

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)**

---

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1973**

Afternoon Sitting

[ [Page 2165](#) ]

**CONTENTS**

Afternoon sitting Routine proceedings Oral questions Re-routing of Island Highway. Mr. Chabot — [2165](#)

Compensation for auto insurance agents. Mr. Gardom — [2165](#)

The Karen Magnussen Award. Mr. Wallace — [2165](#)

Rehiring of Department of Highways employees. Mr. Fraser — [2166](#)

Graduates of BCIT mining technician course. Mr. Phillips — [2166](#)

Sukunka coal negotiations. Mr. Gardom — [2166](#)

Hunting-Merritt labour dispute. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2166](#)

Investment by government in troubled companies. Mr. Wallace — [2167](#)

Committee of supply: Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement estimates.

Mr. Phillips — 2168 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2178](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2169 Mrs. Jordan — [2178](#)

Mr. Phillips — 2169 Ms. Brown — [2178](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2169 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2179](#)

Mr. Smith — 2170 Mrs. Jordan — [2180](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2170 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2180](#)

Mrs. Jordan — 2171 Mr. Morrison — [2180](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2173 Mrs. Jordan — [2181](#)

Mr. Phillips — 2174 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2181](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2174 Mrs. Jordan — [2181](#)

Mr. Phillips — 2174 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2182](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2175 Mrs. Jordan — [2182](#)

Mrs. Jordan — 2175 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2182](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2176 Mrs. Jordan — [2182](#)

Mrs. Jordan — 2177 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2183](#)

Mr. Phillips — 2177 Mrs. Jordan — [2183](#)

Hon. Mr. Levi — 2177 Hon. Mr. Levi — [2183](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [2178](#)

Minister Without Portfolio estimates.

Mr. Chabot — 2184 Mr. Smith — [2190](#)

Hon. Mr. Calder — 2185 Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2191](#)

Mr. Chabot — 2187 Hon. Mr. Calder — [2192](#)

Mr. Wallace — 2187 Mr. Gardom — [2193](#)

Hon. Mr. Calder — [2189](#)

Legislation estimates.

Mr. Richter — 2194 Mr. Phillips — [2196](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — 2194 Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2196](#)

Mr. Wallace — 2194 Mr. Curtis — [2197](#)

Mr. Chabot — 2195 Hon. Mr. Barrett — [2197](#)

Mr. Williams — [2196](#)

An Act Granting Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province of British Columbia (Bill No. 172). Hon. Mr. Barrett. First, second and third readings — [2201](#)

---

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Prayers.

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

**HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education):** I'd like the House to join with me in welcoming a group of students from Alpha Junior Secondary in Burnaby North.

**Oral questions.**

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

## RE-ROUTING OF ISLAND HIGHWAY

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Highways: the mayor of Gold River is elated that the Minister has decided to re-route the Island Highway through Gold River instead of south from Woss Camp to Sayward. I'm wondering whether the Minister would care to tell us if his elation is justified.

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways):** I don't know where he got the information from. I must check his information because he knows more about it than I do. At no time have I given any indication that the re-routing was even being considered.

You keep getting these dream things. I don't know where you get them from — nightmares or something. You keep raising these questions that are just absolutely without foundation and are not even being considered by the department.

**MR. CHABOT:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: the mayor of Gold River is on record as having stated that he understands that the Island Highway is going to be routed through Gold River.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** It's on that basis that I answered the question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. It is important to remember that the Member takes responsibility for a statement of fact. Questions are really not supposed to be based on statements of fact but actually questions asked of the Minister.

You've asked the question of the Minister and he has replied. Now, how you can have a supplementary on the basis of that I'm still wondering.

**MR. CHABOT:** On March 26 I asked a similar question. He stated at that time that no firm decision had been made. So I was just wondering whether a decision has been made. I was wondering whether the mayor from Gold River's hopes and expectations had been fulfilled. The supplementary question really is: has the Minister of Highways discussed the re-routing of the Island Highway with the Mt. Waddington Regional District?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** It's the same answer as I gave you at that time — no.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would remind Members in Beauchesne, p. 147, they shall not repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused. The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver—

## COMPENSATION FOR AUTO INSURANCE AGENTS

**MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey):** A question to the Minister of Highways. Yesterday the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williams) utilized the term "negotiated purchase" dealing with concerns that the Government was getting into. I'd ask the Minister of Highways if he's prepared to make compensation available to any of those people in the insurance industry who will suffer loss as a result of being unable to compete in that endeavour.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** First of all, there's a bill before the House. The legislation is very clear,

**MR. GARDOM:** I wasn't asking the Hon. Minister if there was a bill before the House. I'm aware of that fact just as well as he is. I'm asking if he's prepared to make compensation available to people who....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Where a bill is on the order paper, a question which relates to it should be asked in the committee stage of the bill and not during question period if it's not urgent or important.

**MR. GARDOM:** It may be an oversight, but compensation doesn't appear to be in the bill. I wanted to help the Minister.

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

## THE KAREN MAGNUSSEN AWARD

**MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay):** Could I ask the Minister of Finance if he'd care to comment on the perpetual fund that has been reported in the Press as being set up to provide awards for skaters, the Karen Magnussen award.

[ [Page 2166](#) ]

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier and Minister of Finance):** Yes, there was an announcement yesterday by the Member for North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) of Government policy. I wish the House to know that Miss Magnussen will be our guest Friday morning. As Members of this Legislature on behalf of the people of British Columbia, we will have the opportunity of giving her a personal gift at that time.

**MR. GARDOM:** Is that because the Government is on thin ice?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** No, not at all, Mr. Member. The question was, "Is the Government on thin ice?" No, but we have seen some unique figure skating performances. (Laughter).

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

## REHIRING OF DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS' EMPLOYEES

**MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Highways. The Government indicated that all Department of Highways' employees laid off were to be reinstated on April 1. Have these employees been hired yet? If not, what is the new date?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** At no time did I say that all of the employees laid off would be rehired April 1. I said rehiring would commence April 1. It's up to each local district and engineer as to who he hires and when he hires them, according to the needs of each particular district.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

## GRADUATES OF BCIT MINING TECHNICIAN COURSE

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would you use a microphone please, although you don't need it. (Laughter).

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources. I'd like to ask the Minister how many of the graduates in the BCIT (British Columbia Institute of Technology) mining technician course were able to find work this year.

**HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources):** That's a question for the future. I have no knowledge of how many of them are even asking for work.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What the Minister of Mines has really said is that he doesn't know how many students there are in the BCIT course.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. I think the question is hypothetical, unless he has a crystal ball.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** All right, then. I'll ask him a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: how many students are enrolled in the course?

**HON. MR. NIMSICK:** That question should be directed to the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly).

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

## SUKUNKA COAL NEGOTIATIONS

**MR. GARDOM:** A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. There's been a paucity of information, Mr. Speaker, to the House concerning the Sukunka coal transaction. I'd like the Hon. Premier to inform the House as to what stage these negotiations are in.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** They're in the second stage of negotiations. (Laughter).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do you want a second question?

**MR. GARDOM:** Yes. Are we to assume that that follows the first? Secondly, how many stages to come after that?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** The second stage does follow the first. Then after the second stage, there will be the third stage. Shortly after that, it'll be at the fourth stage. If necessary, we'll go to the fifth stage. At any one of the stages I will give you a report at what stage we're at. At the conclusion I will tell you how many stages we've gone through to get to the conclusion. I want to be very open about it, Mr. Member. (Laughter).

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

## HUNTING-MERRITT LABOUR DISPUTE

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour if he is still using his good offices, or otherwise, in the Hunting-Merritt labour dispute, where I believe he has put a company proposal to the employees concerned.

**HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour):** We have had a mediator involved in that dispute, Mr. Speaker. He was unable to bring about a solution to the strike. Subsequent to meetings in my office with both parties, there has been no further response from either party to put forward any new proposals or to ask for any

intervention from my office.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, the company claims that they put forward their final offer at the request of the Minister and made it available to him. May I ask whether he in his turn passed it on to the union negotiators concerned with a recommendation as to whether or not they should accept it?

**HON. MR. KING:** A proposal was put forward by management in response to my invitation to do so. This was with an agreement with both parties, with the unions involved and with management, that I would not put that proposal on the table unless I had an indication and a commitment from the trade union group involved that they in turn would be prepared to submit that new proposal to their membership for a vote.

I was unable to obtain that kind of commitment. As a result, the offer was not put forward.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** I'm trying to find out when his proposal went west. I gather that the proposal was requested from the company by the Minister, and at that time the union officials and the company were in agreement that it should be put forward. Later on, the union officials withdrew their support for considering such a company proposal. Is that correct?

**HON. MR. KING:** No. What you gather from the explanation I have given is completely false. There was no such agreement initially. There was an agreement that I would try to obtain a new proposal. I was successful in accomplishing that.

There was a contingency tied to it. It had to contain certain things before the union people would be prepared to put it to their membership for a vote. In accordance with the agreement I made with both parties, I did not try to gain the commitment from the union when it was found that the new proposal put forward did not contain the minimum requirements which the union insisted on before they would accept it for a vote of their membership.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** May I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the proposal which he invited the company to submit was presented to the union delegation and was considered by them or whether it was withdrawn by the Minister prior to being given to the union negotiators.

**HON. MR. KING:** Mr. Speaker, the Member didn't seem to understand. The union indicated certain basic prerequisites that they would insist on before putting it to the membership for a vote.

When I received the proposal, I indicated to them that a certain key issue that they had requested be contained in the new proposal was not, in fact, embodied in the new proposal put forward by management. On that basis they indicated they were not prepared to accept the proposal and as a consequence, in compliance with my commitment to management, I did not reveal the full contents of that new proposal to the delegation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

## INVESTMENT BY GOVERNMENT IN TROUBLED COMPANIES

**MR. WALLACE:** Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Premier — in an inter-view in the *Financial Post* he is reported as saying that the government did not intend to follow the example of free enterprise governments which invested in troubled companies. Could the Premier tell us if he has been misquoted?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** No, I've certainly not been misquoted, Mr. Member. Your question couldn't have come at a more advantageous time because at this very moment I have had placed on my desk a report from our Economics and Statistics Branch related to our economic development and the question you mentioned. I'll read the last paragraph. Well, I'll read the whole thing:

"The Hon. Alex Macdonald, Minister, Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce today released the department's *Bulletin on Business Activity*. Mr. Macdonald stated economic indicators show that the provincial business community made progress in the opening months of this year. This broadly-based advance enabled the provincial economy to provide 30,000 additional jobs...."

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** If they don't want the answer, the question was, "Are we investing in losing industries?" and the answer is that the broadly-based provincial economy provided 30,000 additional new jobs in the month of February of last year.

This Government's policies as asked by that Member have led to this increase in the number of employed persons in the labour force, In February of 1971 it was 856,000; in February 1972: 865,000; February 1973: 895,000 employed in one month and that's a record figure under this Government, not even equaled by that group over there.

[ [Page 2168](#) ]

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't think it was responsive, but the question was really too general as well. A further question on the same subject?

**MR. WALLACE:** I don't think the answer referred specifically to what might happen by investing in troubled industries. These jobs presumably had been created prior to the government's decision to buy Colcel, for example, and it seems to contradict the public statement the Minister has made.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** It is very clear, Mr. Member. The choice is between this Government being something more than a business in terms of closing down a town like Ocean Falls or seeing the whole northern economy of this province based on the forest industry jeopardized. Therefore we made a conscious decision after careful research to move into both areas. Without that, Mr. Member, we would have the option of families going on welfare. We would rather see the money going into the maintenance of jobs rather than having those other working people subsidize these people on welfare.

Time will tell whether or not we were right. I think we're right, and I think that the nerve and the drive and the energy of the people of this province will prove us right over that period of time. And I welcome the test of our policy.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** A point of order. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity under the rules of this House, or at least under the agreed rules, to have statements on motions. I feel that while very interesting information has been given during the question period, it was quite clearly out of order. It was out of order because we have the opportunity of making statements of that nature by way of statements of Ministers and having corresponding comments from the Opposition parties. During question period the objective is to acquire information.

Now, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is unable to answer it because of a filibuster launched by the Premier.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. I want to point out that it's a fault on both sides in one respect. The question should not be so general as to launch into a reply that is a speech on the general economic situation. That is not the purpose of question period. So in that sense I should have stopped the question. I don't like stopping questions if I can avoid it.

But then I am faced with the problem with the answer — that I don't know quite what he's coming to and I have to wait to find out. It makes it very difficult for a Speaker if he's always going to be interfering in question period.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** We certainly appreciate your difficulties, but the question was specific. It was whether a policy statement made previously had been abandoned. Apparently the lengthy dissertation was that it had been abandoned. Now that was a fairly clear....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. We can't have a debate on that point, but if you have an objection to a question or an answer that is not being responsive according to the rules of question period, please stand up and raise your point.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, this is the point of order that I'm raising. The point that I am raising is

this: if the question period is to be effective....

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question period is over. Mr. Clerk.

**Orders of the day.**

House in committee of supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION  
AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT  
(continued)

On vote 238: Minister's office, \$72,484.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few short questions to ask the Minister. I want to say that certainly I'm pleased with the sincere effort the Minister has taken this morning in an endeavour to answer the questions in a sane manner. The Premier almost lost control of himself last night during his hysterical creation which must have come from his tired....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. Would the Hon. Member please proceed with his questioning of the Minister.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, but I thought the Premier having lost control of the House, had lost control of himself last night.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if benefits should be paid only when there is no work available to people in their own trade. In other words, if a person is on social welfare and there is work available in his own trade — something that he can do himself — does he feel that these people should be paid social welfare when there is work available in their own trade but they haven't taken it and they're

[ [Page 2169](#) ]

physically capable of doing so. I'd like the Minister to give me his comments on that, and his thoughts on it, and his policy on it, as a matter of fact.

I'd like to ask the Minister, should communities have the option of putting welfare — recipients to useful work. I'm referring to maybe parks boards, or exhibition boards during the summertime who run their community exhibitions and so forth. There's always work to be done with regard to repairing fences and painting grandstands et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister his feeling with regard to payments to seasonal workers where during their seasonal work their wages are greater than the welfare entitlement for any one year. Supposing that a fisherman or a man goes out to work in the oil field in the winter, or goes out to work in the forest and he earns more wages during that particular season than he would have earned had he been on social welfare all year — what is the Minister's response in that regard?

One further question, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister what his feeling is with regard to students receiving social welfare when their parents can actually afford to look after them — to buy their clothes and to feed them. Would the Minister honour me with replies to those questions?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement.

**HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement):** Mr. Chairman, in respect to somebody not wanting to work if they have an opportunity to go to work in their trade — the policy of the department is that nobody can forgo an opportunity to go to work and expect to stay on welfare. Not at all. If we know that somebody can in fact go to work and isn't going to work, then there'll be something done about that. Everybody has an obligation to make an effort to try to go to work, no question about that at all. We had one or

two difficult cases; people who want to take us to the courts and the whole appeal system, but by and large this isn't the case.

In terms of work for welfare, which I think is what you're saying, we have work-activity programmes which are financed by the department which do this kind of work in communities. Certainly one of the routes to go for municipalities is to initiate some winter programmes. Then you can get some people off the welfare rolls.

I think we realize that winter works programmes don't really get at the hard-core unemployed. They usually get at the trades people and those who have been in and out of the work force. But we do have work activity programmes which we finance.

On the question of seasonal pay and the business of welfare: in the department we base welfare on need, and it can be done even on a daily basis or a monthly basis, but we don't look at the yearly picture. Somebody comes into the office and they try to establish a need — we look at what has taken place over the few months.

For instance, if a man comes in in October, and in September he got a \$700 cheque, I would think that if he was not able to explain what took place with that \$700 cheque, I doubt whether he would get welfare. But we have to do it on that kind of a basis.

In terms of students: we are not really taking care of anybody under 18 anyway — unless they are actually in the community.

Now, there are to my knowledge about 120 students in Vancouver who are having welfare administered by the Children's Aid Society. These are people who are transients, where there's been no possibility of getting them back to their homes. But as a matter of practice, I think that the effort is being made to see that the parents do assume that obligation for the young people.

