbia that we have faced to date. I say in the resolution that, if this happens, there will be spills of considerable magnitude and I would like to refer to the task force, Operation Oil, which recently was involved with the spill from the tanker, *Arrow*, in Chedabucto Bay. They say, in part, in this report, "At the time we proceeded to Chedabucto Bay, we already had knowledge of responsibility for a spill by the Irving Oil Company barge, the *Whale* near Peninsula." They say here that the comments are provided about other spills that came to their knowledge during the time that they were cleaning this one up. Burn Peninsula, Sidney Harbour, Halifax Harbour, Magdalene Island, St. John's Harbour, Digby Harbour, sinking of the *Patrick Morris* and the *St. Croix River*.

So I suggest, through you, Mr. Speaker, to this House, that it is not, in my opinion, a matter of fancy, a matter of conjecture, as to whether it will or will not happen. I think it's been established by the occurrence of many disasters throughout the world that the tankers are bound sooner or later if in enough quantity to crash and to spill oil. One of the frightening things, Mr. Speaker, is that the spills, which we have seen to this date, are only puddles compared to what is in store for us in the future. The *Torrey Canyon*, which is probably the largest spill to date, carried 117 thousand tons of oil or 35 million gallons. Today tankers are under construction, which have a capacity of 312 thousand tons or almost one billion gallons of oil — a billion gallons in one tanker. To give you the idea of the size of this, Mr. Speaker, picture a tanker so long that three football games could be played on its decks and still leave room for cheering sections both fore and aft, A tanker so king-size that each of its 18 storage tanks could hold a 9-storey building. A pipe dream — hardly — such ships are being built and they're starting a revolutionary sea change that is just beginning to be felt. The large American oil companies have ordered, to this date, I think, between 30 and 50 ships between 100 thousand and 300 thousand tons. So, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that, when this happens, the clean-up operations which we saw in Chedabucto Bay and which cost this country \$4 million to clean up, pale into insignificance by what will happen.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular time, an oil company, in its attempt to blackmail the Department of the Interior, has invested fantastic amounts of money in a refinery right near the Canadian border. They have invested fantastic amounts of money in pipe for a pipe-line proposed to run between the north slope and the southern coast of Alaska. This kind of pressure is being used by that monstrous company to try to influence the United States Department of the Interior to allow it to proceed. The Member of Parliament, David Anderson, for Esquimalt, has been a leader in opposing this particular measure and I give him full credit for that.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular refinery is being built right on the Canadian border so that those ships won't traverse very much of the U.S. coastline but all of the British Columbia coastline. While we, as British Columbians, do not have any direct power to be able to interfere in this decision of the Department of the Interior, I certainly believe that we, as the Parliament of British Columbia, must let our thoughts be known in no uncertain way. However, it would be dishonest for me to suggest to this House that we will be able to stop this unless we are prepared to allow them to pursue an alternative route. I think, in the interests of the United States, they cannot, in effect, afford to allow the oil off the Alaska slope to remain in the ground. There is an acute shortage of fuel and of energy in the United States today, and this is a domestic source which they cannot be denied.

But it is my position, Mr. Speaker, that the alternative, and there is really only one realistic alternative — that

of a pipe-line — would have to come from the north slope through the Yukon or the Northwest Territories and through one or other of the Provinces of Canada, possibly British Columbia, possibly Alberta. I think that, as Canadians, it's certainly been demonstrated in the past that a spill of the magnitude which we are now contemplating into the ocean will have serious ecological results which may last for years beyond which we even know at this time. The difficulty of trying to do a clean-up of this nature, off the Pacific Coast, which has been rightly named the "graveyard of the Pacific," certainly, in wintertime and with the limited access that is available, might well pose a problem which could not, in fact, be overcome. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a pipe-line, while it may not be desirable, is certainly less disruptive than the alternative which we have facing us today. At least you can shut a pipe-line off, if there's a break in the pipe, and you can control it on the ground to a much greater degree than you can on the sea.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, which is of considerable importance, I think. You may be aware that the Government of Canada is attempting, at this time, to formulate legislation, which will make tankers which are coming into Canada, the subject of a very substantial insurance bond. The figure has not yet been mentioned. In fact, they were going to make it limitless but, now, I believe they will have to put a limit on it, somewhere in the order of perhaps \$15 or \$20 million. But, this, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, will have no effect on the ships which are traversing the coast of British Columbia, because they are going from one American port to another and pass through international waters and so, in this way, do not have to come under control of any regulations which we might make in Canada. So, it's quite conceivable and quite possible that, when this disaster does happen, we might find ourselves faced with a \$12 or \$13 or \$15 million clean-up job every second year off the coast of British Columbia, and may not be, in effect, able to collect a nickel of it.