We have had some difficulty with students of this age simply because we were putting them into hostels at about \$5.50 a day. But what has worked out better is certainly to have Children's Aid administer the funds based on the what was then a rate of \$102, and is now of course more.

Have I answered all of your questions? Fine.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** A supplementary question. In other words, on this seasonal deal, if a man should go out — and it's been known to happen in the oil fields — and make \$12,000-\$14,000 a season, then comes home and spends it on a trip or goes on a two-month drunk or something — then comes back and says, "Well, I've no money left, I'm going to go on social welfare." Is there any worth with this gentleman on behalf of some of your staff to say: "Well, now look, if you are going to continually do this — you go out and earn good money...if you are not going to be responsible yourself, give us your cheque and we will give it back to you." There are cases where this happens and the families, the wife and the children, are the ones who suffer during the summertime. It is sort of "bust and boom."

The other thing I would like to ask the Minister: does he agree with this winter works programme? There was a programme not too long ago where if an employer hired somebody who was on social welfare, the government paid half the wages. This seemed to work. I know we took advantage of it, and did take these people off the welfare roles and they became very spirited. I know some of the ones we hired — actually when spring came, they were so revitalized that they went out and really got back into the mainstream of life again. Would you....

**HON. MR. LEVI:** ...It was a good scheme. We

[ [Page 2170](#) ]

are looking at it again to re-introduce it. There was nothing wrong with that at all. I thought it did have good possibilities and was successful, I think, in around 1,100 cases. So certainly there is good credit due there.

In going back to the seasonal thing....

**HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition):** Are you going to have a look at that?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes we are going to look at it.

In terms of the seasonal thing: the main thing is that and we, fortunately, don't get too many of these kinds of cases. If we do, the individual has to explain to us where the money has gone. Someone can't come in and admit that he has made an enormous amount, then he's broke. What we really have to look at is are there any children. Is there a wife and children involved? Then of course, we are going to have to disregard all of where the money went and take care of these people, And we would probably administer the cheque in that case, if there is a problem. Fortunately, they are isolated cases.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Peace River.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A few questions and remarks to the Minister in his salary estimates. The former administration introduced a programme which they called the "job opportunities programme". It was a programme that designed to try to cope with the problem of the hard-core unemployed employable type of person. As I understand it, the programme was quite successful in that once the department interviewed these people and gave them some encouragement, at least moral encouragement, and had a discussion with them about job opportunities, you provided them with a certificate. They then went out and looked for their own job if that was available to them.

I understand that we had a fair amount of success in finding employment for these people. I would like to know if the programme is an ongoing programme and if it is continuing; if we have any statistical information available to us yet, as to the length of employment for these people that did find jobs? I believe the programme limited our participation in their salary to 50 per cent of their salary earned for a maximum period of six months. Have these people stayed in the mainstream of life? Did we have a fair number of them fall back into welfare categories, or were we able to rehabilitate them to the extent that they continued on in the work force beyond the six month period when we participated actively with their employer in paying their salary?

It seems to me that that is the type of a programme that we should encourage more than just direct payments inasmuch as it is a cooperative effort between not only your department, but employers and the people themselves. To be successful there has to be an incentive and a motivation there that will rehabilitate people and get them not only actively employed for a matter of a few weeks or a few months, but into the work force on a permanent basis. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to comment on that programme. While I am on my feet, I would like to canvass one other area with the Minister — the plans of his department for the disenfranchised native people of the northern communities in British Columbia.

I know that we have problems, for instance, in the Fort Nelson area that are not peculiar to Fort Nelson alone. It is a problem of a lack of job opportunities, of lack of training. It is a problem of too much time on their hands and the availability of alcohol, which has always been a problem. Yet, we have in the same area many times of the year a terrific shortage of employable people.

For instance, the industry catering to the public — the tourist industry, the restaurant industry, the logging camp industry, the oil patch industry — at times of the year find themselves run off their feet because they can't find any help. If you travel the Alaska Highway in the summertime, along about the end of August, you will find that every one of the people who operate a tourist camp are so dead tired and weary that they don't even want to see another tourist come in the front door. Their biggest problem is trying to get help during those critical periods when their business is 300 or 400 per cent greater than it is during some of the winter months.

Is there any real thrust towards a programme that would help these people in their own areas? I don't think we can take them and remove them from the area and transport them somewhere else for training, but if we had personnel available to go in and work with them, it would probably go a long ways to rehabilitate these people.

I know the Hon. Minister Without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Calder) will probably be speaking about this particular matter later. He has a special responsibility in that respect but that doesn't relieve your department of any responsibilities that they have.

It seems to me that it is unfortunate where we do have a resource which happens to be untrained, unskilled, that we can't make use of them, particularly when we have job opportunities right within the area where they live. I would like a few comments from the Minister in that respect also.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to the first question — I think you were talking about the on-the-job training which was administered previously by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr.

[ [Page 2171](#) ]

Campbell) — the job certificate. Actually, in reply to the other Member, that's what I was referring to — that we are reviewing that.

In terms of the non-status Indians: I approved the other day a programme, a work programme, which they came to us about and which we had under consideration — I think it was \$168,000 which will find employment for 82 people. They will be involved in the continuation of their winter warmth programme. That's the one where they are taking a look at the houses of some of their seniors — they are insulating them and putting on new roofs and this kind of thing.

We have had a number of discussions with the non-status Indians about employment programmes. As a matter of fact, they made a proposal to us about the Fish Lake — the Chilcotin facility the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) was referring to before. We will be meeting with them about other work programmes. I think your point is certainly well taken in respect to the north. They have shown a tremendous amount of initiative in these kinds of things and they have come to us. This is the first one we have approved — we are now looking at other programmes. So certainly, we are very much involved in providing this kind of job opportunity for them.

Let me just say one other thing — without getting into my colleague's portfolio, We did last November, in respect to Indian people in this province, say that if they had a need for a facility on a reserve — where this need was in respect to children or somebody — that we would be involved in this. I am happy that we went up to the South Quatti reserve which is on the north of the Island, we met with them, saw the need for a receiving home for children, a very serious problem. I was accompanied by the Member for Comox (Ms. Sanford) and happily we've now got a joint arrangement with the Department of Indian Affairs and ourselves to put up \$90,000 which will develop a facility for a receiving home, day care centre and activity centre. It was our initiative, but the Indian Affairs people came right in with us so that it's a 50-50 proposition.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Mr. Chairman, I am sure it was an oversight on the Minister's part. Perhaps he would go back to before the lunch hour break — pardon me, lunch minute break that lasted five minutes — I asked him how many day-care centres in British Columbia, which had been started under LIP programmes or OFY programmes, are operating; where they are in the province and how are they being financed now and what is he doing about the standards. I understand some of these had really deplorable standards, and I am not one who thinks that everything should be measured by standards — the atmosphere is important. If he would answer that.

I'd like to speak for a moment, Mr. Minister: I've canvassed your estimates very carefully and I've canvassed your report. You have repeatedly stated that you're following through with the policy of the previous Minister in putting great emphasis on home resources and breaking down of centralized types of institutions and treatment care that there is going to be an increase of finances to this home-care type of situation. But nowhere do I find any allotment or any statement about budget counseling.

Surely when one examines the problems of people on fixed incomes — whether they be senior citizens or whether they be single parent families or people on low incomes, people who have graduated from the tragic state of a so-called past welfare family — it's not always a shortage of money that's the problem, it's how that money is used. So frequently today one finds, on close examination, that the priorities of people on a lower income are very different from the priorities of people on a mid-income or even a higher income. Where if someone like the Minister and some Members of this House or a manager of a small plant wouldn't have a colour television and might well see that his children had tennis shoes instead of expensive soccer boots and actually control their family's budgeting much more closely and have a much more conservative approach to financing and priorities. But, in the lower income family there's a tendency to place an emphasis on other priorities.

Now I recognize that in using the example of a colour television, this is not the best type of example

because the answer is, "Well, we don't go out very much so we need it at home." This is probably a very legitimate claim. But, if you look in the shopping baskets, so often you'll find that the single parent family or perhaps those on a lower income will use the expensive prepackaged foods — TV dinners, this type of thing; whereas a moderate income family, by nature of education perhaps, has a priority which would involve them buying a more economical type of food and utilizing it in its better sense.

So often part of the problem in low income families is that incentive is gone. They'll have land around their house where they are, but there will be no incentive to grow their own vegetables; whereas a mid-income family will have their kids out there and they will be growing their own garden. So the whole matter of priorities and budget counseling is very important.

Alberta has a very good programme to examine. I would be pleased to give the Minister the details if he wanted them.

I think there needs to be in every single parent group in British Columbia, and there are many of them forming, someone who is available to provide

[ [Page 2172](#) ]

budget information should these people want it. One usually finds when groups are together and start talking on a positive vein, that they want this type of information.

The Department of Agriculture helped the Vancouver people put on some excellent programmes about two years ago. They were practical programmes on how to buy economically, how to buy quality foods economically. It wasn't a matter of just a TV programme, it was a matter of reaching into the community. A group of women or some men would meet together, there would be one discussion leader who might or might not — be directly involved in the low income situation, although it's preferable if they are. There was a little book that went with it so that they could read ahead of time what was going to be on the programme. Then they could follow the programme. And then afterwards they could have a discussion.

It has marvelous graphic illustrations on can sizes and understanding of weights. I think it's very difficult for us to recognize that there are many people even now in British Columbia that don't know how many ounces are in a pound. I guess they pretty well know how many cents there are in the dollar, but most of us don't know how much those cents will buy for a dollar.

There's a great need for familiarization. There's a great need for helping these people — I don't think on a highly professional basis — to understand the needs of budgeting. It's something that should have been in the schools a long time ago. It's in there now. It does present problems because even among so highly respected a profession as teaching, we find teachers who don't know how to budget either. It's probably a common problem to all of us.

I think, Mr. Minister, it's disappointing to me that in your estimates this very vital first step isn't there. Surely the answer is not to shove the money in and then do it. The idea is to put them together and have them work together.

I would also like to ask the Minister about some of the less publicized — for obvious reasons — programmes that have been going on around the province where there has been a group of, perhaps, single parent families who have had a very difficult time. They're to the point where there's just no motivation. These people have been organizing in programmes where it's been a matter of meeting with these people to the point where there has to be provision for child care while they're out. Coming to a meeting's been an effort and they haven't attended to their personal care. They have cigarette burns down their dresses. They haven't had their hair done. And through slow companionship and motivation, even to having their hair done and paid for by the department — which I believe in in certain circumstances — that these people have slowly regained a sense of identity and a sense of worthwhileness.

But it's been a matter of going right back and trying to help these people even plan their day in the most simple of terms in order that they can get out. I wonder if the Minister would let me know how many of these programmes are still going on; how many he anticipates for the future and if he will keep this policy in effect.

I think in the long run, one can't adjudicate the success of these programmes by the number of so-called obtainable levels by bodies. It's a matter of if there is an improvement in the situation and in the attitude of the individual. But if you did wish to measure it, it's my understanding that some of these people are now in the university, some have graduated from the university, having started through this type of motivational programme, and that this training has been largely paid for through government sources.

I personally feel this is an excellent type of programme that has a great deal to offer. Again, this is where you need budget counseling.

The matter was brought up a few minutes ago regarding welfare for teenagers or people who didn't work. I would like to express to the Minister a concern that I'm finding in some families where assistance to a teenager is causing a real problem in the original home — on a financial basis.

As the Minister knows, I'm sure, if he's got teenagers — lovable babies become revolting teenagers for a certain period in their life. At this time there's a conflict between parent and teenagers and teachers and standards. And often, in a huff — and I think sometimes it's a good idea to let them go — the teenager will take off. This is fine. But I think the state does not have a responsibility to make this easy. If the teenagers want to make the decision themselves that they are going to leave home for relatively minor things — and the most controversial one right now, I think, is the length of hair.

There are young people in British Columbia, in the past and some now, who are living with other families in neighbouring communities, receiving welfare payments which are well beyond any capacity that their parents could give them. They go home, they have money to spend that their brothers and sisters don't have — they're disturbing to that environment and it sets up a climate where it's quite profitable to leave home.

I think that we have an exaggerated impression of how much money teenagers should have to spend today and how much they really have. I would ask the Minister's view on this. I think it's terribly important in trying not to see any teenager go hungry or get into a situation beyond their capacities to

[ [Page 2173](#) ]

handle.

Also that we not put ourselves in a position as government where we're making it easy for young people to leave home, where we're making it profitable for young people to leave home, and where that easiness and that profitability when the child returns to the home just adds a greater strain within the home. It not only creates jealousies among their brothers and sisters, but it also is encouraging to their brothers and sisters to leave home.

I'd ask the Minister how many cases like this he thinks there are in British Columbia or, if there is no record, if he could endeavour to ascertain for the next year how many situations there are like this and if in his emphasis on returning children to the home situation by offering financial assistance he'll be very careful to see that the policy does not aid the one child you're trying to aid in such a way that it creates a destructive force within the home.

Again, I'm sure budget counseling would be a very close part of this in-home resource centre approach.

The next question I'd like to ask the Minister is this matter of — I didn't want to use the term "fraud" — a guaranteed holiday through the government auspices on behalf of the taxpayers. But there is fraud in social welfare. I don't for a minute want to exaggerate the situation at all. I think that many people who receive welfare or rehabilitation services are in genuine need and I think every person in British Columbia is very pleased to contribute to this and to see that the highest possible care and assistance is given. But what knocks the public is that when they're slugging it out and trying to look after their families, there are obvious cases of abuse of this programme and downright fraud. I think that this not only knocks the taxpayer and makes him very resistant to good, constructive rehabilitation programmes, but it also gives those who are receiving assistance an undeserved tarnished image. It slops over. No matter how much we say it shouldn't, it's going to.

And so the Minister, without in any way suggesting that there are large-scale abuses, I believe has a responsibility within his department and his sphere of administration to take the necessary steps to see that there isn't fraud. It's very human and very charitable to say, "Well, the few that cheat mean nothing compared to the

number that we help." But I don't think that's a realistic approach. If there are fraudulent actions by people then these should be suitably taken care of and suitably repaid, not only for the benefit of those who are genuinely in need of assistance and receiving it, but to bring more and more public acceptance, more and more public enthusiasm for assisting those less fortunate than ourselves and not, Mr. Minister, giving perhaps the very genuine hard-pressed taxpayer the need or the opportunity to get on his high horse and cry "wolf" and have good reason for it.

I think that we've been a little bit afraid of expressing the attitude that responsibility is a part of citizenship today. Our responsibility as legislators and your responsibility as a Minister is to care to the best of your ability for those in need. But it's also to protect those who pay. The overall benefit to everyone, I believe, far exceeds the few people who might be cheating and don't like to be caught.

So I would ask what the Minister has been doing and will do about this. As I say, I don't in any way want to create alarm or make wild accusations. That's not the position at all.

I have a few more questions, but perhaps the Minister would like to answer these and other Members would like to speak.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** In respect to the question of fraud, we are constantly being advised by well meaning citizens that there are suggested cases of fraud and we investigate them. In some cases charges follow that. I appreciate the Member saying that she is not highlighting it as something that's horrendous. It isn't. But we are aware that this is public money and we have an obligation to investigate every complaint that we have.

A lot of the complaints do not bear out in terms of the facts, but nevertheless we do do that.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Well I'm not particularly in favour of having the police staff go out hunting. You see the solution, I think, partly to this problem is that if you've got more staff, then the staff can be dealing with individuals and doing some home visits in terms of where they're supposed to be working — not in the office but with the families. Then you become cognizant of what's going on. But we can't hire a team of people to go out hunting this kind of thing.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** First of all, we're mindful of this problem. We certainly check things out. But as we broaden the field staff and the staff get into the homes and we are dealing with these people on a fairly regular basis, this kind of thing will fall away. But we are not in any way underestimating that there can be these problems.

In respect to teenagers, we're into a slightly different bag now with young people. I don't think that any of the welfare rates we've been paying have ever attracted kids to leave home — not too many. We find that some of the people we are dealing with on welfare are young people who have come to the attention of our department anyway because they're somewhat disturbed young people. By and large,

[ [Page 2174](#) ]

most people that leave home prefer to make it on their own, and are doing it. They're out working, picking up jobs. So I don't feel too concerned about the fact that we might be resulting in breaking up families. I think it's a completely over-exaggerated problem.

Now, under debt counseling and budgeting, I asked the staff to give consideration to budget counseling and debt counseling simply because one of the solutions, one of the pressures that we can remove from a lot of people — not just people on welfare but a lot of people — should become more aware of the orderly payment of debt process which is not available under the bankruptcy Act. There is now the possibility of going through bankruptcy on a personal basis for something like \$ 5 0. We are working up a procedure for the staff to become aware of this and make it known to their clients.

There is in the field staff budget a training item. Also, we will be holding a number of seminars with our

staff about various techniques, including the budgeting. Nutrition is something else that we're getting into. We're hiring a nutritionist. We're generally introducing a number of programmes that could be advantageous to families.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one plea to the Minister on behalf of a group of people in our society that I feel very strongly about. When the Mincome brochure came out — I certainly don't want to fault anybody in his department or the Minister or anybody else — but there was some misunderstanding among some people, particularly war veterans. Some people got this form and it says that "we guarantee you at least \$200 a month." I know of some cases where the person who received a war veterans' allowance, a pension, thought that it was going to be taken off. We allow him the first \$50.

I would like to make a plea on behalf of these people to make an exception, particularly for those who are receiving war pensions. I do it because of this reason. The majority of these people gave the best years of their life, in their youth or in the prime of their life, to go and fight for the freedom that we enjoy today. A lot of them were left in very difficult financial circumstances, because they didn't have the opportunity. While other people were at home, particularly in wartime with good jobs and full employment, the majority of the ones who were receiving pensions left their homeland to go overseas and fight for us. They didn't get a chance to build up any nest egg.

I think we have the opportunity to do something for these people in the way of a bonus, if you like, but certainly to forgive all veterans' allowances, all veterans' pensions, and pay them the Mincome over and above this. We can certainly afford it. The money is there. The province is in good shape. I think it would be an excellent gesture on your part, Mr. Minister, to do that. I am making a plea on behalf of this segment of society. Would you give me your comments on that, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I appreciate the Member's comments. We've had a number of requests about this. We constantly have this thing under review. We do at the moment exempt the first \$50. But I appreciate his comments. We do have problems with the federal government, mind you. They won't share in anything that we exempt. They're not even going to share in the \$50. So we're having some ongoing discussions with them.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** One other thing, Mr. Chairman, before this vote is passed. I have some questions that I'd like to ask the Minister with regard to food co-ops. I didn't hear anything about this in the last session. It must have been a hallway news conference....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. This matter is before a committee of the House and therefore is not....

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Before a committee of the House? Social welfare committee?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It's before the agricultural committee and is now under consideration. Therefore I would ask him not to ask

**MR. PHILLIPS:** This group that appeared before the agriculture committee....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** This matter was referred....

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Is that what the Minister said when he says he's planning food co-ops? I'll ask that question. It's a perfectly legitimate question. Just because we have one group that comes and seeks money, that's not the policy that's laid out here. It has nothing to do with the policy which I read in the newspaper.

We have one small group, Mr. Chairman, who have come to the agriculture committee requesting funds. That is the policy that's laid out here — that the NDP are planning B.C. food co-ops. It has nothing to do with a small group who are coming to the agriculture committee. I can see no relation whatsoever. This article states....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. I would ask the Hon. Member to relate this matter to the estimates or at

least to ask the Minister to clarify the view, Otherwise, I would consider....

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I'll relate it to the estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. Otherwise, it would properly be a matter to come under the agriculture department. I'd ask him to put his question to the Minister.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** May I relate it to the estimates? It says here, "Rehabilitation Minister Norm Levi Announced Tuesday...." It's his estimates and I presume that he's going to....

The thing is that this can be very well related to the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement because maybe it's the Minister's intention to have welfare recipients work for the very co-op that he's going to put up. It could very well be. There are people who are on social welfare who could be trained to work in these co-ops. I think it's very important. I would like to proceed with further questioning on this, with your permission, in all fairness, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps it would be appropriate for the Hon. Member to allow the Minister to clarify this statement that he's made. Then if further questioning seems to be necessary, I'll allow him to do some.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Thank you very much.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I did make statements last fall. By agreement with the Minister of Agriculture, he has agreed to carry on with this particular project that we've been discussing. One of the things that he has done is to put a question before the House committee. So it's squarely in his department now. It's not anything that's in my department at all.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish we'd been informed of 'this change of policy before the Minister of Agriculture's estimates came up. Here we're going through this....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I've got a perfectly legitimate question here. I still don't know what the policy is on the co-ops, after the Minister has made an announcement, Mr. Chairman. I want to know.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. The Hon. Minister has answered that this is now fully the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore I would ask him not to pursue this matter further.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** I want to know what this Government's policy is with regard to food co-ops. Would the Premier like to give it to us, now that it's been shuffled between one department and another? I didn't know this when the Minister of Agriculture's (Hon. Mr. Stupich) estimates were up, or certainly we would have explored it further. I don't know whether our money's going to be spent setting up co-ops or.... Really, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. I would ask the Hon. Member to move to a new subject or to take his seat.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** It's closure, Mr. Chairman. It certainly is. We can't find out. We can't get any questions answered during the question period. We bring up a subject under a Minister's estimates that he's made a whole report on. We can't get the answers. We don't know....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. Would the Hon. Member be seated please. I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to the statements of the Hon. Member for South Peace River, when the Minister gets on his feet, would he clarify his own views on cooperatives? Even though the matter is before a committee, I think it is important that the statements by the Minister be discussed in this House. I think it is important whether the Minister has some preconceived ideas about food cooperatives.

The Minister has not answered a couple of my questions. I'm sure this is just an oversight on his part. He was going to answer the last one. That was in relation to the number of day-care centres in British Columbia which were financed by LIP and other programmes and how they're being done now.

I'd like to go back for a moment, because the Minister didn't answer my specific question. He wasn't given a chance to by the Premier last night. With regard to girls who previously would have gone to Willingdon School if it were open, are they in foster homes, generally? What avenues are open for treatment for these girls? If we become involved, as MLAs, who do we contact for help for this type of girl?

I'd also ask what the Minister's plans are for the future of the physical plant that was Willingdon School? There's a good deal of money involved there. I understand that he's made one statement that it might well be used for the Canada Summer Games. I don't oppose this but I also feel, Mr. Minister, that there are many young people and children in this province who could benefit very much from the use of that facility on an interim basis.

The Canada Summer Games are financed very well

[ [Page 2176](#) ]

by the federal government. We're certainly glad to have them in British Columbia. I think we have to look after our citizens in need first. I hope this would be the first priority. At the physical plant, there's much to recommend the school, certainly in the way of grounds and recreation.

I'd like to ask the Minister what his feelings are about a pilot project that I was involved in in his department. There's been an effort to arrange a family exchange programme between single-parent families in certain areas of the province with predominantly rural families. The opportunity for a single parent and his or her children to visit and live in a home in another part of the province with rural families can have many benefits.

The Minister is smiling. If he knows about it, I'm sure he recognizes as I do that it's fraught with problems. Also, I don't think the idea itself is bad. We even had trouble with the British Columbia Railway, as the Minister obviously knows.

But, Mr. Minister, this is a germ of a good idea. Following our relatively unsuccessful or unspectacular attempt, the Department of Agriculture came up with the same idea. I think that the fact that two people came up with an idea may mean that we just went about it the wrong way. I don't know that it was a failure, really. Certainly the hosting families in the interior derived much benefit from it. I've had letters from them and have referred them back to the Minister's department — that if they're interested in doing this again, they should contact their local representative.

I would hate to see a lot of government summer camps for children developed in British Columbia. But I think an opportunity for families who are genuinely in financial need to organize their own type of outings and summer programmes could be beneficial. There's a group in Saanich, I believe it is, who have a friendship club. It's self-organized, self-help, and has had a great deal of benefit, which I won't go into because it's probably more beneficial because it isn't too highly publicized.

I know that there was an interest there in undertaking a family camping trip with their members. Finances were a major problem. I think you have to be realistic in assisting these programmes. But perhaps there could be assistance in reservation of a government park campsite. Or perhaps there could be a central loan area in certain regions, where people could donate sleeping bags, tents, this sort of thing, and keep them in stock so that those who want to take a camping trip and don't have the finances could utilize this service without any great cost.

I don't know whether the Minister does any camping, but my experience has been that every family should take one camping trip, even if it leads to divorce. Secondly, many families today are still tenting, some by choice and some by necessity. I think this is an area that the Minister should investigate. I would ask if he would.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** With respect to camping, I'll have a statement to make in two or three weeks about a camping programme. On a general level, I do camp quite frequently, especially up in the Osoyoos area. That's where I like to go camping.

With respect to your exchange programme, I think you were being a little generous when you said it was a germ of an idea. I think it was probably a scintilla of an idea that just about disappeared. We had a number of problems with it. We weren't quite sure what it was going to end in. I'll be very frank with you. I haven't taken another look at it. You've drawn it to my attention. I'll look at it again. I don't really... Well, I think I've said enough, I'll just take a look at it again.

In terms of the Willingdon School, we have now formally given the school from April 15 to September 1 to the Canada Summer Games. The children's committee has been discussing for some time alternate uses of the Willingdon and Maples complex. We've met with the residential treatment centre people. We've had a number of discussions around the best use of this facility. I'll be very frank with you. We haven't had a meeting of the minds on it. We've decided that we need more time to deal with it. We'll certainly have something to come up with by the first of September. In the meantime we have turned it over to the summer games as B.C.'s contribution to this forthcoming event.

I don't really want to comment on the food co-op thing because I am on the committee, and the question is before the committee. The thing is that the Minister of Agriculture had, on two or three occasions, made mention of his position with respect to co-ops, and had taken it over from me. He has written a number of letters to many, many people, of which he has sent me copies. Just about every region of the province has written to him about it, and he has replied, in fact, that he will have a statement to make sometime during this session. At the moment, of course, it is before the House in respect to co-ops.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I keep blocking on the LIP, I'm sorry. In terms of the LIP programme, what we have been doing, and I appreciate your remarks about the standards of LIP programme day-care centres, is to take over three or four who have come to us for subsequent financing. The latest one, I think, was the one in Vancouver — the one at the King Edward High School. Obviously they have to meet our standards; otherwise we are not prepared to finance them. We are in touch with LIP about the ones that they are putting on, and we have told the LIP people that we

[ [Page 2177](#) ]

do not want to be in a position of having to fund a day-care centre, particularly in an area where we find there are far too many day-care centres in the first place. We want to be able to spread this service around. But there is fairly close cooperation with us in terms of which ones are being set up, and which ones we'll take over.

I do get a little concerned when I hear that there is an LIP programme at UBC, for the development of a further six day-care centres for the public. That is a bit of a concern — after all, we are financing quite a bit of service out there now, so that one could cause us a little anxiety. I'll be speaking to the LIP people again about that.

We do take them over — selected ones, not all of them — but they have to meet our standards.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I appreciate the Minister's comments in regard to the conglomeration, if one can call it that, and I know LIP people haven't been terribly cooperative in taking the advice of your own people as to where these might be centered.

Again, this is another example of a good type of programme that can be destroyed through the public getting the wrong impression, and through, as the Minister said, those funding it not listening to the department. I hope that every emphasis will be put on to encourage the federal government to listen to your suggestion, and I agree with the Minister completely. I have heard about what I agree is an apparent excess of provision of day-care centres at the university, when in fact there are many other areas of the province where they could be better utilized.

I thank you, Mr. Minister, as a taxpayer, and I think in speaking for the area I represent, I do not envision taxpayers' money going to provide child-care so that the parents can just swing. I think every taxpayer is prepared to assist, providing they know that the whole programme is well supervised and is beneficial, but not if it should become a substitute parent. I think we must get back to this business of responsibility. If young people want to get married and have children, then they have to accept that there are privileges and responsibilities, certainly in regard to the care of one's children.

With regard to the standards: are these LIP centres examined in any way for safety and proper care of the children by your department?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** It's the health department's responsibility.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I see, so there are none in the province that are under the federal government's sponsorship?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Oh, no.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I wouldn't want the Minister to misinterpret my statements when I say I don't think one would be hidebound by standards — I really don't. But I think that there are times and conditions where a lesser technical standard can still provide a very beneficial environment for them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly don't wish to prolong this debate. The Minister has been very cooperative. There is one more question that I would like to ask him: is the Government intending to issue food vouchers to welfare recipients that can be cashed in at co-ops?

A second question, Mr. Chairman: will special food vouchers be given to purchasers for surplus B.C. fruits, vegetables and fish from the new fish plant?

And the third question — it is not a question on the third, it is a statement, a suggestion that the name for this be "Socialism at Safeway." That should be the name for this new cooperative plan.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, that I should like to ask the Minister: how many apartment house operators did he have to reprimand for raising rent when Mincome was brought in last January? I know that the Minister was very strong, and stood very firmly last October in saying, "If any of you guys raise the rent because some of our old age pensioners are receiving an increase, then we are going to name you in the paper." I would like to know how many he had to name in the paper.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Let's go to the first question...I've lost it. What was the first question?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Food vouchers — Socialism at Safeway.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I don't favour food vouchers, anyway. We are paying cash to people, and people can make their own choices about where they want to shop. I would hope that if we make some decisions about co-ops people on welfare and many people in the community will take advantage of becoming members. But that is entirely up to them. The second question was in respect to what? You have so bamboozled me with the last question. Oh, B.C. fruits. Well, I'm sure that you know that this is a government policy, and that we want to have people buy B.C. As I understand it, we will be having a programme which will accentuate this.

On the rent question, I phoned two apartment

[ [Page 2178](#) ]

owners myself, in respect to increases — one of them was in my riding — and asked them if they would agree to roll back. One did, but the other one didn't. I checked with the Apartment Owners' Association, but the individual was not a member, and they said, "Well, this is one of the constant problems. It would serve no useful purpose to name him, because he would just go on doing what he wants anyway."

I said earlier that we did have very good cooperation from the apartment owners' association. I met with them, they did a survey of their own and, based on that and some of the interviews, we felt that although there were individual cases there was certainly nothing outrageous.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 238 pass?

Vote 238 approved.

On vote 239: general administration, \$275,862.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Just one question, Mr. Minister, in relation to the salaries. They are all up, and yet I understand that salary negotiations haven't been completed yet. Is this a projected figure, or are the employees actually receiving this?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Hon. Member be seated while the Minister answers?

**MRS. JORDAN:** Fine.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** These salaries relate to last year's increases.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I see. And there is a new position, Mr. Minister — oh, pardon me, it's my eyesight. The Assistant Deputy Minister and Director. This was filled before. You have a new social worker 5 at \$12,840, Mr. Minister. Could you outline what the duties of this new social worker will be?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes, this is an assistant to the director of programmes, Don Bingham. He is packing an enormous load, and we want to get him an assistant to take some of the load off him. That is why that position is there.

**MRS. JORDAN:** There used to be previously a personnel officer, I think, or someone who acted in that capacity. You have a new personnel officer. Could you explain that, please?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** We have a personnel officer and an assistant. We do have a new personnel officer, Mr. April 4, 1973

Spence. He is handling the personnel matters for about 1,100 people in the department, and it is just not possible for one man to do all that work, especially as we are now also taking over some municipality functions. So we are bringing more people in. That is an assistant to him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 239 pass?

Vote 239 approved.

On vote 240: assistance and rehabilitation division, \$342,910.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** In relation to this vote, I did ask the Minister a question under his salary vote. He didn't complete it, and I thought I'd wait until we got here. That's in relation to temporary assistance to Mincome at \$200,000. I assume that this is for staff for mailing. Perhaps he would outline their duties and what they did. I would assume that this is the vote that covers the advertising of Mincome. The Minister at my questioning did say that the voices on the air were two senior citizens, and I would ask him: was one of those senior citizens an MLA?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Leo. (Laughter).