One bright spot, Mr. Speaker, is that, at least, most of these ships will be on American bottoms because of the *Jones Act*, which requires that ships plying between one U.S. port and another must use U.S. ships. So, perhaps, we will have some control in this regard if a spill should take place insofar as collection. But, my, Mr. Speaker, what scant, cold comfort this is! The only way that we can, really, do anything about this is to prevent it and not act after the fact. This article in the paper goes on to state, Mr. Speaker, that a thousand tankers may well be plying up and down the coast of British Columbia, the "graveyard of the Pacific," in fogs and in terrible weather and all I can say is that we must find some way of preventing this.

On February 16 and 17, hearings will be held in Washington before the Department of the Interior and will allow various ecological groups and others a voice to protest the building of the trans-Alaskan route. Mr. David Anderson has indicated that he will be there as a private member. It's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliament of Canada could not have seen fit to send him as an official representa-

[[Page 247](#)]

tive of the Government of Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, that British Columbians would like to see us represented at that hearing and I think that a Minister of this Government should be present to let the Department of the Interior know that we, as British Columbians, are unalterably opposed to this threat to the coastline of Canada's most beautiful Province.

Ours will be an entirely moral position. We have no legal right to ask them to not do this but I think that we must put to them, as our neighbours, our utmost objection to this particular project and so I would like to suggest, in effect, that we go on record as asking a representative to be there to protect the interests of all British Columbians (*applause*).

On the motion of Mr. McDiarmid, debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

The House met at 9:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on Resolution number 4. The Honourable the Member for Alberni.

MR. H.R. McDIARMID (Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief at this point in time and simply reiterate, for the benefit of the House, my feelings in terms of this threat to British Columbia, and simply say that it is my feeling that the Federal Government has abdicated completely its responsibility to the citizens of British Columbia by refusing to send an official delegate on February 16 and 17 to the Interior Department debates, and simply has left this to a British Columbian to appear on his own. I think that it has abdicated its responsibility in regard to British Columbia, in this case, and that, because of this abdication of responsibility, my suggestion that we send a Minister of this Government to those hearings, I think, in fact, to represent the interest of all British Columbians, is particularly valid. I would hope that, before those dates, the Government of Canada will see fit, in fact, to appoint an official representative to make known to the United States the views of British Columbians and Canadians as a whole. If this does not occur, then I would suggest, respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that this House go on record as sending a representative from this Chamber to protect our interests.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Delta. The Honourable Member for Delta seconded the motion.

MR. R. WENMAN (Delta): Mr. Speaker, approximately two years ago in this House we passed a bill recognizing the beauty of British Columbia. At any rate, two years ago, we passed in this House a bill recognizing one of the greatest natural beauty spots in Canada, that of Long Beach. We recognized its beauty and decided to preserve it for the pleasure of British Columbians, Canadians — and this was a good step. This was a wise step — to recognize the beauty around us. During that same Session we passed another bill and that bill related to the removal of a railway track from White Rock. Of course, it's still in the process of being moved but we have a commitment from the Premier, because he recognizes, also, the beauty and the potential of the White Rock and Crescent Beach area.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member begin to discuss this motion which is before us.