**MRS. JORDAN:** I didn't hear any popcorn popping in the background. I wonder if the Minister would answer those questions.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** The advertising came out of the social allowance vote — 243. The \$200,000 in respect to temporary assistance to Mincome, of course, was for the whole setting up of the Mincome programme. We had to take on a large number of people in order to get everything ready — the cheques into data processing, and the office that we set up. Part of the money was spent on that, and part of the money is now being spent on staff.

**MRS. JORDAN:** This isn't just for the original production — there is a carry-over.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** There is a carry-over, yes.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Will I get a chance to talk on 243 to find out if...?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There are other speakers, Hon. Member. I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

**MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard):** Thanks

[ [Page 2179](#) ]

very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask a question about the rehabilitation plans for the department, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman. Under the last government there was sort of a division made between rehabilitation and education. The feeling was that education was not a part of rehabilitation. The way they divided this was that if you were on welfare you could continue to get your welfare payments if you took a mini-course in hairdressing or something like this. But if someone on welfare wanted to go through university or wanted to do a course in teaching or medicine or law, that person automatically would be taken off of welfare.

What I want to find out from you, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, is: do you still have this kind of division between what is education and what is rehabilitation or do you consider education to be part of rehabilitation?

Now an example of this that I'd like to bring to your attention is that of people, for example, who I counseled when I was at Simon Fraser — sole-support parents who were on welfare and had children. As soon as it was brought to the attention of the welfare department that they were students, they automatically were taken off welfare. So they had to leave university and go back on welfare again.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MS. BROWN:** Just a minute, please. I allowed you to speak for about five hours. I waited patiently in my seat....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please.

**MS. BROWN:** O.K. Fine.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard has the floor.

**MS. BROWN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I contacted the former Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement and prepared a brief for him — Mr. Galardi, I think the name was — showing him that it was to the government's advantage to assist people so that they could go through the educational process and get off welfare rather than forcing them to remain on welfare until they were old enough to go on the Old Age Assistance programme.

I got a letter back from him stating that this was an educational matter and was not covered by this department.

I would also like to bring to your attention that this was not necessarily all women. There are some men, too, who came onto this programme who were faced with the support of their children and found that in order to continue supporting them they had to leave university and stay on welfare.

Now, I realize that your statement last night said that the working poor would be able to apply to make up the difference between what the welfare recipient would receive and what the working poor would be earning. Do you consider a student working poor? Because while you are a student at university it's not necessarily possible, if you are taking care of children at the same time, to work. Would the students come under this category?

The other item was that you also mentioned a nutritional allowance for pregnant women. Would this nutritional allowance for pregnant women also apply in the case of the working poor or would it only be for the pregnant women who were on welfare?

Would you make a statement, Mr. Minister, about your home-maker programme? We are kind of anxious to hear how it's going, and if you have started doing anything on it. Thank you very much.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** In respect to the question of education, we are meeting next week with the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) around this particular subject. I know that the Member has been involved in this question. As I understand it, the department has of late been very cooperative but keeping on the very realistic cases. There have been one or two that have been very unrealistic and we haven't agreed to go along with them.

Our approach to rehabilitation is that whatever it requires within reason for someone to be rehabilitated, even if it's up to the university level, has to be looked at if the potential is there.

I am hoping as a result of the meeting next week that we can make a statement which is very specific around this ongoing process.

On the question of women, who are pregnant, I don't want to say anything at this time because we are still trying to assess the numbers. The statement I made last night applies to welfare recipients but we'll certainly have to look at it. I haven't had a chance to do that.

Home-maker service. We have had a number of meetings. We've also increased the grants by 50 per cent. As you know my colleague, the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) and I have met on it. We are looking to develop a home care home-maker service. We've met with the home-making people about further training and expansion of the training process.

We're looking forward to taking off the welfare rolls a group of people who heretofore had no expectation of getting off. I have in mind women of 45, 50 and over who have real basic home-maker skills as a result of being mothers and wives. We are

[ [Page 2180](#) ]

hoping to employ them. We are looking forward I think in talking to the people who are going to have the course so that we can look forward to enrolling about 200 people and coming out with about 150 the first year from the one training area alone. So it is a potential in terms of employment. We will be meeting with them again once they have come up with a training programme.

Let me say this: the home-makers are in need of a place to do this training. At the moment in Vancouver it's being done at the community centre. What they really need is to have a house because that's the kind of situation people will be working in. We're looking into this for them as well.

Did I cover all of your questions?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

**MS. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, about the home-maker programme. Presently the home-makers are not covered by the minimum wage law. Would your home-makers be covered by the minimum wage law?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes, we have met with the home-maker people and the association and I'll be making a statement about that in respect to this minimum wage situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I had a question to ask the Minister, but I'd just like to comment on the statement made by the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard to the Minister regarding a couple who have a child, I assume, and were on welfare at the university. I think this is an area in which, unless there were extremely unusual circumstances....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Oh, one parent? I was just going to caution the Minister that I really think if the

taxpayers found that they were supporting couples on welfare at university that this would raise their hackles. It would seem relatively unrealistic until we're a little more affluent than we are.

I would ask the Minister regarding code number 001, office expenses under vote 241 — the previous expenses were \$2,000 a year and there is now a vote of \$52,000 for the coming year. This seems like an extraordinary amount. I recognize that the Minister is taking on more field staff, but you can do an awful lot of redecorating for \$52,000. I wonder if he could break down for us what this money is being used for and which offices and how many people it will service.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** ...this particular item, you know, for all of the equipment and the setting up and the office expenses. As you know, we have our office at the moment down on Johnson Street, in the Bellamy Building. We have to rent that space and set up office. At the moment there are 40 people working in Mincome.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Did this include any mechanical equipment — typewriters, computers?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes, there are a number of pieces of mechanical equipment relating to envelope stuffing and this kind of thing. We had to buy a bit of accessories for that.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I accept the Minister's statement. I suppose for 40 people it isn't too much. Is the Minister planning to open Mincome offices around the province, or will it operate from a central headquarters, relying on your staff and MLAs to refer to people with problems?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** We're going to operate centrally. We have under review at the moment a very interesting booklet that is being prepared by one of the staff on Mincome and we're taking a close look at it before we do something about it. I think that people will make use of our field offices — and MLAs — and we'll keep them informed of any changes.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Will the booklet have your picture on it?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** You might note from the annual report I don't have my picture in that. I'm not all that beautiful that I want to be that...

**MRS. JORDAN:** Oh, we'll vote for you.

[Mr. Fraser in the chair]

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. First Member for Victoria.

**MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria):** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister how many floors of the Belmont Building they're planning on using. How much space do they have in that particular building?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I am not sure that this is relevant to this particular vote.

**MR. MORRISON:** Well if it concerns that \$52,000....

[ [Page 2181](#) ]

**HON. MR. LEVI:** We're going to have the whole building.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 240 pass?

Vote 240 approved.

On vote 241: assistance and rehabilitation division, \$6,799,189.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** In the salaries, Mr. Chairman, there is a new position, the assistant director of operations. I would ask the Minister, "who he?"

And then, just down a short way, under "social worker 7," the previous vote last year was \$26,520. Two positions are listed for this year and I would assume at that rate there were two last year, unless we had a \$26,000 social worker on the staff, but it's a decrease to \$25,000. Is this a typographical error or did we clip someone's salary?

Would you like my questions all now or would the Attorney General like to withdraw the vote so that Minister can go and have lunch and refresh himself?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No, no, he's overweight now. (Laughter).

**MRS. JORDAN:** There's an increase in the welfare research grant from \$15,000 — it's code number 019. It's increased from \$15,000 to \$122,000 this year. I wonder if the Minister would outline how he proposes to spend that money; how many people will be involved; and if they are grants to individuals, how they will apply for these grants.

Just below that, code number 129 — motor vehicle and accessories — \$85,500 last year and \$140,000 this year. Is this for new field staff? If so, how are you purchasing these cars? Are you leasing them? Are you buying so-many? Are you into compacts, mini cars — what type?

I would also ask the Minister, I think just under this vote, if he can give us an estimate of what the average cost is to hire a field worker — by hire, I mean in terms of salary, office space, equipment, secretarial service — in order that we can utilize this information for next year.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** ...but what you have there because of the reduction is — one of the workers resigned — we hired somebody else who came in at a lower level because they didn't have the seniority of the previous person.

In respect to the \$140,000 item on the motor vehicles: when we were doing the estimates, I said to the staff, "Be realistic. Don't tell me what you think we can get away with, be realistic." This is a realistic figure. For example, since we recently took over the Kamloops Welfare Department, we had to pick up six cars for the staff because the municipal cars stayed with the municipality. We took the staff; we have to find them cars because they're servicing that area.

There was one other question in relation to the \$122,000 which was the welfare grant — \$107,000 of that is part of that research project which is taking place at Brannen Lake, which is a study of behaviour traits in adolescent boys.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Those are various projects?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes. We are also looking into foster home services for children as a project.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I'm sorry, I can't hear the Minister.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Sorry. The \$107,000 of the \$122,000 is a research grant relating to Brannen Lake School — the study of behaviour traits in adolescent boys, evaluation of children's services. The latter is extremely important to us. I've said on a number of occasions that we must have an evaluation component in the services that we purchase. We are not prepared to continue purchasing services without such an evaluation.

There is a project for residential care for all emotionally disturbed children. We are looking at that with a profile study. Foster home service for children — we are looking at that as a project. Social Assistance Services for Children is also a projected project.

Now the expenditures for the projects are approved by the health and welfare department of the federal government and are 100 per cent refundable. It's completely covered by them.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Right. I don't object, Mr. Minister to the use of this money. I think it's being well used, except I don't understand the cost of research, and \$107,000 for one project in one institution seems a little bit high to my mind. Could you outline briefly how many people are involved in the research project and, really, sort of guesstimate the disbursement of the funds?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes, I apologize to the Member. What I was looking at with \$107,000, was really reflecting the increase from last year — while the programmes I described, will in fact, cost approximately \$122,000 — that's four proposed projects, all of it refundable from the federal government.

**MRS. JORDAN:** And you will be submitting a report on these and breakdowns for next year?

[ [Page 2182](#) ]

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Yes, we'll make that information available. You know, we have a policy that all reports that we do will be published.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 241 pass?

Vote 241 approved.

On vote 242: health care division, \$238,058.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I don't know what this division does and I wonder if the Minister would briefly outline. It seems to be a director and two specialists and a pharmacist. Is this the group that handle the drugs that go out? It seems heavily laden with sort of chiefs and typists.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** It deals with divisions of the medical and para-medical services. Also, those two people are responsible for approval of the handicapped pension allowance — Dr. Laundry and Dr. Duncan — and any other approval that is needed in respect to drugs, optical supplies and that kind of thing. This is our medical service which I will be more than pleased one day, to turn over to my colleague, the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke). I think it's more appropriate for a department like mine to purchase service from the Minister rather than us operate this kind of department. That's my personal feeling about it. But that's what it's for. Their primary function, at the moment, is handling handicapped allowance, pensions application and applications for drugs under the subsidy programme. That's what they do.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 242 pass?

Vote 242 approved.

On vote 243: social assistance, \$215,968,000.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Chairman, I must again repeat the question — which seems a little irrelevant with the size of the vote — was one of the voices on Mincome an MLA, a senior citizen? And the other thing — this is medical services and drugs. Is the Minister considering expanding services in this area to all people over the age of 65; also to those who have chronic illnesses, but may not necessarily qualify for medical care. I think of celiac children, epileptics — those who are having trouble paying for a necessary drug for their survival but they don't come under the medical care programme. I find myself often going to your department to try and get these people help.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** I only know of two Members of the Legislature who are over the age of 65, that's the Hon. Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) and the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Bennett). Neither of them recorded anything for us in the Mincome programme.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** No, we didn't need a juvenile role, so we didn't mess around.

The Government is reviewing, and I think we stated before, the whole question of a broadening of the free drugs to senior citizens and to some other people. It's been stated by myself and the Minister of Health that what we're looking into is a bulk buying procedure with the other western provinces. Once those discussions are concluded, we may be in a position to make a statement. I think the Members will appreciate that bulk buying is an enormous saving — not only with drugs but prosthetic devices as well. But it is under consideration.

[Mr. Dent in the chair]

**MRS. JORDAN:** The Government itself and the Minister isn't planning on going into drug production or drug manufacturing themselves?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** Not that I'm aware of, no.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 243 pass?

Vote 243 approved.

On vote 244: New Denver, \$480,058.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Just a short word about New Denver — I think to a layman's point of view, an excellent situation which has struggled along. All that I'd like to ask the Minister about it at this time, is whether or not they will continue with their summer programme, I understand that they've been involved, I think it was in my own area last summer, in working in projects with the parks department and the forestry department — and whether he will arrange further of these for the boys.

The other thing is the travelling expenses. Unless I've missed the boat somewhere — only \$500. Is that to cover all travelling of students? Supposing they go on a trip somewhere — is that the staff and the students in that \$500? If it is, does the Minister feel that this is adequate? I'm not suggesting that the students should be junketing around the world, but there must be, in their integration with the playing sports with the community teams and that, times when they go with the teams.

[ [Page 2183](#) ]

**HON. MR. LEVI:** In terms of the summer programmes, yes, we are going to continue. We will be continuing with that.

In terms of the travelling expenses: I'm afraid that I can't make any comment. I see there's one, but that relates to the office and not to the boys. I can assure the Member that whatever they need to travel, that won't be a hindrance, we will make the money available.

**MRS. JORDAN:** You'd better give the staff a trip out of there once in a while too, it's pretty isolated.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 244 pass?

Vote 244 approved.

Vote 245: child welfare division, \$398,414 — approved.

Vote 246: provincial home, \$431,180 — approved.

On vote 246: Brannen Lake School for boys, \$1,054,739.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has explained that he has a research project going on there. In relation to the salaries, in trying to compare them with other positions, it would seem that the director received rather a high increase this year, as it's \$15,960 last year and \$ 18,420 this year. Is there a reason for this? Perhaps he'd explain it.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** He was assessed by the commission. They said that in view of the experience, ability and responsibility he has, he was classified upwards. It was well-deserved.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I wasn't questioning that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 247 pass?

Vote 247 approved.

On vote 248: Division on Aging, \$260,811.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Minister, I'm glad to see some increase here too. Pardon me, it's a decrease. Sorry. I wonder if the Minister would explain essentially why. Are you not planning on expanding the services for the Division on Aging? Do you not feel it's necessary or are you shifting some of their responsibilities to another area? If you could explain that.

Also, I would just comment to the Minister regarding his memo for possible candidacy of future councilors. I think all Members appreciate this. For my part, I have sent it on in order that they will bring forth their own suggestions. Hopefully, they'll be good people who the Minister may keep on file. There's no political attachment to them. I think it will be handled on a basis — as you know, there are often factions — where those suggested will be reasonably acceptable to all.

Perhaps the Minister would outline just whether or not he intends to expand the role of the senior citizen councilor. I think I'm right in suggesting that he's expanded the allowance by \$10.

**HON. MR. LEVI:** In connection with the Division on Aging, you may recall that their primary function before was in the financial area — pensions, supplementary allowance and so on. A lot of that work has now been taken over by the Mincome.

What we're endeavouring to do now is to find a whole new role in terms of the social service area for the department. In terms of the councilors, we will be planning a gathering of these councilors. We'll probably have 100, once we've appointed the other 25, here in Victoria some time in the fall. What we want to do is to give them a very specific function. We want to give them a kit and keep them informed on a regular basis about any changes in services relating to senior citizens.

About a month ago we did have a conference of people from the field on the whole role of services for senior citizens. We had representatives from the four senior citizens groups, as well as people who work in the field. We're now endeavouring to find a whole new function for the Division on Aging as they phase right out of the financial thrust, which is what they've had for some time.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I appreciate the Minister's comments and commend him. I think this is an excellent approach. I would just remind him — as I find I have to do frequently, being a non-metropolitan Member — that while you will be having regional or non-metropolitan directors come down, there's always a problem of communication between the non-metropolitan areas and the city. It's in every profession; it's in every group. You sometimes get a very well meaning and a very good dominant figure who's always back and forth to the trips. But there's a breakdown between the people who are involved.

When the Minister has conferences like this, I would hope that there might be times when he would select people at large who might bring a broader approach. I would also hope that he will take the

[ [Page 2184](#) ]

opportunity to meet with these people.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 248 pass?

Vote 248 approved.

Vote 249: blind persons' allowances, \$366,000 — approved.

Vote 250: disabled persons' allowances, \$2,337,000 — approved.

Vote 251: education of soldiers' dependent children and expenses, \$46,000 — approved.

## ESTIMATES: MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

On vote 252: Minister without Portfolio, \$63,120.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** Vote 252, Minister without Portfolio. I want to start off by congratulating the Minister on being the first native Indian to have been appointed to a cabinet in this country.

But I don't think that's a reason for the Government to bury you in a little corner over there in the Douglas Building. Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, that man has more ability than that, I'm sure. I can't understand why the Government will not give him greater responsibilities than they have. Certainly they've given him the question of studies. But if they really believe that these studies are justified and the needs of Indians need full-time attention, then I think they have a responsibility to establish a full-time Ministry of Indian Affairs in British Columbia.

I remember many, many times when the Minister used to stand in his place here and plead the plight of the native people in the north. He used to tell us about the great difficulties the native people had with the unions, that the unions wouldn't admit them because of closed shops and the hiring halls. That wasn't too long ago; it was about three years ago, if I remember correctly. He used to condemn the unions for their attitude towards native people in this country and in this province.

In fact, that Minister has stated on the floor of this House that he was seriously castigated by one Ray Haynes because of his statements relative to the unions' attitude and treatment of the native people of this province. In fact, he went so far as to say that Ray Haynes was instrumental and responsible for his campaign funds being chopped off because he was fighting for the native people on the floor of this House. That's the type of treatment he gets from Mr. Haynes and his cohorts.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order.

**MR. CHABOT:** You mean Commissioner Haynes? So now that you're in that cosy office in the Douglas Building, Mr. Minister, I hope that you'll continue your fight for the native people of this province. You used to stand up and say what was wrong with our society and the mistreatment of the native people. I hope that you're trying to correct some of the injustices that exist in this province and in this country.

You people have indicated — it was part of your manifesto in the last election: "An NDP Government will work to ensure the repeal of the *Indian Act* in accordance with the needs and the desires of the Indian people." I'm wondering what the Minister has done to ensure the repeal of the *Indian Act* so that it would reflect the needs and the desires of the native people of this province.

"Press the federal government to ensure that Indians enjoy the full benefits of the Bill of Rights." I'm wondering what action the Minister has taken relative to that policy statement.

"Support the creation of a government-financed Indian court of claims for the hearing of disputes over Indian lands or trusts." I don't know, the Minister is far more familiar with this particular issue than I am. I know he's fighting a case. I don't know whether it's on a personal basis or whether with government responsibilities that he's fighting this case for the Nishkas. But I'm sure there must be other land injustices in the country. I'm wondering what the Minister is doing relative to that.

"An NDP Government will also, as requested by the native people, press the federal government to renegotiate its agreements with the Indians and institute new agreements where desired."

There was also another programme put out when the promises were running pretty loose and free. One of the programmes for non-status Indians was that there be low-interest loans to native Indians for economic development. I'm wondering how many low-interest loans have been made to upgrade the economic affairs of the native people of this province since you've become Minister.

"Assistance in obtaining land for housing." What kind of assistance has been given to help native people obtain land for housing projects?

"Educational programmes designed for native needs." There is no elaboration on the educational programmes for native needs. But I would assume that that statement really means that in certain parts of the province there are native people who do not speak English or French and there is a desire that the native language be taught in certain schools. I'm wondering whether there's any consideration that this

[ [Page 2185](#) ]

take place in some of the more remote areas of the province.

"Needy children from broken homes to be placed with native, non-white, foster parents." I am wondering what the situation is today, relative to this policy statement.

"Strengthening of the *Human Rights Act* to protect the rights of natives." I wonder if the Minister would care to elaborate as to what further additions or deletions should be made to the *Human Rights Act* relative to further protection for the native people.

"Involvement of natives to a greater degree in matters affecting them, accompanied by measures to encourage native staff members in all government departments." I am wondering if the Minister would care to tell us just how many native people have been hired by the provincial government in meaningful jobs since you have become Minister. What departments and what roles?

There has been an expansion in your estimates. There has been an increase of \$10,000, from \$53,000 to \$63,000 — three Ministers before, one Minister now. There has been a substantial increase in the salary of Ministers without Portfolio in the province. The salary used to be \$6,500 and it is now \$21,000. If you add two indemnities of \$12,000 a year, that makes a salary of \$46,000 a year. With a travelling expense of \$7,000, that means that the Minister's income is up to \$53,000 a year. Certainly, Mr. Minister, we and the people of British Columbia, primarily the native people of this province, expect action to justify the tremendous salary which you have at your disposition.

There has been additional staff in your department — there is an executive assistant which wasn't there before, and there is a research assistant. I am wondering if the Minister would care to say what kind of meaningful role they are playing in the function he has.

I am wondering if the Minister would outline to the House as well what his function really is.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Minister without Portfolio.

**HON. F.A. CALDER (Minister without Portfolio):** I think I had better start off with the terms of reference. I think you were in the House when I spoke during the budget debate, in which I thoroughly outlined the terms of reference. As a matter of fact, this is not an attempt to slough off your question with respect to terms of reference — I really mean that. I would suggest to all the Members, since they may be asking out in the field after the progrogation, "Just what is that guy doing down there, anyway?" Take a copy of that *Hansard* in which I outlined the terms of reference. I think this will be of assistance to every Member in the House.

I more or less anticipated that question, Mr. Member, and this is the main reason why we outlined — as a matter of fact I read it out word for word. For anyone's benefit, if they so wish, we can write it out in a briefer form to carry in your Indian files.

To answer your question at this time: my function is to give remedy to mistreatment. For years we have heard about the "second-class Indian." To me and my staff, this has come about because of discrimination in public services. The native Indians do not receive all public services, as you know, because reserves come under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

My portfolio is merely to investigate, and recommend wherever possible, provincial public services to Indian reserves. Wherever we find it is constitutionally impossible, we would approach the federal government and we have done this already, to create this cooperation, so that amendments can be made by the federal House

by which an avenue may be created for us to serve the reserves. Take second mortgages, for instance. We can't touch this because the Indian Act says "no." There was nothing to stop us, for instance, extending Bill 149 by making amendments so that the grants on housing could be secured by native Indians for Indian reserves and so forth.

Highways: we are right in the midst of setting up a two-level meeting of governments so that we can establish the right of the province to build bridges and roads aboard the Indian villages unconditionally. It is on this very point that we are going to do a lot of travelling. You just mentioned my expenses of \$7,500 — by fall, I'm going to be demanding another \$7,500, because we intend to go through every province in Canada and find out what these other provinces are doing. We intend to see all the capitals. As a matter of fact I applied for \$15,000 and never got it from the Treasury Board. We are going to sincerely approach the Treasury Board and I am quite sure that before the end of September we are going to be in need of further funds.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** Right. In the brief six months, for instance, that we have been in office, we have on public services alone received all this mail and documents from the other governments. This is outside the Province of British Columbia. By the way, these books are open to any Member of the House for your review. If you want copies we are only too pleased to let you have them.

As far as the pay is concerned — don't worry, we are going to be so darned active, my friend, that I might be demanding that my pay comes level with the rest of the boys here. Don't you forget that for years when I sat on the other side I was the only little

[ [Page 2186](#) ]

voice that kept demanding that the indemnities go up. I'm not going to stop. If I know that I earn it, I'm going to request equality in pay in this cabinet, so help me.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Equal work, equal pay.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** You mentioned the Indian Affairs Branch. I don't know whether it is a coincidence that I was appointed Minister without Portfolio. It just might have been a mere coincidence, because with the assignment that I was given to study the possibility of public services, I accepted the Ministry without Portfolio because I am one Member who will absolutely refuse the establishment of another Indian Affairs Branch in this country. We have one bureaucracy which to me has been a failure all these years and I don't want to see another one set up under the provincial jurisdiction. It will be over my dead body. I have said this many times — you'll not see another Indian Affairs Branch.

Look at it this way — our people have been denied public services. We extended the franchise to the native people and they have been faithful voters. I said this in my remarks during the throne debate. They are heavy taxpayers, my friend, and they are faithful supporters of every party — this is repeating what I said during my contribution to the throne debate. But I, and I think the rest of you, felt very embarrassed the day after the election — what can we give them, aboard the reserve? Hardly anything. Because we are fortunate in having surplus money and we know that these people — our people — are entitled to these public services, your new Government is determined that we are going to extend the services to them.

We can't give you an answer in six months and I can tell you, rather than make....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** We are representing fair treatment, my friend.

That's on Indian Affairs — we would rather pinpoint our efforts upon the extension of public services on the reserves. Our people are entitled to those services. As I say, we are going to run into many difficulties, mainly with existing laws under the federal government. We have already — it's not in writing — talked to the top people in the federal field and they have agreed that their books will be open to us and vice versa. We are going to work on a very cooperative basis. Our first stop after prorogation will be Ottawa. We expect to be there for at least a week to set this cooperation on a sound basis and then create such things with the other provinces.

Again I repeat that we hope that before our four year term is up that we will have established a model which we hope other provinces may be able to follow. This is my way of answering your first remark about the Indian affairs, and perhaps this Without Portfolio.

It's quite an exciting assignment. But, we are going to take our time about it. We're going to learn a lot. I'm certainly hoping that you'll make a contribution. There are a lot of the Members here who understand the Indian question and we're asking you to lead our office.

I have here all our files — as I say, belonging to the federal government and our own government and departments, and a whole volume of what we are recommending, and another volume on what's pending. My boss and your boss indicated at the time of my appointment that it may take a year. I'm quite sure that this will be a continual thing, and this is the reason why I and my assistant have decided that we're not going to enter a report that is going to be final. We're going to get away from that idea. We're going to have an annual report like any other department. This way, we'll keep you up to date. I think it's better way of handling it.

Indian membership: you were talking about my criticism in years back. I would just like to say, and very truthfully, that wherever I go today, the local unions up north, the Indian Affairs Branch, the public are very thankful, and particularly the native Indian people, because now they're with the unions — they're joining, and they're quite happy with the way that things have resulted from my little burst.

Interjection by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** I spoke on the public services.

Repeal of the *Indian Act*: I think those of you who have studied the Indian policy that was presented by the federal government years back — it was known as the White Paper. Among other things, it requested the repeal of the *Indian Act*. Among other things it requested provincial jurisdiction on Indian affairs. Yours truly became quite unpopular because I and my own tribe were the only ones in the whole of Canada who accepted the White Paper. We became most unpopular throughout the country. This is the Nishka tribe — we were the only ones that accepted it.

I'll tell you why, and I still stand on the position that we were right in supporting it. It is a mere general statement in our view, and by accepting it, we believe that we would have seen the details — the actual legislation that was going to be amended. We wanted to know all the details. If some of the details we believed may be detrimental to the Indian cause, then object to certain of those discrepancies.

[ [Page 2187](#) ]

But as it was, the Indians throughout the country objected to the White Paper after about four years consultation and so it was thrown out the window. I just mentioned this because you mentioned about the repeal of the *Indian Act*. Certainly, that Act needs a revision. It's obsolete in my view. I don't hesitate in making these remarks at all.

About the Indian land settlement: I don't believe that I'm in a position to even mention about this. What I know is what you also read in the papers about the case which I represented, I and my tribe. It's in the hands, according to the papers, of the federal government. What they do, that's their business. If they want to approach any other government, that's their business. It's the least of my worries, or the Indian's worries.

You could treat that case as a test case — look at it the way you please. The only thing is that when they are good and ready, they'll have to go to that tribe and say, "Look, we're ready to talk terms." I suppose that the tribe will say, "Yes, only on equal basis, on mutual grounds and we'll talk terms." This is my assumption.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** I can't say. I'm not involved actually.

You were talking about loans. You were talking about loans and grants and everything. We have the revolving loans in the federal field. We are extended one grant. We hope that any other grants we can look at as a public service and avenues available, we can further recommend from my portfolio to the Treasury Board to

extend such grants.

Loans at the moment are mostly federal, and on the economic development basis. I'm quite sure that our native people are applying for such loans, and no doubt some of them are successfully doing so. Some of them, business minded people — they do go through the banks. I know several who have made a success of their loans. And with the Industrial Development Bank, they cry the equality bit — let them go as far as that — take their own initiative and secure money just the way you secure it.

About employment: it's not on a sound basis yet, but don't ridicule my reply to this. One that I know was announced by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly) not to long ago in which they've appointed a director of Indian education. I do know that several organizations are laying out plans and presenting it to the government on how to create employment.

We have Indian villages now who wish to apply for their own timber — the reserve timber, or any adjacent timber and operate the forestry themselves. I suppose that if this government was to agree and lay out the plans by which that operation can get off the ground — in this way certainly, we'd assist in creation of employment.

Fire fighting: we have people now requesting such things.

This is sort of an inopportune time for me to answer questions because we are just starting to receive word from the federal government agreeing that they're going to meet — and this is news for the House — meet for the first time. And I'll tell you that the federal government is very pleased over this, that they're able to meet.

For instance, in a few weeks the federal government, for the first time, is going to meet with the Highways department to talk about the very thing I was telling you about. It's already operating in Ontario for roads and bridges on reserves, and they're delighted that this meeting is coming about. Our portfolio recommended this, likewise with the previous portfolio that we just got through.

There's a meeting coming in within a few weeks over the whole welfare situation. Again, this is the first time they are actually going to sit down and talk terms, This is why I say it's rather an inopportune time. Perhaps maybe in the fall, we could see a better picture on this whole thing. I think this about answers your questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

**MR. CHABOT:** I want to compliment the Minister in the straightforward way in which he's answered my questions. I have to appreciate the fact that we can't expect everything to happen in six months. This whole pattern of fitting the native people into meaningful jobs doesn't happen very quickly. I know that and I am most appreciative of the way you handled the questions which I put to you, Mr. Minister. It appears to me that the selection of yourself as the Minister to deal with this problem was a wise one.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

**MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd just like to make a few comments on this, respectful of what the Minister said — that he's only been at the job six months, and we're trying to remedy many years of misunderstanding and neglect. But I am rather fascinated by this whole dispute or disagreement within the Indian population itself as to the mechanics by which the Indian can receive equal status and responsibility, and be treated equally in every respect as any other Canadian citizen. This surely is the goal of the Indian citizens, and it certainly would be our goal and is our goal as a

[ [Page 2188](#) ]

political party in this Province.

The Minister did refer, Mr. Chairman, to the White Paper which Jean Chretien introduced in, I believe, 1969. It's interesting to quote the very first paragraph of this White Paper — the very first words that are spoken in the report:

"The government believes that its policies must lead to the full, free and non-discriminatory participation of the Indian people in Canadian society.

"Such a goal requires a break with the past. It requires that the Indian people's role of dependence be replaced by a role of equal status, opportunity and responsibility, a role they can share with all other Canadians."

This statement does not seem to suggest that there has to be an either-or proposition — either a federal *Indian Act* which doesn't work, or a provincial Act which would not work.

I'm just interested to have the Minister's comments on how he himself would see the best mechanism by which the initial goal that I have quoted from the report could be achieved. My personal feeling is that the Indian population should be given the same advantages, services and responsibilities as any other Canadian citizen. In that respect, the non-Indian citizen doesn't have an either-or proposition, federally or provincially. It is all legislation at all levels of government in Canada to which each non-Indian subscribes and lives by.

That federal report went on, for example, to quote this part that was mentioned of repealing the *Indian Act*: "and take such legislative steps as be necessary to enable Indians to control Indian lands and acquire title."

Again, it just puzzles me; I would have thought this was something that the Indian would be very keen to achieve. While the Minister mentioned that his band accepted the federal proposal, he says that every other Indian band in the country turned it down although the government expressed the goal of returning Indian lands to the Indians and giving them title to the land. Goodness me, we have talked enough about the emotionalism of owning your own land in the last few weeks. This seemed to me to leave some doubt as to what the Indian people themselves would like, or what avenue they would follow to reach this goal of equal status with every other Canadian citizen.