MR. WENMAN: Right. I'm just going to draw the point to the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish you'd approach it quickly.

MR. WENMAN: Yes, I certainly will. I'm sorry that.... There is a relevance between the beauty of our Province and the potential destruction of this beauty through the tankers. This is the conclusion that I'm trying to draw. At any rate, we recognized the potential of the White Rock and Crescent Beach areas. We also recognized, many times over, and we've been battling constantly, relating to our Boundary Bay area. The Provincial Government has also set it aside, saying that this will be a great recreational area. In addition to that, in the middle of the wildlife, waterfowl flyway, we find Boundary Bay. Boundary Bay, Mr. Speaker, for the information of those not totally familiar with the lower mainland, for up-country Members, Boundary Bay is the bay through which must pass these tankers full of oil. In this great Boundary Bay — it is in its natural state now — is the flyway in the heart of the flyway of the waterfowl of British Columbia and North America, one of the few last resting places. In the Crescent Reach—Mud Bay area, I have presented a Bill saying that this should be preserved for wildlife.

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, are in vain, if we allow oil to be spilled and poured across these beaches and across these great recreational areas. You know, if you were to stand on Long Beach, if you were to stand and look out from White Rock, it's so close that you, indeed, would see these thousand ships cruising by to land just south of White Rock and, of course, the awareness of the great, great danger.

I think that this motion is extremely important because it is a symbolic motion. It is symbolic of things yet to come. Not only these tankers, but the tankers that will carry not only oil, but many other commodities from the world to the superport. It indicates the need, the great need, for international cooperation. We recognize not only the environment of British Columbia, but a world environment. The pollution from the Fraser River flows out of the mouth of the Fraser River into the United States, along the coast of Washington. The smoke knows no political boundary, be it Provincial, municipal, international, but it blows freely. We must recognize the broad scope of what we are talking about. We have a common interest with the other surrounding areas. We have, on the Pacific rim, our immediate neighbours, of course, Alaska and the State of Washington. As I say, the passing of this motion must be but a first step towards a meeting of the minds of our world leaders, our international leaders, our Provincial leaders,

towards further action.

I would suggest that, when we pass this motion, this is just the beginning and, as my honourable colleague suggested, I think, because of the relevance of this beautiful Province and of the danger it faces from these tankers, I think that we are going to have to carry it further, further than just to Washington ourselves, but I think that we should go jointly. We have two governors, Governor Dan Evans in the State of Washington and Governor Egan in Alaska.... Governor Egan has been welcomed in Victoria by our Premier, and they have held amicable conversations, and I'm sure that were our Premier to invite Governor Egan and Governor Evans, I'm sure that we could have a meeting of minds on these great issues, again, just as a start, to talk about the international

[[Page 248](#)]

situation relating to pollution. So, I would recommend that this motion be carried forward, certainly, carried forward by one of our senior Cabinet Ministers, and that a meeting be called to express our sentiments, not only to our Government in Ottawa, but also to the Governments in the State of Washington and in Alaska.

In the area of White Rock — it is called White Rock right now and we want to keep that rock white. We don't want to have the breaking up of ships and have to rename our town Black Rock, as the oil floats in across our beaches. We are concerned. We have seen the destruction, the massive destruction of oil spills in San Francisco, and we have been concerned and the world has been concerned. We have seen these tankers break up in the Long Beach area in California. We have seen these tankers break up in England and we must not see these tankers break up and destroy our beautiful British Columbia. It is for that reason that I second this motion and that I encourage it to be carried forward as a first step in international cooperation and the control of this massive transit of tanking oil across the world oceans. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. BARRETT (Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to this motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Surrey. The amendment is by adding the following paragraph to the said motion: "This House further assures the Federal Government and the neighbouring State of Washington that this Legislature is equally opposed to all drilling for oil within the coastal waters of British Columbia and, particularly, in the Straits of Georgia and Juan de Fuca. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this....