The report also mentioned that many of the remedies for social problems in our society are structured in the provinces. The report admitted that the Indian population had been non-participating members of this provincial structure. But it also said that this would be the goal of the plan: to provide equality and the same services under the same circumstances to the Indian that is being provided to the non-Indian citizen.

That is my first question really. It seems rather a simplistic one, but I really feel from what one reads and from discussion with non-Indian citizens, that they are equally interested in trying to bring about this very worthwhile goal that the Indians should have — indeed must have — the same social services, education, housing, health and welfare, and all the other advantages which we enjoy. Although this may take time to bring about, it must be done.

What is the hang-up? Why is there this feeling that it cannot be done through a combined federal provincial programme of legislation such as applies to the non-Indian? That would be my first question.

My second question really relates to the more specific problems in our society. I read the disturbing figure of the high percentage of Indian population in prisons, both male and female, and I would like to know to what degree the Minister thinks this is related to the lack of proper legal representation of Indians who are accused of crimes. I don't have the clipping with me, but the import of the article was that one of the reasons that more Indians finish up in jail than non-Indians is that they haven't got the privileges, the money and the access to legal defence in court. I would like the Minister to comment on that.

The whole question of housing is a vital one to the Indian as it is to any other citizen. I would like to ask the Minister about the policy which the federal government was applying a couple of years ago. I got involved in somebody else's riding, and I may say not at my request; I wasn't interfering with another Member's riding. I was invited to the Cowichan Indian reserve, and at that time two years ago I got a noncommittal reply from the Minister.

But apart from the lack of commitment, he stated that the money provided for a house for an Indian was \$8,500. I wonder how anyone can ever expect to build a house, other than a very small, cheap house that wouldn't last any length of time, for \$8,500. I wonder if the Minister can report whether he has made any progress with the federal government in getting a better deal for the Indians in regard to their housing.

I think we are all agreed that education and housing are two of the pillars on which any society is based.

If we are living in broken down homes where the roof leaks, and we have inadequate and possibly contaminated water supplies, and children are unable to go to school, then it is quite obvious to anyone that the improvement of the lot of the Indian population will never be any better than it is today.

I am just a little fed up with the federal outpourings of sympathy and this kind of documentation. This report is full of lofty ideals, and I suppose the fact that it was turned down by the Indians has not made them any more welcome in the eyes of the federal government. But nevertheless, if the federal

[ [Page 2189](#) ]

government does espouse these ideals, even if the mechanism it suggested is not acceptable, the goals should remain the same.

I feel, from what I read, that things have not changed in the last two years at all in making life any better in the housing field or in the field of education to the Indians. Without trying to sound cynical, the point I keep trying to get back to is that we have both levels of government paying lip-service to the need of the Indian for housing, education, better health care and better legal aid, et cetera.

Despite all this out-pouring of public sympathy and espousing of idealistic goals, I don't read or see or hear about any very practical progress that is being made at either level. I stand to be corrected if I am being cynical, but I would hope that the Minister could tell us two things. Am I right; has there been much progress in the last two year? And secondly, what does he foresee in the reasonably near future in bringing about some of these social improvements?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Minister without Portfolio.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the previous speaker is right on. I wish to thank him for stating the problem that my portfolio is now considering. Quite a number of points raised, and maybe some of the points you have raised, and maybe some points that will be raised by other Members, may be just outside my actual study.

First of all, to make a preliminary remark before answering your question, it is for these reasons we are also having my portfolio go in for establishing a bureau of information, if you wish. This is one of our main aims. We have so many.

I know one of the Members brought up the cut-off situation. That is outside of my study but we are setting up a programme in my portfolio in which we hope that we are going to supply information to the House. I've even stated to my assistant that we are going to set up a bureau of information that we hope will be second to none, even better than the bureau that serves the Indian Affairs Branch.

The question of taxation is outside my studies at the moment, but it is confronting every Member. I know the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) is quite concerned about the problem that exists in her constituency. There is one in Sechelt, in North Vancouver, and also west Point Grey, the Musqueam situation, and many other parts of the province in which native people are leasing out Indian lands. Of course, the non-Indians who lease sometimes find that there is a discrepancy. Either they are going to pay to the tribe or they pay directly into the provincial coffers.

This is quite a study; it is quite a deep study. My portfolio has engaged on one occasion two well-known professors at the university, Stanbury and Fields. We are gradually getting information from these two people who really study these.

Then, of course, I would like to repeat again to those of you that are very close to this subject — it might be right within your constituency — we would welcome any information that you have, because as I say, we are going to build up a file of information so that we hope eventually by accumulating all this that we just may be in a position to provide a solution. So we are going for broke. We are going for every problem. This is the reason why I am studying. I could easily have said, I guess, if I wanted to get nasty, "Well, I'm sorry. That's not in my study, so I'm not going to bother answering you."

Now to go back to what you were really saying. First of all, you are actually telling us about provincial

jurisdiction. Ever since I came into this House, Mr. Member, I have advocated provincial jurisdiction.

Under the BNA Act you receive all services under the provincial jurisdiction. You benefit from this. But under the set-up of the Indian Affairs Branch, it is all under the federal jurisdiction. On this basis the Indians have been denied what actually comes under the BNA Act and is benefiting you and your children and your daughter and everybody else. The way this set-up is, we have to come under a different educational situation, for instance.

Pertinent to this, I am going to supply you with another word. When you are talking about ownership of property, you are actually talking about municipal status, which I have championed for years in this House. We are hoping that something will get going with Cape Mudge. This way they can subdivide it and for the first time a native Indian within those boundaries will actually have his own lot.

Interjection by an Hon. Member

**HON. MR. CALDER:** God, I wish I could answer that question. They objected to it right across the country. It was almost unanimous with the exception of my little tribe way up in that corner there. That is the reason why, when it was unanimous with the exception of our group, I just didn't advocate it anymore.

From what I can understand, if you turn the pages in that white paper, Mr. Member, as the years go on, I think you will find that all the items in the white paper will be implemented piecemeal. I understand that some of them have actually been happening without the general public noticing it. I maintain that maybe in the next 20 years a lot of what has been pointed out in the white paper will actually be implemented piecemeal. I'll never change my position on it — I heartily support it, out loud. As I told you, I became very unpopular over this.

[ [Page 2190](#) ]

I hope these two more or less answer your question. I saw this many years ago and this is the reason why I advocated these two very items — provincial jurisdiction and municipal status. This is where you are coming under the bounds of the BNA Act for the provinces, and I can see this is the answer for the Indians' ill, really.

You talk about equality — this is what we know to be equal and this is why we are doing it, because we couldn't get around it. Now that we are Government we are finding ways and means by which to extend these public services. I think this is a more real answer, as far as we can see.

By gosh, while I am here, we are certainly going to find ways and means of getting aboard. We are going to be spending most of our time in Ottawa to see if we can't get aboard — just to repeat it. We have already received good remarks from Jean Chretien and Basil Robinson and the boys, that their doors are going to be open to us and if we wish to go aboard then, by God, they will find ways and means of putting us aboard.

We are only hoping that if we come in with "X" number of dollars they don't withdraw their full share. We don't want them to do that. This is why we have to be careful — we want to throw money in that would add to the benefit of the Indian people on the reserves.

You mentioned housing. We are making Bill 149 retroactive right from the time it was sent in. This is the first thing that the province is going to do, as a result of our recommendation that this grant be operative on the reserves. You mentioned the \$8,000: these are the native Indians who are able to build a house. If they build it on the reserve they get the \$8,000 grant from the federal government; the rest they get from Central Mortgage.

This is the native Indian doing his own thing by his own initiative. No longer does he have to go if he is able to. He's got a fairly good income and can get away from this getting down on his knees and begging for a house. The federal government, of course, still handles houses for indigent Indians. If an Indian becomes urbanized, then the grant is increased by \$2,000. It is \$10,000 off the reserve. It is a straight and out grant, plus what the native Indian gets from Central Mortgage, and so he is able to build himself a house.

Anything that the province has for housing is again a public service. We are going to do our darndest to see that this is operative aboard the reserve as well. This is what my portfolio is after — to see that it works on the reserve, just as it works with you or any one of us.

You talk about prisons. Well, our portfolio has recommended to our friend here, who is wandering around, the court worker training programme. This is a beginning, though maybe not the full answer, but his department has accepted it. We recommend the court worker training programme. We have court workers now in the field but they are not a worker training programme. We have court workers now in the field but they are not trained individuals. We would like to bring them right up to a professional level, if you wish, so they can do something for our own people. We are training police, for instance, to police their own respective reservations.

We have also recommended that the Indian have access to provincial legal aid.

These recommendations have gone through. If you wish, I could give you a list of all our recommendations and those that are pending and about which we hope that something will be done before the next session or before the next spring session.

I think that is all that you had asked.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Peace River.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just a few points that I wish to make in the estimates of the Minister without Portfolio. I want to preface my remarks by congratulating him on his appointment to the cabinet and the fact, I am sure, that in the minds of the native people, not only in British Columbia, but in other parts of Canada, he represents a goal that many of them have been striving to achieve for years. In that way you can become a figurehead for many native people. I think that is a very important thing at this stage in the development of individual rights and the whole process of integrating native people into our "white man's society," if you like to call it that, or our twentieth century society.

To me one of the greatest problems, Mr. Chairman, seems to be that we have always tried to impose our standards, our heritage, our customs and our religions on people who have a heritage, a custom, religious beliefs and an environment that is completely different. I don't think we will ever solve that problem if we approach it from the attitude of the average Anglo-Saxon person. That is why it is important for someone like yourself who has a background of native ancestry behind you — you understand more than many people do and can communicate with Indian people.

I find in my travels that Indian people that I know will speak to me informally, but they are a little hesitant to come out and discuss with me in an intimate way some of their problems. They are hesitant to inflict their opinions and they think they will not be counted and they will be discounted without much thought even though you try to impress them that this is not what you are trying to do.

I would like to know some more, if the Hon.

[ [Page 2191](#) ]

Minister would comment on it, about his thoughts and position on the reserve system, as we know it. I know you are in favour of government and municipalities for reserves. But should we be moving and projecting our thinking away from the reserve system? Is it a good thing to retain it or should it be disbanded or should it be modified or changed in some respects?

I cannot help but feel whenever we isolate people, and this is what you do when you take one segment of society or one particular national race and put them into confined quarters even though those quarters might be 100,000 acres in size, that you don't accomplish the purpose of integration with the white society. Perhaps this has formed a barrier there that isolates more than it helps native people. So I would like the Minister to comment on that, if he would, when he is back on his feet again.

I want the Minister's opinion on the First Citizens' Fund. It seems to me to have worked very satisfactorily and has provided finance for a good number of bands throughout the province, to quote your own words, to "do their own thing."

They have been able to come up with projects, and I think that the type of fund that was set up where the project would be truly their own, is something worth while to retain. Is it a programme that he would like to see changed or improved in any way?

There is another matter that I would like to bring to the Minister's attention. This is a matter of a local nature in that it affects the Fort Nelson Indian band. There is a matter that the chief, Harry Dickie, has brought to my attention a couple of times. I must be quite honest and say that I haven't really got all the background in detail, and I haven't been able to really ferret out the problem. But, it is basically this.

Many years ago, the native people in the Fort Nelson area retained trapping rights on most of the main rivers and the tributaries up there — the Nelson River, the Muskwa River, and the Fontas River basically. Of course this is still a way of life with a number of Indian people who wish to follow that way of life. Frankly, it is quite lucrative right at the present time, because the price of fur has never been higher.

But as I understand it, either through a process of selling their trapping rights or areas — you know, that are set out, or as a result of the white people in the area being a little sharper with the pencil, most of those trapping rights now belong to non-Indian people along all of the main watersheds in that area. The chief has referred quite often to an Indian treaty that goes back many years, in which he feels that their rights are being infringed upon, and that they should have been retained because of something that was in that charter. If the Minister has no knowledge of the matter in detail, I'd be pleased to try to give him as much information as I have been able to receive, and find out just what the problem is. I know that mainly the trapping rights or the registered traplines on those rivers now belong to non-Indian people, and this has provided a source of discontent.

Certainly the Indian people occupied that country long before the white man ever came into the Fort Nelson area. If there is something in a treaty that preserves those rights, then I think that we should do everything in our power to exercise the rights of that treaty.

If it is a problem in the area that is brought to my attention by the Fort Nelson tribe more often than any others.

I would hope that the Minister would also use his influence to encourage Indian people to take advantage of any of these systems and any of the funds that are available to them. I am sure that he knows as well as I do that a lot of the tribes are a little hesitant about applying for finance or grants — basically, I think, because of the feeling that this will somehow impinge upon future rights at some time, even though there may be no reason for them to have fear of any of these programmes.

These are a number of points that I would like to bring to the Hon. Minister's attention this afternoon. I know he is familiar with most of them, as I am. I just want to say that I think it is a good thing for the Indian people of the province that they do have someone now in the provincial government who has a closer relationship to their particular way of life and problems than has been available to them before. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One or two comments to the Minister. First, we heartily approve of the idea that he gets a pay raise. But again, we trust that it doesn't involve creating a department and bureaucracy.

His support of the White Paper over the years, I think, has been most interesting — I noticed it, certainly, since 1969 when the paper came out.

Many of the questions that I might have posed have been answered already, because I do know his views on quite a number of those subjects. I must say I have always regarded them to be very interesting, whether I agree with them or not, they are generally very thought-provoking.

The questions that I would like to bring forward are essentially those of how far are we moving and how successfully are we moving in the direction of full provincial citizenship? Now I use the words "provincial citizenship" specifically. What I want to know is how well are we doing at the provincial level to get the full rights of all services which are provided to non-Indian people in this province, to the Indian

For example, in the case of schools, there is a different situation, and the province does not provide as much money for perhaps historic reasons, or reasons of constitutional niceties, but they certainly do not provide as much money per student as is provided for the non-Indian student in the province. I would like to know how far the Minister is succeeding in getting this discrepancy wiped out.

Certainly I can see no reason for the provincial government or the Minister himself to be against the idea of the federal Department of Indian Affairs providing money for Indian education. But that should not prevent the members of Indian groups in this province receiving exactly the same amount from the province as students who happen to be non-Indian.

Perhaps we could consider the federal money as enrichment money if we get the full amount of provincial money for each Indian student. I know that this has been a concern of his, I simply wonder whether he would like to comment as to how successful he is in this financial area with making sure that the province puts up as much for Indian students as they do for others.

This has many ramifications which I won't go into at this stage. It leads to the whole question of the separate schools and many Indian parents prefer separate schools for their students. I often remember fine arguments in favour of integration being shot down very quickly by parents of Indian students who said they didn't think they wanted their students to go, in the Saanich area, to schools where drugs were a great deal more prevalent than they were in the reserve schools. I am not saying that they were right or wrong. I am saying they had a very good point. But, perhaps, if we could find out more about how much money the province is going to be giving for educational needs of Indians — and that means basically treaty Indians — we might see how far we are moving along that road towards full integration.

There is, again, the question of roads on reserves. Is the Department of Highways treating the Minister generously enough when he requests full provincial revenues for roads on reserves. Or is this again an area where the reliance is placed upon the Department of Indian Affairs, the federal department.

This, of course, goes right to the question of taxation. Indians are taxed, and in terms of sales taxes and other taxes, at just the same rate as other British Columbia citizens. And for many of the services they are treated differently. So considering education and roads in particular, perhaps the Minister might like to expand into other areas, how successful is he being in having these areas of straight discrimination wiped out? Discrimination basically because of historical facts.

My own personal view is that we will never be able to implement anything like the integration that was preached in the White Paper, or proposed in the White Paper, but if we always have the separate funding; we always have the desire of the provincial governments to shove expenses for Indian services onto the federal government department. Inevitably, the result will be subtle discrimination in one sense or another, and certainly a type of apartheid being practiced in British Columbia and many other provinces.

These are fairly straightforward questions. Perhaps on behalf of my colleague...but he may wish to speak as well. But, I would like also to point out whether the Minister has taken up the question of mining rights on Indian reserves; whether the bands themselves are any closer to receiving the same treatment as would the owners of non-reserve land in cases where mines are discovered or minerals are discovered in the ground. These are relatively small points to some but I think that what they really do sum up is how far we are progressing in terms of making sure that the Indian residents of British Columbia enjoy the full rights of other British Columbia citizens with respect to provincial government services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Minister Without Portfolio.

**HON. MR. CALDER:** I will just go backwards here. On the minerals: this is another area where we are really working. As a matter of fact we are getting quite a bit of correspondence on this now. For the information of the House — thank you for bringing it up — both the federal government and the provinces are now on the move to try and regulate, on a one-field area, just where to establish this mineral right, because there are some provinces that, of course, have the Crown provincial.

One of them, a prime example, is this province here. And I think this is the only one that is left, because by the direction the federal government and that of Ontario who are now going federal. The other provinces seem

to be doing likewise. I think I am going to try and arrive at a unity basis and treat that as all Crown federal. We are running into difficulties here; we haven't really negotiated yet. We are still getting material from the other provinces. We've got our ears wide open as to what the federal is going to do in this case.

We did find out just the other day that they just may suggest that all mineral reserves coast to coast be Crown federal. If that's the basis then my portfolio will certainly be recommending as such to our Minister of Mines. Like I say, this is the one area in which we have been receiving quite a bit of correspondence and this is the best way that I can answer it right now. It seems that it is going to go

[ [Page 2193](#) ]

Crown federal all the way through.

On this full citizenship, I can tell you it is very slow. It is very slow indeed. This is the one reason why we are ear-marking our efforts on providing, wherever possible, public services, because this is all part of being a full citizen. I think you were out of the House when I mentioned that we'd been termed second-class Indians mainly because of the denial of these public services. This education integration is all part of these rights and that's coming rather slowly even though I think integration is now well over 50%. It is about 60%, isn't it?

You were also out of the House when I mentioned about the highways. My portfolio has brought together the federal and the highways department for the first time. They are going to try and reach an agreement by which the province would build roads and bridges, and provide culverts, unconditionally, like they do in Ontario. This is the reason why we're going to be travelling back and forth this summer and the next few months to see what the other provinces are doing. Here we've come across Ontario, much to our surprise, and so we'd like to see B.C. do the same thing.

I hope that when we've reached a certain level, if not the whole works, by cooperation with the federal government, and if we are able to provide all public services, I think you can truthfully say that we're getting towards a full citizen. Then the Indian will have received quite a number of things that he's been denied. Mind you, he gets this after certain periods of being urbanized. But hopefully we'll get closer to equality. It could only be done by full cooperation of the federal government and this, I think, we have already established.

To the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith): I've been crucified for my stand years back — abolition of reserves doesn't mean that you're just going to get rid of the way it is now.

I said this in terms of my suggestion of municipal status. You just leave everything as is, only change the definition. Instead of using the word "reserve," you use "municipality." Then by this way, you create an avenue by which his tax dollar comes back to him right on the reserve.

Here he's been crying the blues about getting this self-government thing; he wants to do his own self-governing. But without these moneys or the return of his tax dollar, he still has to get down on his knees and face the east and beg for money. Whereas, by the change of the definition and creating this avenue by which his tax dollar then comes back, I think he'd be very proud to use this money which is the return of his own money, and by his own initiative, self-determine where he goes on the village and do his self-governing bit.

This has been my idea for years; I'll never change it. I think once our modern Indian leaders could see this, we are well away. I am just so amazed that a lot of them just don't see this.

Your second question about the First Citizen Fund. The First Citizen Fund actually is out of my hands, but I do get a lot of mail. Being a native Indian, I get a lot of mail. Of course, I transfer it to his department or to the chairman of the committee. It's a good committee and they're doing excellent work. I know all the boys and girls on that team and they are doing a good job. I have had good comments in and out of Victoria. Up North, I hear good comments about these people, and they're progressing.

But I agree with you that a lot of people in the more remote areas don't know about these fundings and they are left out in left field. I think something should be done to enlighten them that there are such funds available for their use. I agree heartily with that.

The last one — Fort Nelson: could you supply me with the gentlemen's name and address and maybe we

could communicate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

**MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey):** How!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Why?

**MR. GARDOM:** Mr. Chairman, I would very much like the Hon. Minister to take as many, many speeches that I've made in this House and the many proposals that I have raised and the bills that I have proposed since I was first elected.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. GARDOM:** "Ego trip," says the Hon. Member. Where are you from anyway? Columbia River? You must be sitting on a tack, I can tell you that, the way you've been acting in this House over the past few days.

One of the many reasons for my interest in going into provincial politics was what I consider to be the forgotten Indian in the Province of B.C. I note here in front of me the remarks that I made in the first speech that I have in this House in 1967 and I talked about the forgotten Indian. I said this, "The Indian has not vanished, but he has been forgotten for far, far too long." And I said, Mr. Chairman, that "the Indian Community should be treated the same way as any other community and I would like to see our government be one of the trail-blazing governments in the Dominion of Canada and bring about the complete emancipation and emergence of the Indian at this time.

[ [Page 2194](#) ]

"Historically, this has been a social sore in the palm of every Canadian. Now that Canada is well over 100 years old, surely it's the time for some very calculated re-appraisal and re-assessment that will bring about and will result in the final integration of the Indian in every sense. I don't think there's anybody in this province who could say for one minute that the Indian community has received either fair treatment or equal benefit or equal treatment."

I've always enjoyed the opportunity to be able to associate with the Hon. Minister when he was in Opposition as to attitude and philosophy and the need for the emergence of the Indian. I indeed hope, and I know he will continue to do his level best to bring that about.

I would like to say, "Klahowha Tillicum" — May your shadow never grow less and I hope you get your vote right now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall Vote 252 pass?

Vote 252 approved.

## ESTIMATES: LEGISLATION

Vote 1: legislation, \$1,254,786.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Boundary-Similkameen.

**MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen):** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would tell us, in light of the present *Constitution Act* defining the amount payable to a Member of the Legislative Assembly, what provisions he is bringing in to correct that?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** There'll be an amendment to the *Constitution Act*. The former government was wrestling with the problem, as you know, and we have taken the material given to us by the former government. We have complete sympathy with the position of the former government and we'll finalize the draft work they did on the amendment.

**MR. RICHTER:** I want to thank the government also, for their efforts in relation to the T4's which we received today. Thank you very much.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** That was again a direct relationship to the former administration's difficulty. We've taken, as I say, their direction, their draftwork and we intend to complete it. I think all the Members of the House will be satisfied with that direction.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

**MR. WALLACE:** Mr. Chairman, in the light of vote 1 and its contents, I think it is very just and right that the media and the public are having a public debate on the whole question of MLA's indemnities, the length of sessions, the question of whether MLAs should be full-time or part-time. This is vital public business and I think it would be very wrong if this party or any of the parties in the House should not express themselves clearly as to where they stand on this particular issue.

I think it is very true that in the kind of society in which we are living there undoubtedly must be a greater demand on the individual who chooses to run for public office at the provincial government level. I think the kind of legislation which this Government is bringing in...I didn't want that to sound the way it did sound — I didn't mean that. I meant to say the scope of legislation which this Government is bringing in and which I think any responsible Government would be bringing in because of the needs of society and this technological age and all the advances which government can bring to the citizen in the realms of health, welfare, education and the many other areas of government. I accept the fact that the demands on the representatives are increasing.

I am also in favour of two legislative sessions. In the spring, government should deal with the budget, estimates, and the throne speech, and introduce legislation to be debated in the fall. That is too simple an appraisal, but I think that kind of a pattern would be in keeping with the needs of the government of this province to bring about good, effective government and for the public to take part in the process of letting their elected Members know their views on proposed legislation.

The question of being a full-time MLA is debatable. Maybe we should define what a full-time MLA would be. We have to assume from comments made by the Premier and from some of the items in vote 1 that it will be impractical for a Member of this House to continue to function in his original profession or business, as the case may be. Mr. Chairman, let me make it very plain, I am presuming certain things.

If the sessions are to last 13 weeks, as this one is doing, and the fall session is considerably longer than the last one, which was two weeks, and if we are functioning adequately on standing committees, then I would predict that the average MLA — and I use that word carefully — who has come into this House wishing to serve the people of British Columbia but able to do that only if he remains in touch with people through his own work, background or profession, could be replaced by ones who could readily become political agents of their party — too politically motivated — rather than the ones who are motivated towards the improvements of their society, and able to fulfill both roles.

[ [Page 2195](#) ]

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very plain, I am trying to be objective. Maybe some people in this House think that is impossible because of my own personal position. I have discussed this with many people and there is a substantial body of citizens who believe that an MLA in this House can do his best legislative duties by remaining close to the people of the province through the vehicle of his original profession. I think this is a principle that I'm sure the Premier has thought about. But until the point is reached where individual MLAs might have to make specific decisions, I think it would help this House and the people of British Columbia if the Premier would give us some of his thoughts on the point I've raised.

There is tremendous disadvantage to the process of government and the quality of performance by MLAs if they become unduly involved in sitting lengthy weeks in this chamber. I say that with respect, not because I admit to some bitterness about the filibuster we've just had. I admit that I don't accept that it served any great purpose or that filibusters in general are necessary. That's just a personal point of view; I respect people who disagree with me.

But I am saying that much of the positive, productive role that an MLA can serve in this House is to come

here with initiative, ideas, experience and suggestions to formulate better policies. The reason he or she can do that is because the rest of the year he or she is very close to the citizens, whether he be a social worker, clerk, dentist, insurance agent — you name it. They are all people and many of them, as I was, were stimulated to get into politics because they saw some of the needs in our society which could only be corrected by getting involved in an active way politically.

This is where the power sits. Whether you're on the Opposition or in the Government, the individual with this kind of motivation can bring to this House reasonably sound and, hopefully, constructive proposals to correct these needs that I've mentioned. If in fact we lose this contact as Members and we spend our time either here or on committees, then I think not only does this House suffer but the quality of ideas and contributions which 55 MLAs make to this House will be somewhat diminished.

In more specific terms, Mr. Chairman, the figure has been questioned in the Press about MLAs who are about to be paid \$24,000 a year. I think the Premier can probably clarify what vote I means, but I take it to mean that the payment for this individual session that we are now in will go from \$10,000 to \$12,000 — which is a 20 per cent increase since 1970. Even if you want to look at this in straight financial terms in comparison with other segments of society, industry and business, I don't think it is unreasonable to suggest that in three years the indemnity should increase 20 per cent.

I want to place on record this party's appreciation of the fact that we have a full-time secretary. The Government has taken some considerable trouble to give us what is very reasonable accommodation and assistance at all levels — through the Speaker's office, the Department of Public Works and the Provincial Secretary. These are three facets of government which have certainly improved the conditions under which this small party is functioning. We want the political arm of government to know that this party appreciates this very much.

Finally, some comments have been made about *Hansard*. I figure that the total cost is \$135,000. I want to make it very plain that I think it is worth every dollar.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Columbia River.

**MR. CHABOT:** Just one short comment, Mr. Chairman. In this vote we find there has been a 100-fold increase in the allocation to select standing committees. It is my understanding that these committees will sit in between sessions. I wonder whether they will be playing a meaningful role. It is my understanding that not all of the many committees have been active this session.

The Government in the past years has been critical of the former government because of the fact that some of those committees were not active. I do want to say from some of my past experience of sitting on committees that many of them are very meaningful in view of the terms of reference we have studied. The forestry committee in particular — a most effective type of committee. It is the type of committee we should all experience — one that gives us broad terms of reference. We bring back a report to the Government, and in most instances, I must say, the Government did implement the reports submitted to them from that committee.

There is a 100-fold increase here, from \$1,000 to \$100,000 for committees. Are they going to be sitting in between sessions or meeting somewhere? Are there going to be junkets? Are they going to be meaningful? What are going to be the terms of reference of these committees? How many committees will be active?

I have to say that if the role and function of committees this session are going to be allowed to carry on in between the sessions, they are not going to be playing a meaningful role. I think it would be a waste of additional money for the MLAs to be sent around the province unless there are some very worthwhile problems to be studied.

Last night we had a motion rammed through the House relative to committees. We found one committee was sitting all day. It is very difficult for Members of the Opposition to participate in the agricultural

committee and it denied them the opportunity to be here on the floor of the House to discuss the estimates involving hundreds of millions of dollars. I hope there will be no repetition of that.

I hope some consideration will be given to the responsibilities of Members of the Opposition, relative to the meeting of select standing committees while the House is in session. I really would like to know what kind of a role these committees will play in view of the large allocation of dollars. Which committees will meet?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad that the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) raised this matter of the expenditure for committees. I would think that, so far as the functioning of this assembly and the performance of its responsibility to the people of this province is concerned, the suggestion that the committees will be given additional moneys, and therefore the opportunity to serve longer and throughout this province, is one of the most meaningful expenditures that we could make, so far as the citizen is concerned.

Yes, the agricultural committee sat all day today, and the Members had the opportunity of coming and making up their own minds as to whether they would be in this committee, Mr. Chairman, or in the select committee. We had before that committee a dozen men who had come, at considerable time and expense, to present some of the most comprehensive briefs that we have had presented to the committee dealing with the tree fruit industry in this province. It is industry which is truly facing a crisis and which requires the careful attention of the Members of the committee and the concern of each Member of this House.

I would hope that in the meetings that are yet to take place in respect to that particular matter, the agricultural committee will for the first time be able to bring back to this House a report that will clearly indicate to the Government the direction in which it should move in order to provide the relief that that particular industry has so long required. If the expenditure of some of this \$100,000 will permit this Government finally to approach a solution to the tree fruit industry's problems, then it will be money well spent.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of the Members who do not live close to Victoria or on the lower mainland. I would like to ask, on their behalf, that if it's impossible to make a deal with the airlines we be allowed at least air fare, which we could put on an expense account, so that we could get home at least every three weeks during the session.

I've always felt that it was unfair to the Members from the outside areas not to have the opportunity to get home and to have contact with their people during the session. We lose complete contact. I haven't been home since I came down here.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** That's the problem.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Next point: offices for the Members in the ridings, which I believe are going to be provided, in some cases.

Third point: if we're here over 40 days — again, this is for the Members for the rural ridings — I think we should have expenses for living here after the 40 days. As far as I'm concerned, I've always said that you can take the indemnity and have it, but give me my expenses. This is the part that hurts — when you're down here after 40 days expenses are cut off. Maybe that's to shut the Members up and get them home, but you say you have a new deal now, and you're going to be sitting twice a year.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Ask the former Premier.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** So I'm just asking that as well on behalf of the rural members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote I pass?

**MR. PHILLIPS:** Wait a minute! Wait a minute! The Premier wants to give some answers!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The point, Mr. Chairman, I think is well taken — I believe the Premier does

want to comment before you call the vote. There have been many other votes and you've always tried to call them as fast as you can.

I rise only to make sure that this continues, because in this vote 1, we have no indication whether or not we will be paid in a fall session. In other words, what I'm saying is that there's no indication here that there will be a fall session, and according to the expenditure it indicates that there won't be. This obviously doesn't make a great deal of sense.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The Premier indicates that he will be replying on that and I'll be delighted to hear his remarks because it would appear to me

[ [Page 2197](#) ]

that, in voting this money, we should vote for a second session as well. Perhaps it is simply some oversight that this is not indicated.

The second point I'd like to raise is that if we are to sit frequently, as we apparently intend to do — once again, we are expecting a fairly definitive statement by the Premier on this — it does appear to me that the salaries for the officers of the House are thoroughly inadequate. We have the Clerk, Clerk Assistant and Law Clerk. If we're going to sit for a substantial amount of time, I think we'll be looking for new ones, because I doubt if they can keep body and soul together on that. I just don't think that we have properly budgeted with respect to the legislation for this year in the light of the Premier's intentions which have been announced outside the House.

The comments on committees I'll pass over, as they have been mentioned already, but I'd like to mention *Hansard*. *Hansard* is a new vote here, and I'd like to know precisely on what basis the \$30,000 we're granting for *Hansard* expenses under 031 what has been calculated. This vote appears to me to be a vote which is extremely tentative and in need of very quick revision. I'm glad that the Premier nods his head in agreement.