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please. May I have the amendment? Order, please. Irrespective of the merits of the amendment, as proposed, it does not relate to the motion which is before the House. It imports a completely new argument into the proposition and, for that reason, is out of order.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with oil spills on the coast.

MR. SPEAKER: I realize what we're dealing with. We are dealing with the transportation of oil from Alaska to the Seattle area, which has nothing to do with the proposition that's raised about drilling off in the Gulf of Georgia.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have to challenge your ruling.

The Speaker's ruling was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS — 37

Messieurs

Wallace	Tisdalle	Wolfe
Ney	Bruch	Smith
Merilees	McCarthy, Mrs.	McDiarmid
Marshall	Jordan, Mrs.	Capozzi

Wenman	Dawson, Mrs.	Skillings
Kripps, Mrs.	Kiernan	Chant
Mussallem	Williston	Loffmark
Price	Bennett	Gaglardi
Vogel	Peterson	Campbell, D.R.J.
LeCours	Black	Brothers
Chabot	Fraser	Shelford
Little	Campbell, B.	Richter
Jefcoat		

NAYS — 15

Messieurs

Brousson Hall	Strachan
Gardom Clark	Dowding
Cocke McGeer	Nimsick
Harley Williams, L.A.	Barrett
Lorimer Macdonald	Dailly, Mrs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, like all the Members of the House, can only address himself to the motion once. He has not two bites at the apple. He has lost his place in this debate, I would submit, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Some relaxation is allowed in the matter of amendments. I feel that the honourable Member, had he been aware of the fact that he could not speak to the main motion, would have, at least, spoken to the main motion before moving the amendment (*interruption*). Just one moment, please. Unless the House has objection and wishes to challenge the Speaker on this matter, it's my view that a considerable amount of relaxation is indicated so far as amendments are concerned I'm going to permit the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to speak.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker I appreciate the opportunity of speaking. I had taken the precaution of asking you before I stood in my place, if, indeed, I could speak and, of course, you had indicated that I could. Now that I am on my feet, I want to welcome this motion with the sincerity...(*interruption*). I ask the Speaker the rules and the Speaker has never dealt unfairly with anyone in this House. If you're suggesting that, you should be ashamed of that, Mr. Premier. I'm suggesting that you are intimating that the Speaker of this House is making deals and I suggest that you withdraw that comment. You withdraw it. It's impertinent. Absolute impertinence to this House to suggest that the Speaker is making a deal (*interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition proceed and would the House keep order?

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this motion for the sincerity with which it is put forward to the House. This is a motion that has been put forward to the House to prevent oil spills along the coast of British Columbia. I welcome this motion on that, for the reason that, regardless of how the oil spills occur, we should have protection against them in every possible way. To stop tankers from plying the coast, with the potential of

oil spills, is the kind of move that indicates that the mover and the seconder are deeply concerned with the damage that can be caused by oil spills from any source, Mr. Speaker, and, for that reason, I know their sincerity is reflected in this motion. Both of them, Mr. Speaker, are the kind of honourable Members who would fight tooth and nail to prevent one of those tankers from splitting up on the coast and prevent oil from spilling on the coast, under any circumstances.

I won't make any reflections beyond that, because they're deeply concerned and we've seen the concern that they've evidenced, as witnessed by their speeches and actions, tonight.

Mr. Speaker, there is great danger from oil spills on this coast and we must, through this motion, indicate to the Federal Government and to the Minister concerned, Mr. Davis, that this House is deeply opposed to the transport regularly of oil along the coast to the State of Washington. I suggest, too, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit of this motion also includes the concern about positive regulations about the safety of oil that normally is transported off our coast so that we can avoid another Chedabucto Bay, or the spill that occurred in San Francisco, to which the Member from Delta referred. That was a spill, Mr. Speaker, from an oil well off the coast. I'm glad he recognized the damage that that particular spill did, when he spoke.

Mr. Speaker, the potential of damage to this coast, by these supertankers travelling this coast, is one of danger that is not to be trifled with, in terms of cheap politics by any Member of this House. That's why I expect every Member to stand up and vote for this motion, because it shows his deep concern for oil spills, for any reason, on the coast of this Province. So when the Members stand, Mr. Speaker, as I know they'll do, they'll be displaying a sincere conviction, that I welcome, of their deep concern, of not playing politics with oil tankers plying the coast, but that deep concern of having damage by oil spills regardless of any reason. I welcome this motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources.

HON. R.G. WILLISTON (Fort George): Mr. Speaker, dealing with this motion, I think that all honourable Members should be aware of one point, as they give their endorsement to it, and this was brought out by the Honourable Member from Alberni. When it was indicated that Mr. Anderson was taking his case to Washington and that he was joining some forty-four ecological groups there in opposing both the pipe-line across Alaska and the handling of the oil from Alaska to Washington, a great number of those people in the ecological groups are not only opposed to the transport of the oil coming down the coast, but they're also very violently opposed to the construction of the oil-line across Alaska itself. There's great controversy raging, as any of you know who have been studying this matter, concerning the effect on the ecology in the Alaska wilderness from a pipe-line carrying oil at about freezing temperatures, and its effect upon the terrain permanently from the time it happens to be installed.

The only point I wish to make tonight, Mr. Speaker, is, that when we take this stand, and I think the stand is right automatically, with that resource in Prudhoe Bay and developed at the same time, if it's not going to come by boat down the Pacific coast, nor is it to move by tanker through the Arctic, about which there is also a great deal of concern and I think rightful concern, because of the additional hazards there of the ships being damaged through ice floes and traffic across the Arctic before they reach the east coast, there's only one other answer to moving that material from Prudhoe Bay, and that is with a pipe-line. Those of you who have examined it, realize the natural route for that pipe-line comes down about the same angle as the coast runs at Prudhoe Bay to not too far from the Mackenzie River moving north-south and proceeding then down into Alberta and down into both Canada and the United States. So the only point I'm making is that, when we adopt this resolution, I think we should do it with our eyes wide open to the resources there and not do it with our eyes closed. If that is the stand we're taking, we're automatically taking the stand, too, that we would endorse the handling of the material by a pipe-line, which I think most people agree likely is the safest and the only practical method of handling this. So, in supporting the motion, and if we do so, which I think would happen in this House unanimously, Mr. Speaker, I think it automatically implies, too, that we're in this position of supporting the transport of the material in the only other way that's practical, which would be by pipe-line, and that will have to come through Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

MR. R.M. STRACHAN (Cowichan-Malahat): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As my constituency borders on the waters of British Columbia, I am naturally concerned about anything that might affect the clarity and the purity of the coastline of the whole of Vancouver Island and British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. L.R. PETERSON (Vancouver-Little Mountain): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to make a brief statement concerning the dispute between the Amalgamated Transit Union and the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority. I've been remaining very close to the telephone tonight because, as the Honourable Members know, a proposal for collective agreement was made yesterday and voted upon by the members today, between the hours of two and eight o'clock. I've just been in a telephone conversation with Mr. Collins, representing the union, and he has advised me that the vote has been counted and the proposal has been accepted with a 60.2 per cent majority (*applause*).

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that they had an excellent turn-out; 1,600 of the members turned out to vote on this proposal and the fact that it has been accepted means that transit operations can be resumed, both in Vancouver and in Victoria, on Saturday. I would just like, I'm sure all the Members would agree with me, not only to express our congratulations to the parties, which I have to the union on the telephone, but also we owe a debt of gratitude, I feel, to the motoring public, the motorists in both Victoria and Vancouver, who co-operated and minimized public inconvenience.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Attorney-General's announcement and I also welcome the fact that

[[Page 250](#)]

the two parties together have finally come to a solution. I'm sure that the Attorney-General, along with the rest of the Members of this House, appreciate the hard work, both on Hydro's part and the union's part, to bring about this settlement. I hope that this settlement brought about by the two parties, directly, will lead to more amicable labour relations throughout the Province. I, too, thank the people of the lower mainland for their co-operation, their patience and their understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Cowichan-Malahat.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While the Attorney-General was sticking close to his telephone, I was sticking close to the radio, when that last division was called, because we were all interested in the outcome of that particular situation. It proves again that, without interference, labour and management can get together.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the motion that I was debating when I was asked to give up my place temporarily. I think this is not merely a resolution designed to express our opinion on whether or not tankers should go up and down the coast of British Columbia. This is a resolution that demands a close examination of the manner in which we, the wealthy people of North America, utilize, use, develop and exploit our natural resources. There is this proposal, because oil has been discovered in the northern section of this hemisphere, that, for some unknown reason, we must immediately start to drill, develop, exploit and carry that oil from one section of North America to the other.

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask and we must answer is: how many oil wells are there all over North America that are already drilled and already capped? How many gas wells are already drilled and already capped? I'm speaking of North America. Mr. Speaker, right in the United States, every State that produces oil is on a strict quota system and they're only allowed to dig X gallons of oil out of that ground each month. So, why should we even be faced with this danger at this time, when we have these millions of barrels of reserves already drilled for, ready to be pumped, when the oil is required?

This whole thing is part of the insanity of our attitude towards developing our natural resources. I have said, time and again, that, under times of crisis or actual need, we may have to do certain things but at times when we have so many thousands of oil wells capped, when every State in the Union is on a strict quota system, with regard to how much oil they take out of the ground, I think it's completely insane for us to be talking about building pipelines or tankers to carry oil from the northern section of the hemisphere to anywhere else in North America. It's part of the insanity that we have to examine in the handling of all of our natural resources.

You know, Mr. Speaker, three or four years ago, this resolution would not have been on the Order Paper because it's only in the last three or four years that any public attention has been given to oil spills of one kind or the other. Now, we ask ourselves, why is it that, suddenly, these oil spills are all over the place? Did they never happen before? Certainly, they've happened before. But they weren't public news. The public was not aware of the danger to the ecology and the environment. People didn't have the interest in pollution four or five years ago that they now have. Oil spills weren't news. It's only when these so-called fanatics, whom I hear people refer to, began to draw public attention to the multiplicity of dangers to the ecology and to the environment and to the waterways, that they began to receive public attention. So in these last three or four years, every time there's been an oil spill, the photographers are flown in and the movie cameras are flown in, and television has been flown in and they've shown the whole world what happens when there is an oil spill. But, you know, I read an account of an oil spill the other day. They are happening so often, it's not even front-page news any more. It was on about page 16 of the newspaper. An oil spill. They're happening so often that, unless these so-called fanatics continue to draw attention to the continual need for vigilance, then the crisis of the moment will pass and the people will allow this kind of thing to go ahead, without let or hindrance, because it's entrepreneurial, it's private enterprise and nothing must stand in its way.

I simply urge the Members of this Province to support this motion, certainly, but to look at the overall picture. Let's use all of the natural resources of this Province, this country and this continent in a much more rational manner than we have in the past. It's not just the big tankers that are involved in this particular deal that we have to watch. The B.C. Hydro, itself, is responsible for bunker oil being transported in the waters of British Columbia. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, some of the tankers that take the bunker oil to Georgia Strait, in my constituency, should have been driven off the seas years ago. Yet, there they are, on behalf of the B.C. Hydro, bringing bunker oil right into the very heartland of the population of this Province. I would ask B.C. Hydro, the two Members of the Cabinet who are directors to see to it that any tanker that brings bunker oil to Vancouver Island is a first-class ship, capable of carrying that oil without any possible danger, except under most unusual circumstances. We have to look at the whole picture, not just this particular motion, although, Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to support it.

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

MR. H.P. CAPOZZI (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly tonight. I certainly would like to add my congratulations to the members of the union, etc., for the settlement of this strike. It has been particularly crippling in our area.

I do rise, however, to speak briefly to the motion. I would hope that the mover of the resolution would consider the possibility of reexamining his geography. I hadn't quite appreciated the fact that Alaska had been sold from the United States. You will note that it does say from Alaska to the United States. I'm sure the Americans might be a little bit disturbed by the fact that we have taken Alaska away so easily.

I do think that this resolution, Mr. Speaker, points out one significant fact. That is that the relationships across from Province to State, have not been what they should have been. The fact that we are in a House, isolated as we are, debating a resolution as to whether we should permit oil tankers to come down from Alaska into the continental United States, which I am sure is what my good Member from Alberni meant to say in his resolution, is a fact that, without this, if we had been more aware of, and they had been more aware of, our concern by a constant relationship between our Province and between the State of Washington, this problem would have not have taken place. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that, by debating this resolution tonight, we are really

bringing to the attention of the people in the northwest that that concern is not a concern that is limited by

boundaries, by confines and by borders.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that, by this resolution being debated in full seriousness by the House here this evening, that we are also serving notice to the Members, the representatives of the Government, that certainly the time is now, that our Antipollution Board, our people concerned with the ecological studies of the Province of British Columbia, should be meeting regularly, on a regular basis, with similarly concerned people from the State of Washington. It is absurd for us to believe that we can live in isolation when we deal with ecology or with pollution, when the very fact that a tragedy takes place anywhere in the Western Hemisphere will eventually affect those things that affect us here in British Columbia. From this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Government, that, within their Antipollution Board which we have established, they would take into consideration the possibility of very regular, of very definite, of very planned meetings, for the study of these problems, with representatives both from Washington and from Alaska. We are dealing again with a concern that we deal with now beyond our limitations, not just as British Columbians, not just as Canadians, but as the very proud, very proud people who inhabit the northwest of this Continent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Saanich and the Islands.

MR. J.D. TISDALE (Saanich and the Islands): The question is whether we will pour oil on the troubled waters. I listened to the Member from Cowichan-Malahat make a strong point on the reasonableness of not requiring the oil at this time. Of course, delay does not answer the question and it might be worthwhile recalling that the late President John F. Kennedy said, "That as long as the United States of America, which is a world power, depends on 19 per cent of its oil consumption, domestic and otherwise, to come from import, the country couldn't consider itself to be sovereign over its affairs." So the business of capping wells as being a remedy to open the well supply, the oil supply from the capped wells, certainly, would not do anything to the reservoir or the reserve that they need to carry on their domestic or their war effort, if you wish to call it that.

No country, especially Canada, with about 50 per cent of its ability to handle its needs in the oilfields, can possibly rest idly by and say we must not continue developing our reserves. This is part of the business, of course. I think that one of the most important things that the honourable Member had to say, after he misquoted the facts in regard to oil demand, was the fact that in our waters, already passing through here, are cargoes of oil that are not being carried in very satisfactory containers. Then we think of the recent agreements, Mr. Speaker, that were made with Russia to supply its mother ship fleets out here fishing the fish off our shores. These tankers come right into Vancouver, too. I think all North American people are interested, not just British Columbians. As the First Member from Vancouver Centre was saying this is a North American continent problem and until we can deal with it without the smallness of our boundaries within our eyes, we are dealing with people, we are dealing with the whole ecology, we are dealing with the system of transportation. My suggestion here tonight, for what it's worth, is that, if we've been able to surmount the obstacles to be able to come closely to any point of landing on the moon, surely, we have scientists who are available today, without doubt, of being able to come to a knowledge of how it would be possible to solidify the liquids so that they would not be in danger. They're talking about even towing icebergs for fresh water down through the waters here to supply countries and parts of the country that are dry. Surely, there may be a way, a scientific way, that we've not investigated, of the movement of oil so that it will not necessarily be a pollutant and not escape. It may sound silly, it may sound foolish, but it is not so. I realize that the exposure to accident is increased because of the amount of transportation that would be necessary to bring this oil past our shores. That exposure could be reduced by invention of tankers and types that would not be vulnerable to the loss of the fluid if it were punctured. This can be done with the modern techniques and science that we have today and it's not near as funny as it was a few years ago when we said that we could land men on the moon. We've been able to do that. I believe that there are methods of getting this necessary fluid to the market without endangering our ecology.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver-Howe Sound): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would appear that a number of the Ministers of the Crown are exceedingly anxious to have the question called on such an important motion as this. I'm delighted that we had the opportunity of hearing from the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources on this important subject. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept what the Honourable the Minister has said,

that by passing this motion, we are deemed, in any way, to approve the overland transportation of oil from Alaska through Canada to the United States. That is a decision which is to be taken at some other time, in some other form. We are concerned only with the threatened disaster to British Columbia and our coastal waters from the proposal which is presently being mooted by the constructors of the Cherry Point Refinery. And, let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one reason that we are debating this motion tonight. It's because Atlantic Richfield has decided to build a refinery to serve its needs in the Pacific Northwest States and it has no source of crude oil. It costs it a \$150 million a year to buy its crude oil from those sources which are available and it hopes to save that much money by bringing the oil from Alaska. It wants to bring it the quickest and the cheapest route and it happens to be through our doorstep. That's why this matter is before us and this is why we're debating it. The question is not one of ecology of the interior part of this country, or whether a pipe-line is better or not, because this company has very successfully hidden the financial details which would allow a proper decision to be made as to whether one or other of these routes is the more acceptable.

During the remarks by the mover of this resolution, and I certainly do congratulate him, he urged not only that this House go on record but that Members of the Cabinet, in whose responsibility this particular matter must fall, indicate that they would go, immediately, if need be, to join with the Federal Government in making whatever representation needs to be made, to ensure that the tragedy we all fear, does not occur. I would have thought tonight, before any Member on the trivia bench would be calling for the question, that the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources, or his

[[Page 252](#)]

associate, the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, or any of those other Ministers who form the Environmental and Land Use Committee, which is charged with the responsibility for giving us the best ecological climate in this country, in this world, would have risen in his place and assured this House that, upon the passage of this motion, that he would be in immediate communication with the Federal Government for the purpose of offering his assistance. I trust that, before this question is called, one of the Ministers will stand in his place and give us that assurance, because the expression of this motion, as important as it is, and with as great weight as it will carry in the Nation's capital, cannot help but be improved, fortified, by the immediate action and the immediate presence of one Member of our Cabinet in that city.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we are concerned about what our Government is going to do. If the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who spoke today and talked about the environmental czar is so concerned about the abilities of the Federal Government in this field, then let's send one of our people down there to tell them how to do it, if you think that our people have the slightest intention of doing anything about it, or any ability to do anything about it. That's what we're debating tonight. Perhaps we should send the Honourable the Minister of Health, because he's the new addition to the....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think the honourable Member has made his point.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I certainly hope I have, Mr. Speaker. As I take my place, I'll look forward to hearing from one or the other of the Ministers as to their immediate intentions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Esquimalt.

MR. H.J. BRUCH (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker, I want to support this motion because there is considerable concern of the coastline of the constituency I represent, both sides. The concern that has been generated about the ecology, I'm quite certain that many of the people in the State of Washington can be aroused, as well, to express their concern of having that refinery within the inland waters. It would be bad enough if they agreed to move their tankers outside of our territorial waters and put a refinery down the coast of the State of Washington and, therefore, minimize the danger, particularly, in the inland waters. It is, to me, a very grave situation, when the proposal is to bring those tankers, continually, into the inland waters of the Straits that separate the Island from the mainland. I would not only urge that we contact the Federal Government but, in the past, we have had some pretty good conferences in the set-up between Alaska, Yukon and British Columbia. I think there would be a useful purpose served if the Government, at this time, would arrange to sit down at another of these conferences and discuss this

particular situation in all haste and in all seriousness.

The motion was agreed to *nemine contradicente*.

The House adjourned at 9:55 p.m.