Perhaps, if I can re-echo the words of my friend on my left, it is a time for some definitive statement by the Premier as to what he does intend for the future legislation in the House. What is he going to do in terms of two sessions? What amount of time is he looking towards? How is that \$100,000 which has been set aside for select standing committees going to be used? Precisely how many committees can we expect to be operating? I raise these because in the vote....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well I'm delighted to hear, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier is intending to answer them.

In this vote, it appears we've mixed up two things. For instance, on your select standing committee there is a hundredfold increase, which obviously indicates a new way of handling committees. Yet further up there is the sessional allowance for Members and the salaries of the officers of the House, and there has been no provision there for the future and apparently no indication of what changes will take place.

So this vote 1 I find confusing, because it is neither is one thing nor the other — it's neither based on the old practice, nor is it based on the new. Some items are clearly old practice, some items are clearly going to be new practice. I would repeat the plea that we, at this stage, in the House get a definitive statement of the Premier's intentions in this regard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands.

**MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands):** Mr. Chairman, a very brief comment: I associate myself, for the first time I believe, with the remarks of the Hon. Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips). As one who has about seven miles to drive each night at the conclusion of the sitting, I must admit amazement when I first learned that there was no sliding scale with respect to indemnities paid to Members from more distant ridings. Mine could be reduced, and I suppose the suggestion has been made elsewhere. But there certainly

should be some recognition of the additional difficulty and expense incurred by Members who are 200, 300, 400, 500 miles or more from this chamber.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I recognize the Hon. Premier.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is perhaps a reflection of an opportunity outside of the party's scope that each of us functions in, whether it's weak or strong, and that is the opportunity to espouse policies related to personal impressions and opinions and experiences and, frankly, just listening to my colleagues of all political parties over my 12 years of experience as an MLA.

I think that it's a wonderful debate that we're having, and I mean that quite sincerely. I cannot recall a time in my 12 years here where we ever debated this vote. There was always a timidity around the vote to discuss salaries, working conditions, everything else. With no judgment meant by it at all, purely on the basis of a statement of fact, there has not been a dramatic change in the way we have operated for 20 years.

I don't intend to comment as to why or how — it's just simply a statement of fact that there was never a gradual change in our role in this House. Our role was adopted in 1952, and that role never varied. That's a matter of fact.

When we came to this vote, there seemed to be the old style tacit agreement that silence was the best role. There was never any opportunity to negotiate for salaries. We used to sit with bated breath and hope and wait that something would be done in the estimates, and I cannot recall any other time, except once when I signed a round robin of silence that we would indicate that there would be a salary increase.

Now in terms of the salaries, for the first time last session we did have a legislative bill. I won't go into the reason why that bill appeared, except to say that it obviously was an attempt to take off political heat from the fact that we were fixing someone else's salary at 6½ per cent, and it was an afterthought that ours be fixed at 6½ per cent too. Nonetheless, the bill was passed by everybody in this House, and on the

[ [Page 2198](#) ]

basis of that bill, the present salaries have been calculated in terms of increases over the three years.

Now that's the first time that we've had a bill, or a direction passed by a previous parliament, binding this parliament. I think it's a very good system. Then there can't be the argument that, "Well you raised your salaries after you came into office." The people who voted on that salary increase, most of them are not here any more, and fortunately there can be a retroactive cheque to them.

Nonetheless, the salary was voted on before the House dissolved. I think that's good. It happened by accident, but it was good.

Now in terms of the role and the change: I have never attempted at any time, either when I was Leader of the Opposition, a private Member or Premier, not to discuss the question of salary. I recall the last salary increase we got, I was besieged as Leader of the Opposition by the Press saying, "what is your reaction to it?" I said, "It is good. It is necessary. It is very very important that MLAs get good indemnities." And for those who have some feelings — new around this House — that you want this, and you want that — just remember that 12 years ago, five thousand bucks was standard fare, period. That is what we got as MLAs. One big room for the official Opposition, and \$5,000 as MLAs. And if you think you could do a job on that basis, you've got another think coming.

I want to say to all the MLAs who are not here in this House, to every one of them of every party, I want to thank them for their public service. Because anybody who stands for office, and has the misfortune of getting elected, begins to understand, like the public will never understand, what it means to be an MLA. For those who believe that MLAs are only part-time, let me tell you MLAs have always been full-time in my experience. Always been full-time.

In terms of the kind of contacts and jobs, there is no use in even trying to explain to the public what an MLA goes through. Every one of you who has had his own phone available at the local level has been in far more contact than say a federal Member who sits in Ottawa and is able to escape his constituency. Right here we are

under close contact with our constituencies. They have telephone contact with us, and if we don't answer that telephone call or that letter, by golly we hear about it in a hurry.

I know that within the parties themselves I am sure the same experiences exist, that they will write to one MLA and say, "Why doesn't your colleague answer my letter?" And then they'll go to another MLA and say, "He wouldn't give me the answer I wanted. Why don't you help me?" And we've all been through this. But that's the nature of man, and that's the nature of being an MLA in a democracy. So we are full-time MLAs. So far as the pay — the pay should be adequate, I have never believed that gentlemen or ladies should come into politics after they have been a success at something else. I think that is mistaken attitude carried over from the Victorian era.

We need young people in politics; we need older people in politics. We need professionals; we need working people. We need students; and we need retired people. Housewives — I have never considered anyone to be a housewife. I have considered women who have taken a vocation of raising children as being human beings in that particular role at that particular time as they choose. In terms of the other professions, they are here in this House as human beings, not as women or as men, and I make that very clear.

Men and women of this province from all experiences should be encouraged to come to public office. It is difficult for all political parties, during election times, to find candidates whom they want to reflect them. I remember a famous statement by...well, I won't repeat that one, I'll let it go.

But politics is a strange thing. It is difficult to get people to stand for public office, very difficult. I remember when I first came to the House and I saw, with all due respect, some of the government back benchers and I said, "My golly, how did that guy get elected?" And someone whispered into my ear saying, "You think he's bad. You should have seen who we had running against him." (Laughter). So it cuts across all party lines and the problems are the same. O.K. — you are here in public office and now you are running.

Now I notice there are certain newspaper columnists who make it a fetish to deal constantly with the idea of salaries and MLAs being overpaid. It's been a good line to use for years. Whenever you are out of a column, kick around the MLAs and extravagant salaries. I don't want to name any names, but I don't want them to run out of columns either.

Bless him, I have never seen him in his column announce that he'll take a 50 per cent reduction in salary if the MLAs will consider the same. But nonetheless, we don't have access to that particular saw, and that reflects, with all due respect, an archaic approach to public life that even the public doesn't buy any more. So the columns are welcome, refreshing antidotes relating not only to historical notes of the House, but historical attitudes about payment to MLAs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go on to the other questions. The question raised about political motivation and public service. I'm predicting what the column will be anyway, so I might as well get my licks in while I am at it (Laughter).

In terms of the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) raising the question of political motivation and public service, I just don't believe that anybody would come to public office with purely a political

[ [Page 2199](#) ]

motivation. If he did, he won't last in this House. If you come in with the idea that all you are going to do is serve your party and act for your constituents, you'll sure find out in a hurry that ain't so. You can get away with it for one election, but they'll catch up with you out there. So the public has its opportunity to reach out and pay its own retribution in terms of hiring and firing. So if anybody here has come with the idea of serving the party only, he'll only be a one-timer.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Well, you ought to know what happened to you. You shrunk down to tens. (Laughter).

But in terms of that kind of thing, the risks are on the individual MLA. Each MLA, he or she, must judge for herself or himself exactly how they wish to play the role. The people hire us and the people fire us, and they

do it with a vengeance. The attrition rate in this House is fantastic. Fifty-five Members in this House — I have been here 12 years, and I am now number six on the protocol list. So there have been a lot of bodies washed under the river in that time.

So you never know in this business, and you are asking people to take a slice out of their life. Young lawyers, young doctors, young professional people are asked to take a slice out of their life at their highest potential earning years. And they should not suffer economically because of that. They take an abuse in their professional practices. They take an abuse if they are teachers in terms of the time away from their service. If they are a working man they lose their seniority on the shop floor. If they are any other role it disrupts their life very very much.

So the public must understand when they ask young professionals or young people from the working place or anywhere else, to come here, that there is a major disruption in their life, and they should not suffer economically because of that. The job should pay what the job is worth. Who you want in the job is up to the people of the province to decide. There should not be the idea that this is a charitable role.

Now the question of the tension that exists around the new roles. Understand, I have no disrespect to the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) — the tension around the role of the committees is a valid question because it is a brand new experience for all of us. I appreciate the concept expressed by the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) and I'll try to tie the two things together.

The only experience we have had in an extra House committee was in the committee dealing with reform of the rules. And much to my — not amazement — to my satisfaction, that committee went out and did a first class job on a non-partisan basis for the people of this province.

I believe there are areas of service that can be made to this House by having a committee work. The most obvious example of this is the House committee on agriculture. If they go out and do a job after this session and come back in the fall with either a minority report or a majority report, but hard information they have gathered from the people who were involved, then we will be able to improve not the legislature, but we'll be able to improve the lifestyle of the people of this province who depend upon the lawmakers to solve some of their problems. It is worth the experiment. And \$100,000 — it is not the figure, it is the potential of that role.

I am greatly excited about the possibilities of committees going out there, finding out what is going on, coming back, and sure we have got our political divisions, we can fight that out — but at least we've got a framework of talking to people out there rather than going through this rush, rush, rush thing we go through in a session in terms of committees. So, no beef about that — I really want it to work.

In terms of the other committees: the tension should be eased on the basis of fact that we did have a chairman of the public accounts committee from the Opposition. That's a good thing. I think he did a pretty good job — an excellent job — and I think any government should be able to afford the risks of going through that kind of committee. I don't know if I'll say that in a year or not, or two years from now — but the concept is there, and it is working.

The other area of concern was the question the role of MLAs. We do have the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We have never had a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association officers in the time that I was here.

People were sent to Commonwealth parliamentary meetings on the basis of — I don't know — some kind of pick from a Ouija board and yet we all pay dues to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, so I think a method has to be worked out of how we pick people to go to these conferences.

The reason I got to one the first time in my 12 years was because I used a tactic. When the former Premier announced someone was going to go to a parliamentary conference, I attacked him by saying he was offending the Queen by not sending me as Her Majesty's Leader of the Loyal Opposition. Two weeks later, because of that monarchical statement, I was sent to another parliamentary conference.

I don't think that should be the system of deciding who should go. Our Speaker is president of the parliamentary association and I would hope the Speaker would work out some system whereby Members from

all parties would go to the parliamentary things.

Now, the fall session. The amount of money deals

[ [Page 2200](#) ]

with this session. We don't know what the fall session is going to be; we don't know how long it is going to be; we don't know how much money is going to be involved.

Expectations. I don't know; it's brand new. I know that you can give the reasoned kind of questions you have because you came from a reasonable place. But I want to tell you that kind of reasonable place that you came from in terms of committees sitting, salaries laid out and everything else — this is a brand new ballgame for us. I don't want you to rest on the experience you didn't have; just take my word for it — you are lucky you weren't here before.

It is a brand new ballgame and we are going to work it as we go along — I hope in the same spirit that went into the cooperation that existed with the all-party committee.

I love this place. I really do. This place represents a true extension of people's democracy. I want to see, in my time — be it brief or long, I don't know — the House solve its own problems. Let's go into the fall session; let the House committee work out how much time, what's involved and then the money will be there. I don't want to prejudge anything in terms of a brand new experience.

The question of rural Members. I don't know. You have raised an excellent point in terms of airlines, you have raised an excellent point in terms of offices and an excellent point in terms of some kind of method of reaching back to these....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Yes, the Member who outlasts us all, number two on the protocol list (Hon. Mr. Nimsick). The snow is melting in the Kootenays now. For those who have been here before, they know the significance of that statement. The snow is melting in the Kootenays. Old Number 2, he used to talk about that, but it's different now. (Laughter).

Anyway, there is a serious problem in terms of airline passages. The Member is right, those bus passes are much appreciated but they really can't get a guy from Victoria to Prince George in a weekend. That is a valid request, With the House's permission, I would like to discuss it with the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) in consultation with the Speaker and perhaps we can work something out.

The offices in the ridings for Members. Because this was raised, I asked the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) to give me a report on the availability of office space in offices throughout the constituencies. I find this is a valid point. In my own home in Port Coquitlam, before we moved, I had a separate office that we used. I patterned my interviews usually on Saturdays during the day, but I found that it would have been much better in terms of my own family life for me to get out of the house and go somewhere to an office if I had an office with a telephone. That is a valid request and I have asked the Minister of Public Works to see if he can come up with something in that regard.

I want to make the job one that has all the additions possible to enable it to be done best. We will fight each other tooth and nail on who should have the job, but once the job has been decided by the people there should be no handicap to anyone in not doing the job in the best possible fashion.

The last item is the Clerks. Well, I don't know. (Laughter). They have to have some kind of evaluation on their performance and I would welcome any suggestions by a separate committee as to the evaluation of their performance. Trial by fire is suggested. (Laughter).

We've never heard them speak. They are always fussing around and opening books. They are constantly leaning over and touching the arm of the Chairman or putting something to the attention of the Speaker. I don't know what is going on. If I had a better idea, I might be more sympathetic to their case. But in any event, since the appeal was made by the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. D.A. Anderson) as a lawyer, and I know it wasn't

based on legal....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** A non-lawyer. Well, a non-practicing lawyer, I think that some case can be made for....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** You're not a lawyer?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** He won't let me practice anymore.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** He won't let you practice? Do you want to quit so you can practice? (Laughter).

Anyway, be that as the case, I have tremendous sympathy for lawyers and we will have to examine how they are being paid. All in all, I want to thank all the Members for their contributions in this debate. Everything we are doing here in terms of salaries and better services, I believe can be justified. We are at a new age in British Columbia; people demand a great deal more from us and we should be in position to deliver.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 1 pass?

Vote 1 approved.

Schedule A: \$35,771,657 — approved.

[ [Page 2201](#) ]

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report resolutions.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the committee reports resolutions.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House that the rules be suspended and the reports of resolutions from the committee of supply on February 28, March 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 28, 29, 30, April 2, 3, 4, 1973 be now received and taken as read.

Leave granted.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** I move that the rules be suspended and the resolutions from the committee of supply be now read a second time, taken as read and agreed to.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of ways and means.

Motion approved.

House in committee of ways and means; Mr. Dent in the chair.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Chairman, I move that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province there be granted from and out of the consolidated revenue fund the following: (1) \$35,771,657 to make good certain sums expended for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972; (2) \$1,718,909,091 towards defraying the several charges and expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** I move the committee rise and report resolution.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the committee reports resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That towards the making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province there be granted from and out of the consolidated revenue fund the following: (1) \$35,771,657 to make good certain sums expended for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972; (2) \$1,718,909,091 towards defraying the several charges and expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution be now read a second time, taken as read and agreed to.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Barrett begs leave to present Bill No. 172 intituled *An Act for Granting Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province of British Columbia*.

Leave granted.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be referred to a committee of the whole House forthwith.

Motion approved.

The House in committee; Mr. Dent in the chair.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report to the House recommending the introduction of Bill No. 172.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the committee reports recommending the introduction of the bill.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I move that the report be adopted.

Motion approved.

## AN ACT FOR GRANTING CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves introduction and first reading of Bill No. 172, intituled *An Act for Granting Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province of British Columbia*.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that

[ [Page 2202](#) ]

by leave of the House the rules be suspended and the bill be read a second time now.

Motion approved; second reading of Bill No. 172.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** I move that by leave of the House the rules be suspended and the bill be referred to the committee of the whole House to be considered forthwith.

Motion approved.

House in committee on Bill No. 172; Mr. Dent in Chair.

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Mr. Chairman, could we have a moment so that the bill can be distributed.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive approved.

Schedules A and B approved.

Preamble approved.

Title approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in chair.

Bill No. 172 reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is An Act intituled *An Act for Granting Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province of British Columbia*.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

---

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

Copyright © 1973, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada