

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)**

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1971

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 263](#)]

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1971

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

On the motion of the Honourable W.D. Black, Bill (No. 27) intituled *An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act* was introduced, read a first time, and ordered to be placed on the *Orders of the Day* for second reading at the next sitting after today.

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

MR. D. BARRETT (Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in my place to open the Budget Debate. I just want to refer briefly to some warmth that was engendered or almost heat engendered between some of the Members and the Speaker last Friday. I regret that very much. Part of the difficulty arose, Mr. Speaker, because some of the Members wanted to see the Budget as it was presented to this House. I understand the press was frustrated. They were not able to see the Budget before it was delivered. Well, I found out the reason after I listened to the Budget. If I had to present a Budget like that, I would want to keep it secret, too. As a matter of fact, I don't really know why everybody was so uptight about hiding that Budget. We thought we were going to get some miracles. I did find on February 5 that there was actually a miracle. But it didn't come out of the Budget, it was announced in a newspaper. I thought it was disconnected from the Budget but, certainly, connected with the Government. It was a headline on the sports page of February 5, that says, "Chant Reborn in Buffalo." I wanted to share this with the Minister, because half-way through the dynamic Budget, he was sound asleep. Along with him was his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Industrial Development, who was so tired from his travels, he, too, was sound asleep half-way through the Budget presentation. The Premier had his face right at the Opposition, so the Ministers were safe while they were asleep. I'll return to the Minister of Trade and Industrial Development a little bit later.

There was one comment made in the wind-up of the Throne Debate to which I wanted to refer. It was made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. A number of things he said, which, I understand, he is getting some bad times for now. One of them was this business of health being the best in the rural areas. I, in my travels in British Columbia, have received complaints about whole public health unit areas that were without directors, and during your Speech, through you, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that, "The health services were up to par all over the

Province." Well, in the Prince Rupert, I thought it was the Skeena district, I phoned the Minister of Health this morning and I got the reply back immediately. I wanted to know how many of the 17 health units outside of the lower mainland were without directors — and there are three. Prince Rupert hasn't had a full-time medical director for their public health unit since 1967. The M.L.A. for that area knows full well there is a serious problem in not having a full time health director in that area. Dawson Creek, also, has not had an appointee since April 1968; two years without a public health doctor. In Saanich, the last appointee resigned in March of 1968. Three areas all of them represented by Government Members. I would think that the Minister would check more closely before he would make the kind of statements that he did.

MR. D.R.J. CAMPBELL (Comox): I didn't talk about that at all.

MR. BARRETT: Yes, you did. You mentioned in reply to the Honourable Member from Burnaby North who had gone through her speech talking about children. One of the comments you made across the Floor — we'll check the tape, the daily *Hansard* that we get and we'll go over that — the broken record. Ten months from now we'll go over the very important documents of the day.

I thought, also, that the Budget Speech forgot to mention the hidden taxes that we are faced with here in British Columbia. One is a 10 per cent increase in automobile insurance, that free enterprise automobile insurance, sponsored by this Government, which guarantees the companies involved in automobile insurance sales the opportunity to act as if they were the Courts, and there will be a general increase in the automobile insurance. Also, we understand that the poor, debt-ridden telephone company is having some problems again. That American monopoly that reaches into every home here in British Columbia is asking for a huge increase. We pay the highest rates in Canada now and we expect we will be paying higher rates under the protection of the Public Utilities Commission of this Province. The time is long past due that the...*(interruption)* sorry, Ottawa. Right.

HON. L.R. PETERSON (Vancouver—Little Mountain): Does the honourable Member know that telephone rates come under National jurisdiction and are not under the jurisdiction of the British Columbia Public Utilities Commission? *(Interruption.)*

MR. BARRETT: It's not a point of order, he doesn't even know the rules of the House. It's not a point of order, but that's all right. The Attorney-General is quite correct. It is the protection of Ottawa. But there has been no move by this Government to protest the increase in the rate. What is your position on the increase of rates? Are you in favour of it? Or are you against it? Stand up and say that if those rates go through, you are prepared to put the B.C. Telephone under public ownership, because it hits the old age pensioners, the people on fixed incomes, who you say you fight for. It hits them harder than anyone else.

The previous Attorney-General protested. But we don't see that same action from the present Attorney-General. They made a profit of \$40 million last year under the current rates. Yet they now want to capitalize for further expansion. They want to capitalize out of earned revenue, rather than go into the market to borrow just like everyone else has to. They have got a captured source of funds here in British Columbia and they intend to up the rates as they wish.

The kind of things that were also missing from the Budget Speech was some action of chronic care for senior citizens. I remember, in 1956, the former Minister of Health, Mr. Eric Martin, announced in an election campaign that the Social Credit Government was concerned about those in need of chronic care and would incorporate a chronic care programme, if re-elected in 1956. The same promise in 1960 by the then Member from Burrard, his running mate, and the Honourable Eric Martin, at that time. We're still waiting. We're still waiting. We still have the pictures and we still have the pamphlets that were sent out by those two Government

[[Page 264](#)]

Members at that particular time.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I spoke during the Throne Speech about the strike at Sandringham Hospital. That strike still lingers on, where that national corporation is still making a huge profit out of illness, illness of the aged of

British Columbia, with the Victoria Council of Churches that has taken an open position condemning the management of that hospital. This Government has done nothing to provide services for those people who desperately need chronic care and rest home care. The kind of business that goes on there makes one wonder if this Government really cares.

In the area of caring, we have the Minister of Welfare. Now he's in a little bit of a jackpot again, because he's having running battles with his Cabinet colleagues. We expected during the Throne Debate, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister would stand up and tell us what he has been doing in his department that allows us to have 120,000 people on welfare in this Province. When he took over, there weren't 120,000 people on welfare. There are now over 120,000 people on social welfare in British Columbia. Last year he couldn't wait to get to his feet in the Throne Debate. Six days after the House met, he got to his feet and told us there was going to be a complete and entire change in the methods used by his department, without costing a dime more and, maybe, using less people than we have today. Later in the Session, he gave us his solemn assurance that he was working on a plan that would "... straighten out all the problems relating to welfare. There would be no such thing as welfare," he said. "The emphasis will be on rehabilitation." I suppose his theory is, Mr. Speaker, before you can rehabilitate you've got to put them on welfare first. That's why he's got it up to 120,000.

We heard, too, you know, of a little tiff that happened. First of all, we had to change a name. We went from the Department of Welfare to the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvements. "I want nothing to do with welfare," said the Minister. I don't blame him. At the rates he pays I wouldn't want anything to do with welfare, either. I don't know if he still keeps that hotel room in the Hotel Vancouver, but that's a different form of welfare.

MR. R.M. STRACHAN (Cowichan-Malahat): Shelter allowance.

MR. BARRETT: Is that what it is? Shelter allowance. Well it's some shelter, some allowance.

Several months went by, then in June of last year, the Minister got all fired up because the press was still calling the Minister, "Welfare." "I am the Minister of Rehabilitation, not Welfare," said the Minister. What's more, he sent out letters to all the media proclaiming his new title with gold embossed stationery, that must have cost a pretty penny in itself. For a Minister of Welfare it's really flying in the face of reality to have that kind of embossed stationery. I'm sure the welfare recipients like to have that kind of stationery, when they get a letter from the Minister — "You're cut off" — in gold.

A few months went by and we came to October. At this point, the former Minister of Social Welfare, who is the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, tried to help out. On October 15, he made a statement to the press to the effect that Rehabilitation Minister Gaglardi would disclose a new approach to welfare-spending at a conference of Provincial Welfare Ministers in November. That was from the *Victoria Colonist*. Next day, the Minister of Social Welfare or Rehabilitation made this statement to the press, "Gaglardi said that Municipal Affairs Minister Campbell was not playing cricket, when he announced, earlier this week B.C. will present a new approach to welfare-spending at a meeting of Provincial Welfare Ministers in November. 'I don't know why he is making any statements about matters such as what I will be proposing,' Gaglardi said. 'That isn't playing cricket, you know.'" That's a long way for the little boy from Mission to come. That little fighter who used to represent the little man and his great struggles behind the bulldozer is really pushing one out, now. "That's not playing cricket, you know." Look what Victoria's done to that Minister.

MR. GAGLARDI: Send me over a cup of tea.

MR. BARRETT: Send you over a cup of tea? You bet I will. What's that play with a cup of tea? *Arsenic and Old Lace*. On October 27, the press again asked the Minister (*interruption*). Now you said you weren't going to interrupt, Mr. Speaker, through you. Now, there he is. "Peace," he says, after he interrupts me. He wants to be left alone. That's the man who proclaimed in this House, at one time, that he was being attacked so badly that we thought the way he was interpreting it he thought we were trying to say that he ground glass in little old ladies' teacups. But you weren't nearly as bad as the one who took over, two removed from you. You were a sweet Minister of Welfare compared to the one that we've got now. Anyway, he was sweet compared to you. He's got a heart and I mean that. And that's something that is absent with the present Minister, in my opinion.

On October 27, the press again asked the Minister when his new approach would be made public. His reply was, "Oh, you mean the one released by Dan What's-his-name." He said, "It will be coming out in due time." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had some experience in a leadership campaign and the first thing you do, when you are running against an opponent, is to forget his name. The Minister has learned that very quickly — "The one released by Dan What's-his-name."

Finally, at the end of last month, on January 29, the great new approach was revealed. The Minister went off to Ottawa and presented a brief at the meeting of the Provincial Welfare Ministers. The great new approach was "Gaglardi wants welfare money to be subject to income tax." What a great heart. What a great lover of the poor. "Tax them," that was his answer. Not being satisfied with paying social assistance rates that don't allow people to maintain a decent standard of living, the Minister wants to tax them. That's his great new approach.

However, something went wrong with the communication system inside the Cabinet. This time it wasn't Dan What's-his-name who was in trouble. This time it was Cec What's-his-name. What happened there? When the press asked Cec What's-his-name for comments on proposals for social welfare taxes, the Premier snapped, "What? I don't know anything about it. He, the Welfare Minister, must have been misquoted. We want to keep the taxes off the poor." *Vancouver Province*, January 30, two days later. "The Minister was asked about the Premier's remarks. He said, 'I don't believe that the Premier said what was reported in the newspapers. He's a very fair man and he wouldn't say that.'"

You know, Mr. Speaker, two more days went by and we came to February 3 and again the press questioned the Premier on the matter, and according to the *Vancouver Sun*, "Bennett brushed by reporters trying to clear up the matter Tuesday, shouting, 'old news, old news, old news, I said all I'm going to say on that.'" Old news. Two days before, "Told

[[Page 265](#)]

that Gaglardi said that Bennett must have been misquoted, because he is a nice guy, Bennett retorted, 'I think he's a nice guy, too.'" What's his name? I added the last part. He knows full well what your name is, Mr. Minister, it's give him enough of a heartache.

In fact, there was no misquote or no misunderstanding. The proposal to tax social welfare benefits was printed on page 6, paragraph 5, in the Minister's brief to Ottawa (*interruption*). You mean that the Premier was misquoted. Well, I haven't had a copy of the brief. I understand it's a real dandy. I am waiting for a copy of the brief. Send a copy over, will you? As far as I am concerned, and I know this isn't going to hurt you one bit, but as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, you've been nothing but a "big bag of wind" as the Minister of Welfare, or Rehabilitation, or whatever you call it. The biggest failure we've had in that department. I withdraw the "bag of wind," Mr. Speaker, I got carried away in a moment of emotion. I almost felt identified with an applicant for welfare. Having faced that, I withdraw that statement. You're a failure, you're a zero, you're a blank. You've done nothing as Minister of Welfare that adds up to any progress at all or, in terms of the kind of red-neck hostilities that you've created in some rural areas by your statements, through you, Mr. Speaker, about getting people off welfare. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to start getting deadbeats off welfare, you had better start cleaning out that Cabinet. There are more deadbeats per capita in that Cabinet than there are out in the general population. I'll come to the much travelled Minister of...Name them?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't think of anything more that ambitious backbenchers would want named.

I don't want to believe that no matter how strong the ambitions of some of those young, dedicated men of high principle in the back benches of the Social Credit Party, that none of them would ever attempt to usurp a Cabinet Minister. Never. The kind of loyalty, dedication and love that exists between the backbenchers and the Cabinet is a wonder to behold. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's a question the love of loyalty (*interruption*). We have the sweet voice again (*interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BARRETT: You know, Mr. Speaker, I'll name the Cabinet Ministers, a couple of them, later on.

I want to talk a little bit about the two sensitive Ministers, with whom in the past, Mr. Speaker, I'll admit, I have had an exchange of words, sometimes heated. There was an overreaction in the press to a polite exchange that the Minister of Lands and Forests and I were having the other night. The newspapers are just not used to heated exchanges of opinion. Some of these reporters are naive and new and just don't understand that, sometimes, politics calls for a direct exchange of statements, both speaking at the same time, very loudly. I just want to tell you that there is a great love affair between that Minister and myself.

For example, I can remember when I first discussed Cypress Bowl. I remember when I used to sit in a corner as a quiet little backbencher. I remember when I'd sit in my place in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I'd talk about Cypress Bowl and the kind of comments I'd get from the two lead-desk twins, the Minister of Recreation and Conservation and the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources. I remember the kind of response I used to get. I'd talk about Cypress Bowl and I remember I read a letter from the Minister of Recreation and Conservation. I read his own letter about Cypress Bowl, saying that it wasn't a park. I produced the Order-in-Council at that time and the Minister said I was being devious for reading his letter. I remember that. Well, it was no smear to read his letter. He never even said a nasty word in his letter.

I remember, too, the flights of beautiful duet attacking me from those two Ministers about Cypress Bowl, saying that I was a mountain goat gone berserk, that I didn't know what I was talking about, that I was fibbing, Mr. Speaker. Naughty, naughty, and the whole mess came crashing in on their heads, and they blandly stand up and say, not that they made a mistake, not that they goofed on this thing for five years, not that they didn't heed the warnings that they were getting. They just stood up and said, "We've decided that we'll make it a public park."

The irony was, Mr. Speaker, throughout every one of the discussions that I had with the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources about Cypress Bowl, he said to me, "We always keep the municipality informed." And they did it again. They made it a public park and you know how the municipality found out? They read about it in the newspapers. They make policy on the seat of their pants, Mr. Speaker, and when the going gets rough they just shift chairs. And they've got very short memories.

Now, we did have an exchange that was a very polite exchange and I want to refer to that. During the speech of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister and I exchanged verbal, polite comments to each other. I sent a note to the Minister and I said on this note, Mr. Speaker, "Do you deny that Bulkley Valley Forest Products Ltd. controls nearly 100 per cent of the saw log quota in the public sustained-yield units within the boundaries of pulp harvesting area number 4?" Now, I'm not going to discuss the private conversations we have and I am sorry that the press attempted to intrude in the very pleasant, private conversation we were having. It's none of their business. No, they are not snoopers. It's just that they are young and new to this business and they are eager to get on with the job. Now, look, if we are going to pay for that hotel room in Vancouver, the least you could do is go over there and use it. If you've got nothing to contribute, you can just toddle off. I'm sorry you don't have your own aeroplane, but you can get one fairly cheaply out here.

You know, Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, I remember I am a social worker and how I have to understand all kinds of behaviour, no matter how weird or how unbelievable it is. I want to tell you it has been a long time since I have practiced professionally and I have difficulty in accepting and understanding some degrees of behaviour. There are exceptions, but I try, Mr. Speaker, I try my best.

But back to the dialogue between the Minister and myself. The quote is, "Do you deny that Bulkley Valley Forest Industries controls nearly 100 per cent of the saw log quota in the PSY'S within the boundaries of pulp harvesting area number 4." I want to talk about this, just a little bit because, during the Throne Debate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs reviewed some of my comments as I had travelled through parts of British Columbia. Apparently, the Minister was most upset because he interpreted my comments to mean something about the company land. That's a matter of dispute, Mr. Minister, and let's dispense with that right now.

I have stated that, in my opinion, Bulkley Valley Forest Products Ltd. will make money in the long run out of the

land development in the Houston area. They have not made money yet, Mr. Minister. They have the land, they have bought it, but in the long run, in my opinion, they will make money. Now, Mr. Minister, if you feel that's a lie for holding such an opinion, that's quite all right with me. Time will tell. Only time will tell. It's a difference of opinion.

As you know, the town of Houston was a small village until the Bulkley Valley Forest Products made an appearance on the scene. They purchased land all around the existing town. Some they got from the Crown, some they traded with the Crown, some they bought from private sources. They created a land bank, a private land bank and the town was given new papers of incorporation and it was formally a democratic existing community that elected its own council. They went into the format that the Minister outlined: two appointed by the Government, two appointed by the company, and three elected by the people. Far from being a real democracy. The biggest landholder in the area is the company itself and it has a direct interest on that council. It doesn't have to go through public democratic voting procedures, it's got two people on that council. Well, it's a small empire. The area we are talking about is equivalent to some small European countries, you know. The area that they control in terms of logging, not the land within the boundaries of the town, the area that they control in terms of the logging and pulp harvesting is equivalent to a small European country. Now, I asked the Minister this question (*interruption*). Some research? Now, I'm glad you mentioned that because the only research I got on this was to write to the Minister himself. I find that the best source and I did write the Minister. I wrote the Minister last November and I wrote to him and I said, "Dear Mr. Williston: Would it be possible for you, for your Department, to supply me with the names of the operators and the amounts of their allowable cuts in all pulpwood harvesting areas, plus a map showing the boundaries of each area?" That was for the Province. The Minister was very prompt. He replied, December 21, just a month later. "Dear Mr. Barrett: I have for you a reply to your request for information on the allowable cut of established licenses within managed units in each pulpwood harvesting area. Enclosed please find a map of the Province outlining the pulpwood harvesting areas and the lists of the established licenses. In the case of public sustained-yield units, no parties are presently considered as being established." This is the map the Minister gave me. It's freely available to the public and the area that I am talking about and the question we go back to, that I wrote the Minister is, "Do you deny that Bulkley Valley Forest Industries Ltd. controls nearly 100 per cent of the saw log quota of the public sustained-yield units within the boundaries of pulp harvesting area number 4?" The Minister would not answer the question.

HON. R.G. WILLISTON (Fort George): I said I would give it to you in writing.

MR. BARRETT: You'd give it to me in writing. You wouldn't answer. I'm coming to that. "You would give it to me in writing." I'm going to read your reply. Now, that's a very simple question, Mr. Speaker, and it calls for either a yes or a no. I want to read the reply that I got from the Minister and, then, I am going to go into detail on your reply.

"I attach the statistical information to which references were made in your note and in discussion last evening. Within the last four years there has been a constant change in the upgrading of the utilization standards and policy and I do not blame anyone who is not in constant touch with the situation to be confused. As you will note in the material there is a present state of change between the IU and CU standards within the area of pulp harvest area number 4. The former IU plus one-third quota arrangement no longer applies in a practical manner, whether it is a large lift in third-band material. This latter volume, in some units, represents a higher figure than the original IU quotas which formed the basis of allocation. Third band never becomes a quota allocation but is based upon performance in a specific operation. Even here there is a present policy change being considered insofar as efficiency of the plant is concerned. You may have seen some reference to the debate on this point at the Truck Loggers Convention. When PHA's were originally constituted, it was considered that a specific volume of round wood had to be allocated for pulp use. This was abandoned before most of the areas got into operation. The reason was that round wood could only be cut after all available chips had been used and the policy is to balance pulp in capacity with residual supply. Therefore, if round wood were allocated and could only be used for pulp, it remained in the forests and was not available for milling purposes. Kamloops, Quesnel, Bulkley Valley never will process round wood directly for pulp. The same will be true for Northwood, Prince George, Intercontinental, within the near future.

(Signed) Ray Williston."

Is that yes or no? Now, we come to the question that I asked and your answers, which jive completely with

the information that I have from your department, which caused me to write you the question in the first place. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I am making the charge today that Bulkley Valley Forest Products controls nearly 100 per cent of all the saw log quota in the public sustained-yield unit areas within the boundaries of pulp harvesting area numbered 4 shown on this map, which include areas number 4, 68,40 and 13. There is no competition, Mr. Speaker, in that area. The small logger that this Government used to pride itself about, and that the Member from Skeena strongly spoke for in this House, has been wiped off the face of the map in that area.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not true.

MR. BARRETT: That's not true? Mr. Speaker, they did not sell their quotas because the Government discouraged it. What they did is that Bulkley Valley Forest Products bought up all the little companies and acquired the assets of those companies which were the quotas. At a fair price! I'm not saying there was anything scandalous about that, but what I am pointing out to you is the flaw in the system that allows a large company, with headquarters in New York and in London, to come in and control a whole huge empire in this Province. My friend, the directors of the Bulkley Valley Forest Products largely reside in New York and in London. Read from your own document — the British Columbia Pulp and Paper Industry. "The Bulkley Valley Forest Products Industry is a joint venture of Bowater's Canadian Corporation and Consolidated Bathurst Ltd., which each hold 46 per cent of the company and local interests have the remaining shares, 8 per cent." Their offices, Mr. Minister, are in New York and in London.

I'm suggesting to you that when I ask a simple question, "Do you deny that Bulkley Valley Forest Products Ltd. controls nearly 100 per cent of the saw log quota?" it shouldn't require two pages of explanation, which I will

[[Page 267](#)]

come to in a moment, it should get a simple yes or no. But, coming to your explanation, the reason I came to the conclusion that they own nearly 100 per cent, is that I wrote to the Department and the material you provided me last December indicates how much they own. In the number one area, there's an 8,000 quota and Bulkley Valley has got all of the 8,000 quota, except for 400 forest service reserves. The allowable annual cut — 8,000. The increase is 89. You know what's involved there (*interruption*). OK. Look, I'll do your direct figures in your memo. OK? Now, Mr. Chairman, (*interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, here are the quotas. Here's the allowable cut that you have given me. Now, you tell me the three levels of bands. But the three levels of bands have got nothing to do with who controls the quotas.

AN HON. MEMBER: It certainly has.

MR. BARRETT: Do you mean to tell me that the other quotas are open, through you, Mr. Speaker, that if they don't perform that those quotas will be open on the other two levels? (*Interruption.*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BARRETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion I came to is a conclusion that I got from a Government document and I quote from that Government document, known as the *Bulkley Nechako Region British Columbia Regional Economic Study*, April, 1970, published by the Province of British Columbia, Department of Industrial Development Trade and Commerce, Economics and Statistics Branch. I quote on page 58: "Bulkley Valley Forest Industry Ltd. controls nearly 100 per cent of the saw log quota and PSYU's within the boundaries of PHA number 4." There it is, in your own document. There it is, in your own terms to me. Then you are telling me that I'm telling a lie. I ask a very simple question. Do you know? Do you deny that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WILLISTON: Mr. Speaker, I never accused the Member of lying on that statistic. We were talking

about profit on land sales, to which the honourable Member mentioned that he did not speak about quota when he was in the House.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that it is a matter of opinion on profit of the land. Only time will tell. The two representatives, Gallagher and Waller, were in my office from Bulkley Valley Forest Products and I put the question to them about the land. I have the dates that they were in my office and they said they were losing money on the land. I said, "In the long run will you lose money?" And they said, "We can't answer that, now." I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was very clear what I was talking about because I wrote the note to the Minister, and I said, "Do you deny that?" I took the quote exactly from the Government's publication.

Mr. Speaker, the fact simply is this, that Bulkley Valley Forest Products controls that whole area in terms of the resources of that forest. There is no way that any one else is going to get a break in there and don't tell me different. We have a multinational corporation that went in and bought out these small loggers, levelled the small sawmills that were there. I saw two sites that they had levelled and burned and they have centralized the whole industrial development. There has been a change in the whole social structure in that area. The small logger, who did function in there, the pioneer of this Province, no longer has any role in the forest industry in that huge empire. The pioneer, who did open this Province, who this Government speaks of so bravely, is no longer a factor in the forest industry in that area, he's sold out. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that there should be no price that allows sale of those quotas to cut out the small operator, to allow only a handful of huge corporations controlling the forests of this Province, Mr. Speaker. That's what I'm concerned about. I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that it should be looked at very seriously because, Mr. Speaker, there is a total of some 39 pulp harvesting units and the Minister doesn't deny that they control the area. In 29 out of the other 33 public sustained-yield unit groups not more than three companies hold the bulk of timber in each license. Some of them are multinational and some are United States' companies. A total of about 28 companies are involved. Now, there is a very dangerous trend developing through this Bulkley Valley Forest Industries Ltd. and I am warning you, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I am expressing my opinion that that's a very dangerous trend. There are little people of this Province who still believe that they are pioneers. They are the little entrepreneurs who you say you protect. There's a little guy out there who wants to believe that part of his treasure of this Province is something he can have a hand in developing and get some honest return from the sweat of his back. What about that little man? When we have these startling facts and the Minister can't answer yes or no until I have to squeeze it out on the floor of the House, then, I tell you it's something to worry about.

Now, beyond that, Mr. Minister, I want to refer to something the Budget didn't deal with and that relates to the north as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the best thing that could happen to the northern part of British Columbia is to kick out every Social Credit M.L.A. they've got. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that they have never had it told the way it is in the north. They have been led to believe that those seven safe Socred seats that the Premier boasts about are there by divine right. If anybody needs a voice in this House, Mr. Minister, if anybody needs a voice in the north, it's those pioneers, who have not had fighting M.L.A.s in that area for years. The last time we had a fighting M.L.A. from South Peace River, he stood up in this House and I remember it. He enunciated the problems he had in his constituency, which I had not seen at that time, and he said, "If five Ministers would get up off their seats my problems would disappear like fog in the morning." He stood right there and said that, Mr. Speaker, and do you know what happened? He disappeared like fog in the morning, along with a number of his colleagues, who were taken care of, not at a general election, Mr. Speaker, but at the Social Credit Nominating Convention. That's where it was done.

I was in Dawson Creek and I walked down a street after doing a television interview, after a list of complaints about the lack of health services, dental care, huge welfare roles, no action being taken on local problems. The Member tried his best on roads. I said on television the Premier refers to this area as the seven safe Socred seats. Those people should have

an alternative. Probably it's been our Party's fault for not being up there, Mr. Speaker, and I am not denying that. But

don't let anyone fool you that the north has been well served by this Government.

I went into the town of Chetwynd, Mr. Speaker, and it didn't give me great pleasure to see what I saw. I didn't feel happy about what I saw in that town. But if you think I was going to give the generalized Junior Chamber of Commerce flack-type claptrap about the beautiful little town I was coming into — there was no way, Mr. Speaker. I said as I came into that town that I saw a ring of shacks around that town, the poverty of which I had not seen comparable to, other than in Mexico. I said that right in town. I understand the Mayor of the town was upset. It is a shame, Mr. Member, to have ever said it back there. You should see that town. You should see some of the housing. It was comparable to some of the housing I saw in the Minister's riding of Nelson-Creston.

After I went through the town, the Mayor was very up-tight, because I said what I said. He issued a public statement saying that I had better not come back up and that the Leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Tommy Douglas, should not come to town. I issued a counter press release saying that Tommy Douglas could take care of himself. He used to be the former bantam-weight boxing champion of Manitoba. But I wasn't concerned about Tommy Douglas, I wasn't concerned about the Mayor's bad feelings. I was concerned about the fact that the people of this Province, who are the pioneers of this Province, have to live in abject poverty in the rural parts of this Province, Mr. Speaker, while huge corporations dominate the north and reap huge profits and will reap huge profits.

The local newspaper was upset by my remarks, and I received the following letter from the Chamber of Commerce, which I intend to read to you, along with my reply.

The Chamber of Commerce sent me this letter:

"Dear Sir:

I have been instructed by the membership of the Chetwynd Chamber of Commerce to express their dissatisfaction over the statements you have recently made about our town. We appreciate your effort and concern about the north country and it is encouraging to note that the opposition parties in the Provincial Government are also beginning to show an interest in our northern development."

That's not so. But that's the line they have been fed, Mr. Speaker.

"We are also critical at times of our Government and feel that a more rapid approach should be given to our needs. We must, however, give them credit, due to the fact that any spending in our area receives criticism from your Party in the House."

When? When has any Member in this House stood against welfare payments or housing payments for people of the north? We have fought against the outside interlopers who have taken the treasures out of the north.

"Mr. Member, your statements do not compliment the effort by local people who are Canada's last pioneers" — the irony of this — last pioneers — "and have every reason to be proud of their accomplishments. Chetwynd is one of the better towns of British Columbia and we would like to show it to you next time you are here."

One of the better towns, Mr. Minister, remember you said, "Hear, hear, " to that. You just sit there for the next ten minutes.

Here's my reply, Mr. Speaker: "I want to thank you for your letter of November 5, 1970." To Mr. Martin, President of Chetwynd Chamber of Commerce. "I appreciate your concern of the severe conditions of inadequate housing surrounding Chetwynd. I repeat what I said when I visited Chetwynd earlier this spring, that I was shocked to find housing ringing the community, that was comparable to what I had seen in northern Mexico.

I can understand your feelings but, nonetheless, I must call things as I see them. I am not alone in my assessment of your problems, because I enclose a photostat of an excerpt of the *Alaska Highway News*, that quotes your own Chamber of Commerce, with its analysis of housing around Chetwynd. It seems to be almost exactly the same as mine. I suppose that once the Mayor sees that you have been saying the same things as I have, he will ask the Chamber to close up. Seriously though, I deeply regret that you say in your letter that we criticize expenditures in the north. That it is not only malicious, but foolish. The reason you have received little attention to your local

problems in the north is because the Premier of this Province refers to your area as one of the seven safe seats in British Columbia.

In our democratic system it is frequently the squeaky wheel that gets the grease. The Government is so sure of the Social Credit majority in the north that it need not hasten to complete projects because they have adopted the attitude that the north will vote Social Credit in any event.

I recommend for your consideration a very good thought that a fighting Member of the Opposition might be more beneficial to your area than having a quiet backbencher sitting in support of the Government moves. As to your comments of the pioneers, the Social Credit Government is busy giving away vast empires of the north to outsiders. Its only responsibilities are to the boards of directors in New York, London and Tokyo. The multinational corporations that now dominate the north do not give a tinker's damn, and I can't say that word, Mr. Speaker, for the pioneers of your area who have sacrificed their lives to open the north. In contrast, we of the New Democratic Party, say of the north that it should be developed with the interests of northern residents and pioneers in mind, rather than serving the needs of outside corporations. I would appreciate it if you would read my reply to your membership." And I signed the letter.

In December of this year I received a letter from the *Chetwynd Reporter*, the Chetwynd published paper. The name is Mr. George Peck. Mr. Peck works for the *Chetwynd Reporter* and was upset by the remarks that I made. He, too, felt that the Chamber of Commerce attitude was the best approach for the community. So he decided to go out and do a study of his own to prove that I was wrong. This is the article that he wrote, published in December in the Chetwynd paper, by Chetwynd reporter, George H. Peck. "Thirty-five point eight per cent of Chetwynd's families live in poverty and live in housing 27 per cent of which can only be referred to as shacks." This is the reporter of the local paper. "Forty-six point four per cent of our families form a distinct lower financial class and earn less than four thousand dollars per year. Their numbers are probably greater per family than any other class. Forty-seven per cent of our families are in the middle class, financially, earning four thousand to ten thousand." He calls four thousand to ten thousand, middle class. "Six per cent of Chetwynd's families are earning more than ten thousand per year. Only six thousand. Maybe that is why 8 per cent of our houses can be termed 'fancy' but, certainly, not at all elaborate. 8 percent. Dave Barrett is right. I took a trip around Chetwynd and 31 per cent of the buildings we live in can only be described as shacks." Actually, I discovered that Chetwynd has two very distinct social classes. A lower class, call it as you will, and an

[[Page 269](#)]

upper or middle class. He goes on to give an excellent breakdown of some 500 homes; 658 homes that he personally surveyed with his secretary, starting out on a theory that my statements were incorrect. He came up with the following figures: 55 fancy houses, which would be normally compared to the kind of average subdivision in the lower mainland; 369 adequate houses, which would not be called adequate in a normal subdivision in the lower mainland; 55 inadequate houses; and 179 shacks. That's what you've done for the people of the north.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense.

MR. BARRETT: To allow this kind of situation to exist in my Province of British Columbia and you say it's nonsense. I say, "Shame on you and shame on this Government for allowing this to happen in our Province." A Province as rich as ours — 37 per cent of the people in one town living in shacks — and all you've got is a response of "nonsense." These are figures and are available to anyone who wants to read them. That's all you can do for the north of British Columbia? Then we get this hot air in the Budget Speech, about how you are going to create jobs, create development. You know the Minister of Industrial Trade and whatever-else-he-does and travel that he does for twelve thousand bucks worth, sent out a little booklet today. You've got a habit of putting your statistics in your mouth, Mr. Speaker, that can only embarrass the Government. On Friday, we were told by the Premier that there were going to be 25,000 created in the Province of British Columbia. J-O-B-S was his four letter word. I want to tell you I've got another four letter word that I've heard. It might more appropriately describe it — B-U-L-L.

Look at your own statistics. In this booklet that I got in my office today from the Minister, "In 1964, we had 639,000 people in the labour force and that year we increased the job opportunities by 29,000; 1965, 28,000; 1966,

11,000; 1967, 47,000; 1968, 27,000; 1969, 44,000." Mr. Speaker, no figures for 1970 and the forecast is a dynamic decrease down to 25,000. Your economy is wound down and you are bragging about it in your Budget Speech. The normal increase that we could expect because of the pattern of growth here in this Province, that you boasted about in your Throne Speech, you are now decrying and predicting less than what your own department has been projecting over the years. Read the Speech again — 25,000 new jobs! What a slap at the Minister of Trade and Industrial Development. But, you know, that Minister is really something to behold. If he sticks to that 25,000 figure, Mr. Speaker, we will be going backwards. Just to take up the slack in the increase in the work population, 25,000 won't even touch it, and that's below the average. What have they done about creating new jobs? Mr. Speaker, what have they done about creating new jobs?

You tell me about the thousand new jobs, Mr. Speaker. I'll just digress on that for one moment. Last September, twelve girls came to my house who had just graduated from the Riverview Mental Hospital training course as psychiatric nurses. They had finished the course. The job openings were frozen and eleven of those twelve girls had to go on welfare within a week after they had graduated from the Government training course. Those are the frozen jobs you held and forced people on welfare and then you announce you've got all new jobs. Don't talk about a thousand new jobs. Those girls had a bitter, bitter experience. I ran across one of them up at the Skeenaview Hospital, which I'll talk about later to the Minister of Health, in Terrace, the Skeenaview Hospital, where the M.L.A. visits at least once a month to see how those old people are being taken care of. Have you been up there, Mr. Member, to Skeenaview? Yes, well, you should visit more often, because I was just as shocked about that and I'll come to that in the estimates.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Minister has spent over \$10,000 of taxpayers' money, hard-earned taxpayers' money and you produced nothing last year. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that that Minister is the Minister of Nonaction. What have you done with that money travelling all over the world? What have you produced? We've peddled away the resources of this Province to any promoter who can grab it fast enough. The Wenner-Gren deal was the best example of that. He's a good dummy hand at bridge. I don't know how to play bridge, so I don't know what the word, "dummy hand," means. But I will tell you this. He hasn't produced.

Your own statistics, and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in their publication 31-002 on pages 11 and 16, show new manufacturing all across Canada. Between 1960 and 1969, 1,977 new manufacturing establishments were in B.C., the normal growth. How many of those, Mr. Speaker, were involved with petroleum and coal products? In those years, we saw huge fortunes being reaped out of the natural gas of this Province and the oil of this Province. Five industries in petroleum and coal products in ten years were established. Five, local bait, that's all. In the primary metals industries, 24 — a total, of all those companies, of 48 jobs out of the metal resources and the petroleum resources of this Province at the secondary industry level. Forty-eight jobs in ten years out of the natural resources from those two areas. Is that something to be proud of?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if we had a Minister of Trade and Industrial Development and Commerce, he would be out beating the bushes around the world, selling British Columbia as the new nerve centre of the Pacific rim trading community.

Mr. Minister, I spent a day, Saturday, with the leading economist in British Columbia and within the first few minutes of discussing the Budget, he shared with me that the most obvious role that British Columbia could play, in terms of industrial development, would be to attract the head offices of major companies here to British Columbia, with the sustained employment those head offices would give. We have a natural setting — geographic and weather. But he stated to me that there has been no aggressive moves by this Government in the secondary industrial development area.

We hear many, many times, that that's not a factor. If you read the Employers' Council of British Columbia's own research, you will find that labour-management relations are not their first concern. In the weighty study that they did in 1966 it's their sixth concern. One of them, ahead of that, is this Government, and this is the Employers' Council of British Columbia's own work.

We hear so often, Mr. Speaker, "What is the Opposition going to do about it?" Well, I'll tell you, for a couple

of dollars. I've been very busy. Tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, at ten o'clock, Mr. Fujita of the Toyota Motor Company will be in my office, out from Toronto to discuss with me the feasibility of establishing an automobile plant here in British Columbia. Ten o'clock tomorrow morning and I will be discussing with him, Mr. Speaker, the kind of terms and the kind of development, that if we were Government, we would like to see. After I've had that discussion with him,

[[Page 270](#)]

if the Minister of Trade and Industry cares to, if he has some time, I'm sure that I can make an appointment on your Government's behalf, Mr. Speaker, because if you are concerned about jobs, it's just a short walk over from my office to the Minister's office. The backbenchers are too anxious. What have you done about getting jobs? You could have written to these people. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that, if the Minister wishes to meet with these people, they are invited. I gave him the invitation before, Mr. Speaker, and he turned down my invitation before. Well, I don't know if you want to sell any wine to Toyota. You can speak to them yourself. You've got enough problems.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that at ten o'clock tomorrow they will be in my office and, if the Minister cares to, I will extend to them an invitation to meet with the Minister after they are through with the meeting in my office.

Mr. Speaker, there was really nothing new in that Budget. There was no new philosophy. There was no new drive. There were no new directions. There was no leadership given to the people of British Columbia. All that was new were the taxes, Mr. Speaker, and, for the most part, one of them anyway was completely frivolous, in my opinion. We'll have an opportunity to debate those later on.

Because this Government has been in office so long, they have come to rely on their rhetoric. They have come to believe that this Chamber is the boundary of the world of British Columbia. In the past, they have delivered their speeches to the applause of backbenchers, that have echoed throughout this Chamber, and their way of pounding of their desks was a marvel to behold in the past. Even this Budget never got that kind of pounding.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has reached a point in its life where it is no longer worth living as a Government. This Government has nothing to offer the people of British Columbia except its own memory. It reminds me of the last paragraph of a great novel by F. Scott Fitzgerald. It's called *The Great Gatsby*. Nothing could be more appropriate to sum up the Budget of this Government than this paragraph: "Gatsby believes in the green light, the orgiastic future that year by year receives the forest. It eludes us then, but that's no matter. Tomorrow, we will run faster. Stretching out our arms farther, one fine morning. So we beat on. Boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past." And that's this Government, living in the past, nothing to offer the future. And, for no other reason, this Government, because of that Budget, should be swept out of office as soon as possible.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, the Budget was just a little bit more austere this year. I noticed instead of having a flamboyant, dateful picture, like last year, it was done just with a simple neatly etched diagram. Of course, last year's model was that beautiful new extended care unit in Campbell River. I am always fascinated by the pictures, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget (*interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MIL McGEER: I see this lovely one of the legislative lawn and, on the back, another beautiful picture of the ferries. I like that one because the ferries are giving such a wide berth to one another, which is kind of reassuring. Then there is the picture of the regional colleges. I thought that picture would have meant a little more if there had been a few of the people that we always would like to see in these Budget pictures, but who never seem to get there. Mind you, as far as people go, there's always that marvellous picture of the Minister of Finance. He looks very youthful in the picture, this year. I notice that the blend of the brown wood in the background matches almost perfectly the colour of the Minister of Finance's hair. You know, there are none of those creases, there isn't that worried expression on his face, that seemed to cross the faces of so many of our municipal leaders, this past summer, with so many on welfare and so many unemployed. Well, there may have been creases of concern in his brow, too,

but then I'm not sure that one would expect them since this is exactly the same picture that appeared in last year's Budget. Unless, of course, there is a little bit of trick photography there. But I thought it would have been appropriate, instead of reprinting that youthful looking picture of the Premier for Centennial Year, how much more appropriate it would have been if we could have had some action pictures of the Premier visiting around the Province. How about instead of that...*(interruption)*. Well, I'd like to tell the Minister that we are a little more modern in our thinking than to feel it appropriate to ride around the Province on an elephant. That may be the Social Credit style for the second century. In any event, I have one picture here that might have been appropriate rather than that one of the junior colleges, which showed nobody present. This one has the Premier meeting people there. Do you remember how he left? He wouldn't even stay for the opening. They were picketing him for some facilities *(interruption)*. "That's not true," says the Member. Well, the people who were there were all of the same opinion, except you, Mr. Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you there?

MR. McGEER: No, but the picture is right there. It shows the delighted subjects showing their gratitude for what the Premier had done. Then, of course, that one on the legislative lawns, again, carefully taken this summer, in that tranquil state. But, if we had the Premier meeting the people when they came to the Legislature to meet him on Opening Day, we'd have had an interesting action shot of what went on in British Columbia during the past Budget year. That would have been a nice interaction between the people and the Government, the kind of thing that you might expect for this rather expensive little booklet.

But, Mr. Speaker, the expense of that booklet is small in comparison with the expense of what is going on across Canada this very day. Because the sensation in the East is a scandalous series of advertisements, which are appearing in every newspaper in eastern Canada. Today, the *Star*, the *Telegram*, and the *Globe and Mail* in Toronto, the *Montreal Gazette*, the only English-speaking newspaper of any size in that city, the *Ottawa Journal* and the *Ottawa Citizen*....

AN HON. MEMBER: The *Montreal Star* is by far the widest read English-speaking newspaper.

MR. McGEER: Yes, the *Montreal Star*. I take that back I'm sorry, Mr. Member. A former Montrealer and Godspeed if you wish to go back. The *Halifax Chronicle*. These are all carrying, today, on the very day the Federal-Provincial Conference starts in Ottawa, the following three-quarter-page

[[Page 271](#)]

advertisement: "Send for it today, British Columbia Centennial Budget," and there's a picture under it of you-know-who. A record pay-as-you-go, completely financed, with Canada's lowest Provincial tax structure. Create more jobs and relieve unemployment. Provide more money for education, health, hospital care, medical care, housing, social services, etc. Improve the total environment to give B.C. the best ecological climate in the world. Keep the development of B.C.'s vast natural resources and job-creating industry forging ahead.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I've always told visitors coming to hear one of the first of the Premier's Budget Speeches to look forward to a tick finish, where he does this terrific summary and all the loyal backbenchers, in turn, beat their desks to give that final sprint down the wire. You know, it didn't happen on Friday. Everybody kind of limped in gasping. I think they could hardly believe what they heard. But it's reassuring to know that, over the weekend, the Social Credit backbenchers have regained their breath a bit and they can come up with a little bit of applause for this advertisement. Here's what it says, "...meet the needs of a population expanding twice as fast as the rest of Canada." That wasn't what the Budget said, though, was it? The Budget complained about how rapidly the labour force had expanded and about the difficulty that it had in meeting the number of people demanding jobs. "...guard against inflation by continuing B.C.'s strong financial position with no public debt or resulting interest or service charges, thus enabling the total budget to be used to benefit every citizen." Didn't say anything about the increases in gasoline tax. How does that benefit every citizen? The increases on his vacation this summer, when he has to pay a tax for motels. "...maintain B.C.'s high credit rating in the financial capitals of the world," it says. But where does it say all the borrowing has to come from for all the Crown corporations? Not a word about borrowing one penny on the open markets of the world. We've been avoiding them like the plague and the consequences of that

to the B.C. economy are something I am going to deal with shortly. But it says here, "For your free copy of the latest Budget in B.C.'s first one hundred years as a Province of Canada mail this coupon now. (Signed G.S. Bryson, Deputy Minister of Finance)." Then the blank, "Please send me a copy of the 1971 British Columbia Budget Speech. Please indicate if you require more than one copy."

Well, Mr. Speaker, after all this complaining from the Minister of Social Rehabilitation, as he calls himself, and the Premier, and the Finance Minister, and all the Members of the Cabinet about all these people who have been trooping to British Columbia from all over Canada, what do we do? We give them a pitch that would embarrass the flimsiest con man in Canada, and every incentive to rush out to British Columbia and say, "I want a stake in the gold rush."

I wonder if the Premier's down handing out autographed copies now to the welfare recipients in Toronto, so they can catch the first bus out here. But that's not the stupidest error in planting these advertisements in all the eastern papers at our expense. This was done just as we are rushing into a Federal-Provincial Conference where every single Province in Canada is angling for the best financial opportunities for their people. This is like rushing into a game with a group of professional poker players bragging about a brace of deuces. It's the kind of stupidity we can do without. I don't know whether it were placed there to satisfy someone's personal vanity so they could strut like a peacock in eastern Canada, but I can tell you this, it will do us no good to solve our problems. It won't improve our bargaining position at Ottawa. I can tell you...*(interruption)*. "Ridiculous statement," says that Minister. Well, all I can say is, that for a Minister, you are short on horse power and long on exhaust. That's what we heard from you last week.

Which Province? Which Provincial Government was moaning its loudest about bad treatment from Ottawa? Who needed the \$500 million in Federal land-outs? The last time there was a Federal-Provincial Conference, that's in the appendix of this very Budget, this Government made those demands on Ottawa. Then all these advertisements about the wonderful debt free Province! How does that square with the argument presented in the briefs to this conference? I am telling it the way it is and that's what hurts.

The second thing, if people are really coming to this Province and loading up our welfare rolls, this is a fine way to discourage them. A newspaper costs only a dime and you couldn't blame the welfare recipients in these other Provinces for believing what they read, even if those of us out here know better.

I say this, despite this stupid and extravagant series of advertisements, which will cost the taxpayers of British Columbia dearly, not just in the cost of their presentation, but in their results.

The Budget was the most disappointing ever presented by Social Credit to the Legislature. It has marked a bleak start to our Centennial. All the little man can look forward to in our Centennial Year is a higher price for his cigarettes, a higher price for his vacation motels, higher property taxes on his home, despite the \$10 increase in the home-owner grant. The municipal per capita grant didn't go up — that's going to be more than offset.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to continue the tradition I have started by presenting a third Liberal Budget to the Legislature and to the people of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, in past years Social Credit Members have scoffed at my Budget proposals and they've roared with laughter, as the Attorney-General just did, at the revenue figures I've given. But, as the years passed, Mr. Speaker, and the accuracy of the figures become evident, the scoffing of Social Crediters may die down and the people of British Columbia will come to recognize the value of forward looking spending proposals and will realize how much more can be done with the resources that are available to Government. How much farther British Columbia would be ahead, today, if the Liberal Budget proposals for the past two years had been implemented. We wouldn't be falling so far behind. A year ago in my second Liberal Budget, I said this: "The taxes being paid this year demand a better Budget than the one which it had for last year. The Minister of Finance continues to allow his services to drag behind both the needs of the people and the taxes he collects from them. Because of these great needs, Mr. Speaker, I put forward, then, a Budget of \$1,317 million which was \$137 million more than was proposed by the Premier. It was greater even than the Budget proposed by the Premier this past Friday for our coming fiscal year 1971-72. That one was only \$1,300 million. This year, the Premier was \$17 million behind where he should

have been last year. In other words, he's more than a year in arrears, yet Members from the Government side roared with laughter when I presented this Budget. The Member from Kamloops was incredulous. Yet, I stated that such a Budget was not only possible but it should leave a generous surplus.

As Members will see when Public Accounts for the

[[Page 272](#)]

current fiscal year finally come out, that Budget would almost have been balanced, despite the staggering and colossal mismanagement that the Provincial Government has been guilty of this past year. I stated this in the distributed text of a year ago and, again, I am quoting: "Dangers of a recession, dangers of deflationary pressures and dangers of loss of productivity due to strikes, may cause the revenues to be lower. In view of these uncertainties, a surplus cushion of \$82 million was built into the spending proposal." Those remarks don't appear on our peculiar version of *Hansard*. All that is noted, Mr. Speaker, was that an uproar took place, no doubt indicating that Social Credit Members were drowning out the tape with "cat calls."

I want to draw to the Members' attention that, while final revenue figures are not available for the current fiscal year, they are available for the year before that. That covers the period of my first Liberal Budget in 1969. That one called for a spending programme of \$1,130 million or \$106 million more than predicted in the Premier's Budget. The Member from Vancouver Centre scoffed at that Budget, too. Yet, now, the revenues for that period are before the Members. They are in Public Accounts for 1969-70 and they show that that Budget was conservative, because the revenues were \$1,179 million. That would have not only covered the Budget that was proposed, but left a \$40 million surplus.

Now, for this past year, the second Liberal Budget. Had we put that Budget into effect, we would have had a stronger economy, one that was more dynamic and one that would have enjoyed the long-range benefits, amongst other things, of a \$15 million industrial development fund. I had hoped that reminder would wake up the Minister of Industrial Development, because it was he who was complaining all year long about the lack of a Federal programme to help out the depressed areas of British Columbia. Do you remember those complaints, Mr. Minister, the wires you sent to Ottawa pleading for help? We could have done those things and still had a surplus of \$49 million. What would have happened if we'd put these spending proposals into effect? I want to underline this for the Members, Mr. Speaker. They would have directly created six to seven thousand jobs and more than twice as many more people would have indirectly benefited. Between the effect of that Liberal Budget and our willingness to deal effectively with the labour disputes, B.C. would have had the lowest unemployment in the Nation instead of the highest. Because the policies of this Government, and I hope the Minister of Labour is listening to this, led to 2,900,000 man-days of work loss and that, Mr. Speaker, is equal to wiping out 11,000 jobs for a full year. Remember, for every new job created by a new industry, the multiplier effect of indirect benefits creates another one and one half jobs. In other words, the 11,000 jobs eliminated in lost time, plus the 1,400 people let out of the Civil Service — no, I apologize, Mr. Speaker, 1,400 people who were not replaced in the Civil Service when they left — had an effect not of 12,400 jobs down the drain, but 31,000 jobs down the drain. Now, (*interruption*). I think it does, Mr. Speaker. The Member says it doesn't apply to the Civil Service.

Where do you think the planning in this Province has to take place? If the Civil Service doesn't do it, who does? When you dig your knife into the Civil Service it slows everything up, in the public sector and the private sector. If you take these jobs that Social Credit threw down the drain, 31,000 of them, add the 6,000 jobs that the Liberals would have created and the secondary effect of those jobs, which was another 15,000, you would have had a total, this past year, of 46,000 more jobs. How many were looking for work in British Columbia last year? Seventy six thousand. Our unemployment shouldn't have been 76,000, but 30,000. That 76,000, Mr. Member from Vancouver Centre, was during the peak employment period. Think what would have happened if we'd had 46,000 more jobs, 40,000 more families off welfare. Perhaps 70 to 80 thousand people in all. What a difference that would have made to municipal tax costs. What a difference that would have made to the Provincial Budget, a Budget that is going to be overspent by \$40 million on welfare costs alone. Wouldn't it have been better to spend that \$40 million on jobs? We say it would have been better. In fact, we said it a year ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my Budget prediction a year ago that revenues would be \$1,400 million is going to be far

off the mark. But who could have envisioned the colossal mismanagement that took place this past year? And it was this mismanagement that led to the disastrous drop in revenues. Who could have predicted that the industrial relations policies of the Government would lead to nearly 3 million man-days of work loss? Eleven thousand jobs down the drain. Who would have predicted that the Minister of Labour and that divided Cabinet over there, would have wrung its hands for three months while our largest industry was shut down? Who would have predicted that housing starts would be off 75 per cent during the best construction season? Who would have predicted that the Government would have allowed 1,400 Civil Service jobs to lie vacant? Who could have predicted that a Government would graduate psychiatric nurses from its own school and then fail to hire them when the hospitals were short of staff? Who could have predicted that the Government, every time that an important decision was needed, would have its key Ministers making one of their boast-to-boast tours?

Well, given the lack of leadership and confidence over there, perhaps we should be grateful that matters weren't worse. But even with all that colossal damage, even with the do-it-yourself depression that you people so skillfully managed for us, we still obtained enough revenues to almost balance the Budget that I presented in the House a year ago. "Interim financial statements indicate that Government revenues for the full fiscal year, ending March 31, 1971, will be approximately \$1,265 million." And when you add to this the windfall of \$39 million from the Federal Government and this comes from those advanced payments the Federal Government is making on income tax and its contribution towards technical and vocational education, you get slightly over \$1,300 million. But had this Liberal Budget of a year ago been followed, the revenue picture would, obviously, have been far brighter (*interruption*).

No, it's not out \$100 million. That's right. That's what we should have had. That hundred million...

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Will the Members please address the Chair.

MR. McGEER: ...was what that mismanagement of your Government cost us (*interruption*).

No, my Budget was for \$1,300 million. What I told you is, even with the colossal mismanagement, that the revenues will be close to what that Budget forecast. Remember, when I presented the Budget, a year ago, I warned that there would be deflationary pressures and it was wise to build that surplus cushion in. But no one could have conceived of the kind of stupid management that the Government gave us during the

[[Page 273](#)]

entire year. All I say is, that if our Budget had been followed, people would not have been receiving welfare but would have been working at productive jobs.

What was the welfare bill for the first nine months? The Minister of Rehabilitation has left his seat, but it was \$97.8 million, \$3.3 million more than the Budget for the entire year. Those payments also imposed a colossal drain on municipal financial resources, which slowed down their development work. You will remember how the Members on this side opposed that move to double the welfare contribution of the municipalities from 10 to 20 per cent.

Had the Liberal Budget been followed, the Government would have been receiving income from taxes, the private sector would have been richer, there would have been a multiplier effect to the economy and the municipalities wouldn't have beer back to the wall.

Well, we had a four-letter-word Budget on Friday. "J-O-B-S," the Premier said, "25,000 of them," blazed the headlines in the *Daily Colonist*. But that's a statement that should have been made a year earlier, because the 25,000 jobs were needed during this current fiscal year. Those and 40,000 more will be needed next year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a provision for 25,000 jobs in that Budget of the Premier's. Do you know he stated on television, Friday, after he left the Legislature, that part of that 25,000 figure was the thousand new Civil Service jobs he was creating. He didn't have the honesty to admit that the Government had closed out 1,400 positions and that, in truth, the Government had decreased the number of Civil Service jobs rather than

increasing them.

What's wrong in the planning, Mr. Speaker? It's perfectly obvious. On page 14 of the Budget Address, you see this quote, "Not surprisingly, the labour force rose from 836,000 in 1969 to 877,000 this past year, an increase of 5 per cent." Well, if it weren't surprising, then why wasn't there provision for jobs? If it were known that the international markets in forest products were weak, that's mentioned too, then why wasn't it evened out by accelerated public works? If there were deflationary pressures, and almost every week the Premier went into orbit about Ottawa, why didn't the Government reverse the trend with its own spending?

Mr. Speaker, the primary task of Government is to go against business trends. You lead and you don't lag. You flatten out the business cycles, you don't exaggerate them. But the Government didn't do any of these things. You added to the problem by slowing down on public works. You laid off civil servants. You stood by while industrial disputes took place. If the press reports are correct you even redeemed parity bonds, effectively taking your own money out of circulation and adding to the deflationary pressure.

Mr. Speaker, that's "hardware store economics." We need better. Now, what was the result of these hardware store economics? Where did the increase in the labour force go? They went on welfare. That's where they went. The increase in the size of the labour force was almost exactly equal to the increasing numbers on welfare. The increase in numbers on welfare almost exactly equalled the increase in the unemployed. The average number of people unemployed in British Columbia, average for the year, was just under 70,000, almost twice the previous year. This is a lesson in simple arithmetic. You can't hide people. You can't put them in a deep freeze for a year. You can't shirk the labour force. Your choices are only two: either you provide jobs or you provide welfare. It's a pretty simple equation, isn't it? And it doesn't do any good for the Cabinet Ministers to sit on their behinds and whine about the Federal Government. That's not going to make the problem go away. It isn't going to start British Columbia moving again.

Mr. Speaker, we don't excuse the Federal Government one bit for its fiscal and monetary policies. We haven't before and we don't now because the Federal Government has worsened the unemployment situation. We admit that. But a Provincial Government that has pursued the kind of economic policies that you over there have pursued this past year, should have very little to say to any Government. You've got too much to answer for yourselves. Here we have twice the unemployment in the Nation. If it were all the Federal Government's doings, why did we have that unemployment, double the Nation's average? Why did we have almost 40 per cent of all the man-days lost in industrial dispute, right here, at home, in good-life British Columbia?

How much better it would have been to have followed our proposals, instead of moaning about Ottawa. Take, for example, our proposal for highways, a year ago. Our Budget was \$170 million. Do you remember that? What have you got this year? Still not that high and if you add the gasoline tax which I presume will be added, in fact, it has been added, there is going to be a net reduction in a commitment to highways isn't there, Mr. Minister of Highways? How does that square with the Premier's boast on page 32? "The Government is introducing bold, new spending programmes in resources development, designed to create a maximum number of jobs. Major projects planned include the Vancouver Island Highway extension..." Got that one in. We proposed that a year ago. Our Budget for highways was greater, a year ago, than the Premier's is now. How silly the term "bold" has become, with its Finance Minister, who has begun to enter his dotage.

How much better it would have been to follow our education budget of a year ago — \$402 million. That's \$4 million more than your Finance Minister proposed a year later. What was the money intended to do? Well, it was intended to provide these long overdue facilities for post-secondary education. Remember when the Premier went to the opening of Douglas College? He was picketed there. No facilities. The Minister of Public Works says, "They weren't picketed at all." As a Minister of Public Works, you should have been getting that job done. He'd be the first to excuse the Premier. Well, what does the Government note? Here it is, right on page 27 of your Budget. "Total enrolment in the universities will be an estimated 34,750 in September, 1971, a rise of 175 per cent over 1960. In the fiscal year ended March 1, 1970, Provincial operating grants to universities made up 78.1 per cent of the total university operating budget." But, it also notes that the current enrolment in the Provincial vocational schools is up 13.8 per cent in a single year. The only mention made in the Budget is for operating expenses, nothing for capital to

provide the needed facilities. Still not there in the Budget. Yet our Budget of a year ago...*(interruption)*. Mr. Minister, surely, you don't think \$14 million is going to...might I add, even what was budgeted last year hasn't been spent...surely, you don't think \$14 million is going to cover these enormous increases in population which, you, yourself, or your Minister of Finance, forecast in his Budget.

Where is the capital budget to provide these facilities? It isn't there, Mr. Speaker. The people who should be building these facilities are looking for jobs. The people who are attending the schools need the facilities and, instead of having a Budget that will get on with the work, all we do is

[[Page 274](#)]

add to our welfare rolls.

How much better it would have been to follow our Budget for recreation and travel industry of a year ago. The increase of \$5 million still hasn't been met by the Provincial Government. Provision was made in that Budget, Mr. Speaker, of last year, for money to make a Provincial Park of Cypress Bowl. Now, a year later, the Government announces it will make a park of it but there's still no action on the job, and it was the jobs we needed this past year. Last summer, when there were 76,000 people unemployed, that's when the work should have been done. We should be skiing up there in our Centennial Year, not wringing our hands wondering how we are going to escape the clutches of the Mafia.

How much better it would have been, Mr. Speaker, to have followed our Industrial Development Budget of a year ago? We proposed an increase of \$15 million last year. Far from matching that Budget, this year, the Industrial Development Budget was slashed again — the only Minister to take it in the neck. He doesn't know what he can do with the Budget he has already. The Department of Industrial Development will not miss that Minister. What we provided for in our Budget of a year ago was incentives for secondary industry to be established in the Province, because we've got to have the long-term stability of manufacturing jobs in this Province. All these things we talk about, these public works projects, are all short-term things, only to get us out of the slough that we are in. But, sooner or later, these have got to be covered by stable, long-term manufacturing jobs. That's why we had a Budget of incentives of \$15 million, why we provided for a start on our Science City — that was in the Budget — why we provided a departmental Budget that would have helped a confident Minister, not the present Minister, to further the cause of industrial promotion. You know, we've been critical of the Minister because he racked up this record spending, travelling around. I don't begrudge it. I think that the department would run far more smoothly if the Minister were travelling permanently. It would be an economy to the Province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our Industrial Development Budget provided for an economic council to be established, that would address itself to future economic goals for the Province and lay down appropriate ground rules of management and labour. I've discussed with the honourable Members before the details of duties of such an economic council.

There's only one part of that Liberal Budget of a year ago that was less, and that was the Budget for welfare. The money wouldn't have been needed because there would have been jobs instead of breadlines in the Province. I'm sorry the Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation isn't in his place. He's been the big spender this past year. But what a failure his Provincial Alliance of Businessmen has been. All the jobs that were promised, and the only increase that has come is on his welfare rolls — 30,000 of them. His policy is weak and confused and the interim financial statements that were presented show that less than a quarter of his Budget was spent. I'm talking about less than a quarter on the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen. When it comes to welfare, he was already overspent before the end of December. You know, in the middle of the year, when unemployment was soaring, the welfare rolls were bulging and revenues to Government were down, the Premier told the gullible press what a disaster it would have been had McGeer's Budget proposals been followed. Let the Premier tell the people, now, now that he stands in the economic rubble of his own bad judgements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to a happier topic. I hope that there will be a little less scorn and skepticism from the opposite side as we present a third Liberal Budget. Mr. Speaker, this is a Budget for the people and not against the people. It is a second-century Budget, because it's forward looking and not backward looking. I

thought how appropriate it was, really, on the Opening Day, that so many of the Social Credit Members came in last century's dress.

Well, these are the main spending features of the peoples' Budget. I know the Member from Cowichan-Malahat, as a friend of the people, will be interested in these spending proposals. I want to add, once more, this will be a fully balanced Budget, with revenues sufficient to cover the proposed expenditures. No tax increases, they aren't necessary. I notice that even pleases the Social Credit Members. As we go on, you'll see that all of these tax increases, really, weren't necessary and that we could have done great things in British Columbia without the necessity of giving that dose of sulphur and treacle to the little people of British Columbia during their birthday year.

Now, these are the main spending proposals and I am just going over the high-lights, Mr. Speaker. First of all, for the pioneers, and I think that we've got to recognize these important people in our Centennial Year, I suggest free bus passes, good at all times, for all citizens age 71 and over. Why not as a Centennial present? Secondly, all property taxes on personal homes eliminated for persons 71 years or older. Now, the Members look sceptical at that. But let me explain how it can and should be done (*interruption*). Well, we could, perhaps, improve it to 65. I think that's an interesting suggestion. I'd be happy to incorporate, if the Member would care to join our group, and put his suggestions into a future Budget. You know, that Member, Mr. Speaker, is very interested in Social Credit theory and he keeps reminding me that one of my relatives, who sat in this Chamber many years ago, had some interesting ideas about what should be done with money during tough times. I hope the Member is paying particularly close attention to what we could do in British Columbia just by spending money and getting it into circulation.

The second proposal for our pioneers — eliminate all their property taxes, because those people, with one or two exceptions, Centennial people, who are semiretired but still receiving an emolument from the Legislature, although most people of that age are on fixed incomes. What we could do, when they die, is to add their taxes as a surcharge to succession duties. In the meantime, one could pay, from current succession duty revenue, a grant to the city and municipality in lieu of the taxes. This way, we would give the people their Centennial grant. We don't give it to their heirs, because we added whatever their taxes would have been as a simple surcharge to their succession duties. You see, this way it would be very simple to relieve these people of all taxes, without taking away essential revenue to Government. All you do is just say, "We won't charge you any taxes. Whatever it is, we'll pay the city or municipalities." Then, when the time comes to add up the bill on the estate, just put a surcharge on succession duties. A very easy way. Take the dollar taxes away. It's not really a home acquisition grant, it's a home retention grant, if you want to put it that way.

The third thing, and I know the Minister of Health Services will be in favour of this one, and I realize there is a financial problem here, and that's the commencement of a programme of Centennial homes to provide chronic and

[[Page 275](#)]

custodial care to the citizens no longer able to care for themselves. The idea would be that these homes would be operated at cost, or modestly subsidized by Provincial Government, just the way it's done in that wonderful Social Credit Province of Alberta, and has been done for many, many years. I think if they can do it there, it can be done here.

My second programme for the people, Mr. Speaker, is for the poor and the disadvantaged. I know that the Leader of the New Democratic Party has a particularly keen interest in the poor and the disadvantaged and we are coming to that. We have not left anybody out in this people's Budget. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the provision of day care centres for children of working mothers and single-parent families. I've suggested one source that we could pump into this and that's the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen, because there are \$500,000 that are just smouldering away. The Minister of Social Rehabilitation is just incapable of doing anything useful with it. He's not spending it. Why not put this into day care centres and this would really enlarge the work force?

The second and this is a very vital one, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a guaranteed annual income to all B.C. citizens. The New Democratic Party and I agree on this. I want to say how it should be done, though. This is to provide a rebate, or negative income tax, on the Provincial portion of the Federal income tax returns. In other words, the vehicle is already there for doing it and all that's required are a few simple changes. No a few changes on that

involved form that we get given to us with that coloured booklet from the Minister of Finance in Ottawa.

Thirdly, for the poor and disadvantaged, and this is only a partial programme that we would have to expand, depending on how well it worked, and this is a grant of \$25 annually to all tenants who are not sending children to school, in lieu of the home-owner grant for school purposes. This would be a first stage of a plan to eliminate disparity in school levies. As the Member from Vancouver Centre knows and has often mentioned to the House, the higher the home-owner grant goes, the more the tenants get shafted on school taxes. People resent this because almost half the people of the metropolitan area rent rather than own homes. There is simply no way that we can get everyone in the Province owning a home. Not that everyone wouldn't want to own one, simply, that it is mechanically or engineeringly, to use a bad word, impossible. Yet, we have this discrimination and this \$25 grant would be a first step, perhaps, a tentative first step, but it would be a move in the direction of tax equality. But, in that rental, Mr. Member, as you know, has to be included the taxes on the apartment or whatever building you rent, even if you are renting a home owned by some one else, he can't qualify for the home-owner grant and he has to include those taxes in the rent that you pay.

Now, next in the series of proposals for the people is for the Indians, the original citizens of this Province. We are honoured in our Centennial Year to have an Indian sitting. I only wish he were with our Party because we are going to put forward an exciting programme for the Indians and I'd like to put this one up especially for that outspoken Member. This is to have a North American Indian Festival during 1971, with tribes from all parts of North America being invited to the Province (*interruption*). No, I didn't, Mr. Member. But, in any event, for this great Indian Festival, that we should hold here in 1971, I would suggest the Government offer a prize of \$100,000 to the best Indian art exhibit, with an additional \$75,000 for the best Indian art exhibit, from within British Columbia. Now, the purpose of this isn't just to put on a display for our Centennial Year. It is to attract attention to the craftwork of the Indians and help them to stimulate an industry where they would not just serve a domestic market of British Columbia, but would serve a market all over Canada. I'm talking about a \$100,000 prize for an Indian Festival.

Now, the next proposal for the original citizens is free post-secondary education, including tuition, books and living allowances, for all reserve Indians who can qualify at any institution in Canada because, if we are going to help these people help themselves, we want to give them the very best tools that we can and that includes the finest education that the country has to offer.

Now, next, the environment. A proposal for the ecologists. Once more, \$10 million for a Department of Environmental Control. We detailed a year ago what we would do with this Budget, how we wanted a Cabinet hawk, to control environment, instead of all those Cabinet chickens, who make up the present Land Use Committee. We decided that one way would be to use part of this money to commence construction on a Centennial thermo-electric generating unit, to be located near Victoria where there is a power shortage but, perhaps, we could add a small addition to the Burrard thermal unit. It would be fueled from the wood waste from the beaches, harbours, coves and rivers of the lower mainland and Georgia Strait, and it would operate on a combination of wood waste and natural gas. It would be a start on a Centennial clean-up.

You know I used to...(*interruption*). Yes, that was provided for and I don't want to go into all the details of our Department of our Environmental Control. We will be getting to that probably during discussion of the estimates.

I used to, Mr. Speaker, own a summer place on Bowen Island and we sold that property, not because of the air pollution of two pulp mills in Howe Sound, but because the beaches were virtually unusable, due to the clogging and contamination of wood waste which abounds in all our lower mainland waters. There is a hazard, in addition to virtual destruction of the beaches, for any small boatman who goes out. He never knows when he is going to hit a deadhead and wind up in the bottom of the Straits, a permanent addition to our underwater park. We have had many people drown as a result of deadhead accidents.

Lastly, and this is the last of the main spending features of this Liberal Budget, and this one is to create jobs. We are not satisfied just with the incentives of higher spending in so many of these key departments. The first would be to remove the 5 per cent sales tax on all building materials used in construction during the six winter months.

Again and again, we have heard the Premier and Finance Minister call for the removal of this tax at the Federal level. He suggests it be done to stimulate construction, and I say he's right. But he has within his power and so do you, to remove this 5 per cent Provincial tax which is levied on top of that 11 per cent tax and so stimulate construction right in the Province, at a time when the construction industry is flat on its back. The idea in taking it away during the six winter months is to stimulate construction during the time when normally it tags. It is not enough to leave an open-ended tax incentive. If you put time limits on it, you force people to make decisions to go ahead, or do without that tax concession. This is the kind of thing that would start movement of the private sector during the slack months (*interruption*). No, I'm just following through on the Premier's idea, but he doesn't have the

[[Page 276](#)]

courage to do it himself. He just demands that others do it for him (*interruption*). Well, I say he's the one who moans to Ottawa about the 11 per cent tax. Why doesn't he take it off, here? Well, he doesn't have the courage of his convictions. His conviction is that the tax should be removed. We'll wait and see.

Do you know what the Premier was doing at my age, Mr. Speaker? He was a Member of the House, a backbencher, as the Member from Kootenay well knows, supporting a Government he called, then, the greatest Government British Columbia had ever had. Then, shortly after that, Mr. Speaker, he deserted that Government. Do you know why? Because he couldn't sit with any Government that was cruel enough to bring in a 3 per cent sales tax. That's why he crossed the Floor, plunging a knife into that Government. If they had made him a Cabinet Minister or Leader of the Conservative Party, when he tried for that, and failed, any of those things... But what happened, as the Member from Kootenay well knows. What was the first thing he did when he got to power, through the back door, preferential ballot? What was the first thing he did? Why, he raised the sales tax from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. There's consistency for you. But, I'll tell you this, Madam Minister without Portfolio, you are going to find consistency in this Party right down the line.

Now the second of our policies for providing jobs is a provision of a Centennial fund of \$50 million for municipal projects all over the Province. This is so that every community in B.C. can have a celebration worthy of the name and get on with important projects in their own local area, that have been long delayed.

Then, lastly, is an Industrial Development Budget of \$20 million, Mr. Minister of Industrial Development. His brow furrows in wonder. The figures make his head spin. He's literally staggered at the thought of an industrial development programme. I understand that. It's more complicated than being the Premier's partner in a bridge game. But we wouldn't have you as a Minister in our Government, so you can breathe a sigh of relief. What this Budget is for is a construction of a Science City, the provision of incentives for new secondary industry in all areas of the Province, and I can't emphasize too strongly, Mr. Speaker, how important it is when other Provinces in Canada are offering these industrial incentives, how important it is for us to match them or do better. Because if we fail to do that, can you blame these industries for establishing their future plants in Ontario or some other Province that offers the incentives that we are not prepared to equal? Those are the highlights and I'd like to move, Mr. Speaker, to a transportation policy for the second century (*interruption*).

Give me time. It's early in the Session and you know how the Speaker feels about giving notice of motion. You know, this motion that we are debating is that the Speaker do now leave the Chair. I've never made that motion that he leave the Chair. It has always been your side. We've always voted that he stay in the Chair but, after Friday, I'm in a bit of dilemma. I'm going to have to hold my feelings back a little, I think, when the time for the vote comes.

As the urban Members from the other side, and if the Member from Skeena will excuse me for a few minutes while I talk about urban problems, I do want to say this. That, really, one of the greatest tests of Government competency in this modern age is developing adequate transportation systems. I don't want to take a thing away from the Social Credit Government during the years of its prime — that was a long time ago, but we should remember because, during the time when what was needed in British Columbia was a transportation policy of moving people quickly and easily from the far-flung communities of the Province — that was one that Social Credit understood.

The great highway systems were built, some say designed by a former Coalition Government, but I wouldn't be able to testify to that. I can only say that these great highway systems, which abandoned the old principle that

linked up communities, and moved traffic across the Province, the ferry policies that linked the mainland with Vancouver Island, these were great policies. We use the past tense because the programme petered out and, really, what we're into now is just kind of a mopping-up operation. We're just getting the very last bits finished, like Highway 16. Some areas, you know, such as the Pemberton-Lillooet Road, they haven't got to that yet, but we are gradually mopping up with dibs and dabs the last of that policy.

There is a place, Mr. Speaker, where the Social Credit transportation policy has come unstuck. That's when this kind of baffled, rural Government had to deal with the modern transportation problems of urban communities. These are the ones that have to be dealt with if we are not going to have the rancid odour of stagnation over our great metropolitan areas. The transportation policy for our urban areas should hinge on three great developments. One, the completion of an adequate crossing to the North Shore. Two, the commencement of a rapid transit system and, three, the installation of a one-hour ferry crossing to Vancouver Island.

Now, so far, there has been a negative response to the third crossing plan from many quarters. The Mayor and City Council of Vancouver deserve the dressing down of their lives for their negative do-nothing attitude towards commencing this vitally important project for downtown Vancouver. Our Provincial Government became a dropout in this whole thing sometime ago, but I've got a proposal to drop the Provincial Government in again.

Before coming to that, I want to say that this third crossing would have already been completed had the Premier not greedily gobbled up the Lions Gate Bridge in order to subsidize the money-losing bridges in Kelowna, Nelson and Agassiz. When it became politically expedient to remove the tolls on those rural bridges, the obvious source of funds for this new crossing was cut off. I'll say this — the tolls were taken off — the Agassiz-Rosedale Bridge hardly collected enough tolls to pay the wages of the toll-taker. I'll say this, that Mayor Rathie, who was far more imaginative than our present incumbent, warned the Provincial Government of the dangers of removing the tolls on the Lions Gate Bridge and said it would stall completion of a new crossing. That has happened. It held us back for a decade, but this is all past history.

The problem today is that populations are expanding ominously and so much buck-passing is going on between the responsible officials of the various levels of Government, that the problem isn't being met. I want to use some of the Premier's own words. They have usually been applied to projects that are more to his liking. What he said is, "They will never be cheaper than today." This applies to that third crossing. I just want to apply this particular one because the Federal Government has been persuaded to take on the bulk of the financing.

We desperately need jobs. The crossing is desperately needed. It's going to be more desperately needed by the time it's completed. So let's get on with the job without delay. We've been invited to express opinions on whether we would

[[Page 277](#)]

prefer a bridge or a tunnel. I want to express mine, and I know I am going counter to the generally accepted choice. I say that we should build a bridge rather than a tunnel. It's a personal opinion. I said I knew it was going counter to opinion. Let me explain why. I know your opinion is that we shouldn't built it at all. Right? Well, the Members from Vancouver Centre want to build it, so we are together, anyway, on that. The NDP don't want to build it. "Why build it?" say the NDP. Well, we know where we stand. But the idea of a bridge, as the Minister of Public Works knows, is to display a structure. It's audacious. You put it out there in front where you can see it. The idea of a tunnel is that you hide something. You pretend it isn't there. A tunnel is a policy of concealment. A bridge is a policy of display. You know, I think industrial sloppiness has really destroyed our conviction that the works of man can be beautiful and attractive. We have had so much, and, perhaps, all the dams that have been created around British Columbia with the debris behind them and the pulp mills and so on, have made us doubly sensitive in British Columbia. Still, in all, there are works of man that are beautiful and attractive. The soaring bridges that span some of the world's greatest harbours are architectural masterpieces. They stand the test of time, as do the great works of the master painters and the master sculptors. The model of the proposed new bridge, to me, is breathtaking. I'd like to see that bridge as a stunning new centre piece to our harbour. "Never cheaper than today," my friend in the NDP. The problem of the NDP is that it has this preoccupation with welfare and not with projects. I'm going to come to how we finance it, because it is very simple. When we get to financial things, the Member even puts the hearing-aid on, so we are going

to come to that. It really isn't difficult.

I want to give a contrast, Mr. Speaker, between bridges and tunnels. I don't know how many of you have visited New York. There are two absolutely breathtaking bridges that span the mouth of the Hudson River. One is the George Washington Bridge at one end of Manhattan, and the other is the Verrazano Narrows Bridge that runs at the other and actually goes across to Brooklyn. These two bridges are breathtaking architectural pieces. In between, we have the Holland Tunnel and the Lincoln Tunnel (*interruption*). We are not talking about the Brooklyn Bridge. The Verrazano Bridge is one of the largest bridges in the world. If any of you have not driven across that bridge, it's worth the toll, if you are ever in that area. The view is breathtaking. That bridge doesn't detract from the magnificence of the Manhattan skyline, it adds to it. It's a backdrop, the work of man enhancing the backdrop of nature. The Golden Gate Bridge, I think is, another. Although I've never seen it, the Sydney Harbour Bridge is supposed to be another. Who would say, today, that the Lions Gate Bridge detracted from the beauty of the harbour or the beauty of Stanley Park?

I can remember, as a little boy, when that bridge was first being put up, the vigorous opposition to it and I remember how my own uncle, who was then Mayor of Vancouver, was castigated for his support of this project. People said it was foolish, it would ruin the harbour, it would be ugly, all those things were said about that bridge. Yet, it's one of the architectural showpieces of British Columbia (*interruption*). Oh, that's dreadful, abysmally ugly. I quite agree. I think that these monstrosities have taken away our courage to create great architectural structures. But this new bridge, and I've seen the plans and models, to me, it's exciting, and I'd like to see it displayed (*interruption*).

Let me tell you why. The Member from Burnaby-Edmonds hasn't read the report. I'm going to lend him a copy afterwards with the suggestion that, having studied it, he make a presentation to the NDP Caucus. If he can't do that, I'd be happy to come down and do it for you, so that you would see that this is a necessity. Not just a toy. I'll say this, that not only will that bridge be beautiful, but the distributor that comes across and hugs the escarpment of the Vancouver skyline is going to provide a platform for that dismal cliff that sits above our seedy waterfront. At least, it will add a little bit of class to that dead north end of the city.

Now for the NDP. What's the benefit to the city of Vancouver, or is that of any consequence at all? The consultants and the planners pointed out, in exhaustive detail, what the population growth would be, how the choking of the downtown streets was already due to the lack of a proper crossing and distributor system, that this would remove something like 70,000 cars a day from the downtown streets and would provide immediate release. I want to say that the Provincial Government, with its project of widening the Upper Levels Highway, with the new park at Cypress Bowl, with the expansion to the ferry service, with the new highway up to Lillooet through Pemberton, we hope, all these things are going to put added pressure, too, on the crowded downtown area of Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, for the Members from Vancouver Centre, the downtown area has become the neck of a bottle and, as that bottle grows and the neck remains the same size, the pressure is going to become unbearable. To the west, water, to the north, inadequate crossings. All we have is, to the south and to the east, uncontrolled sprawl. If we are to preserve the agricultural zoning, which the Member from Delta advocated that we do, we have to have some place to take people other than into the urban sprawl in the Delta area. You can't use those North Shore slopes, you know, for agricultural land (*interruption*). That was in our programme, too. All right, what I say is this, that without any further delay, the city of Vancouver, the Mayor and the City Council, should commit their \$12 million share for the first stage approaches. To do anything else would amount to gross irresponsibility on the part of Mayor Campbell and the City Council. Those are my words to the city of Vancouver. Twelve million dollars is a bargain to unclog the city streets and we've got to have a city council that will wake up and realize that.

The Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, the consultants' report calls for Provincial share of \$40.7 million. The Act of the Provincial Government provided \$27 million, but, what I suggest to provide that money is to do with that bridge fund the same as was done with the Columbia River Treaty money, namely, the advance payment collects compound interest. The Columbia River Bridges could have never been built had that \$273 million not been invested at compound interest. Honourable Members, who were here at the time, will recall that a car stood by so that when that cheque passed hands it would be sped to the bank within the hour so the interest could be collected. Now, all we

suggest is that the same rules apply to this \$27 million that were invested for a third crossing of Burrard Inlet. What's sauce for the goose, should be sauce for the gander and, if 8 per cent interest was paid and compounded on that money, the following schedule of funds would apply; 1969, 29.2 million; 1970, 31.5 million; 1971, 34 million; 1972, 36.8 million; 1973, and this is the year when the funds would be required, 40 million. In 1974, 43 million. I'm only taking the rate that you invest for

[[Page 278](#)]

Canada Pension Plan money. I think that's fair. It is the lowest interest rate but, still, in all, it's the market. All this says is that the Provincial Government's \$27 million should have been protected against the inflation that's taking place, with the huge wage increases that the Minister of Labour has helped negotiate, that we should protect against the erosion of that dollar value. After all, that was the principle behind the Columbia River Treaty and those dams couldn't have been built if that advance payment from the U.S. had been \$273 million and no interest. So this third crossing can't be built unless this advance payment of \$27 million carries the interest it appropriately should (*interruption*). Their \$1.2 million, they haven't put it up. They are carrying the whole financing. What more do you want? I say this, Mr. Speaker, if we delay, through ineptitude on the part of either the Provincial Government or any of those municipal governments, we face two things. First of all, much higher construction costs at some future time and, secondly, the ugly possibility that the Federal Government will lose its interest and wash its hands of the whole project. I just say, Mr. Speaker, we should strike while the iron is hot. And that requires...(*interruption*). If you had been listening, Mrs. Minister without Portfolio, you would have heard a description of how the Provincial Government funds requested, \$42 million in the consultants' report, could easily be provided by the \$27 million if the simple and obvious thing were done, namely, to supply compound interest from that original investment (*interruption*).

Well, that is what the report said. I'm not trying to invent a new finance formula. All I'm saying is that if everybody gets off their behinds and carries out their share of the job we can let this contract next month. Look, the plans are ready. Jobs are needed. You'll never get a better price than now, if you try to get a contract with the present conditions in the construction industry. Wake up, political leaders in British Columbia, get a job done. I say that to you because you have a responsibility, just like the city of Vancouver and the North Shore municipality have.

I want to say something about the next step. And that is the transit system, because here the demands are a little more leisurely. If you look at the consultants' report, which came out this past year, you will see that the cash draw-down is considerably less and, by the time the bridge is completed, providing it goes ahead now, the emphasis could be shifted for the following ten years on to development of rapid transit facilities. The report made it clear that, in the early stages, what should be done is merely to acquire property. The building of the rapid transit system in downtown Vancouver could be nicely phased with the approach system of the First Narrows crossing, because that approach system requires a tunnel underneath Thurlow Street and, by the time that was completed, we could then shift the tunnel work to commencement on the subway system for rapid transit. Then the north-south corridor of this rapid transit system, which will go to Richmond, Delta and Sea Island along the current B.C. Hydro track, can go to the airport to connect up with the new one-hour ferry crossing from Iona Island, just beyond the airport, to Gabriola Island.

You see, we don't really have three separate projects. We have a continuing phase of one transportation policy and, by getting on with this total job, one can phase the construction beautifully to even out the number of people who will be employed and the cash draw-down that will be required by Government. I only say that a Liberal Government would immediately embark on this second-century transportation programme. The tenders would be called by spring and, again, one could expect a very favourable contract for construction work at the present time. But, best of all, we could provide a steady and phased development of employment to give rather steady jobs in a notoriously cyclical industry.

I'd like to carry this forward to Vancouver Island because people in the Victoria metropolitan area might think all of this is something apart from their immediate interests. This isn't so because the Victoria area should be tied in with this, too. I recently made in Vancouver a speech concerning rapid transit and my subject was "How Rapid

Transit Would Affect the Lower Mainland." I talked about the terminals at Horseshoe Bay and Departure Bay and the need to shift them to Iona Island.

Let's start on Vancouver Island with where that new ferry terminal, the one-hour crossing with reduced rates would leave off. Now, first of all, to complete the link to the mainland, you'd have to build a bridge from Gabriola to Vancouver Island proper, which would carry a motor expressway and a rapid transit line for both passengers and containerized light freight. That would run just a short distance to reach a transit interchange. This would be the master transportation complex serving as a core for all the Island's transportation needs. It would be located near Nanaimo, probably in the Cedar or Cassidy areas. It would consist of a bus terminal, a rail terminal, freight distribution centre, and an airport. The airport should be planned and be capable of expansion into a major air terminal at some future date. From that master interchange would run a thoroughly revamped rail network for both passengers and freight, providing rapid service to all major Island communities on a frequent service basis. That would take us down past Duncan, with a stop and, then, from there on to Victoria. I want to say, for the Member from Cowichan-Malahat, that this would put the Vancouver Island transportation network on a solid footing. The Island communities would be brought closer together, in a time sense, if not a political sense. Time, not distance, is the over-riding determinant of economic patterns in this new jet age. The key to it all is the recovery of the use of the E & N right-of-way, either outright or under a use agreement. E & N years ago ceased to deserve the vast lands on the Island, which they were given in exchange for providing rail passenger service on the Island. The Canadian Pacific Railway pioneered its passenger service with trenchment procedures on Vancouver Island almost 25 years ago. It is what we are seeing, Nationally, today and the CPR has been in reverse on Vancouver Island ever since. The equipment became old and the service was bad and, as a consequence, the passenger use declined. As passengers stayed away, service was reduced leaving still less reason for the public to travel by rail. Today, the E & N stands as a modern mobile monument to negative salesmanship and narrow-gauge thinking — "Toonerville" trolley in the jet age.

The facts of Island transportation are such that either a freeway must be built from Victoria to Courtenay or alternative needs found to move people and goods. I favour the alternative reason (*interruption*). Because your highway isn't finished. You have to deliver on your promises first. An I can say is that that Member, if he ever gets more authority than he has today, with all his broken promises for highways and everything else, is going to be the death of the Party.

If we recapture the use of the E & N right-of-way and build an integrated transportation system to serve the needs of the present and future, the charm of Vancouver Island can

[[Page 279](#)]

be maintained and there will be room left and opportunity to use motor-vehicles in the noncongested areas. There is, certainly, noncongestion of automobile traffic in the riding of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We can evolve a high-speed rail service connecting all transportation facilities on the Island, with only a few extensions required. The first one, of course, is to Gabriola Island, the second into the harbour and downtown area of Victoria. Ironically, this is where the E & N terminal used to be. The third would be to Pat Bay and Swartz Bay. Now, what you would have on Vancouver Island is a single system connecting bus, rail, air and ferry terminal, speeding up the movement of people, and making more readily accessible to them the transportation facilities of the world. It would bring to an end the ridiculous situation of inconveniencing Islanders, something that has become an increasing irritant for them in the recent years. You know, Mr. Member from Cowichan-Malahat, it's almost as fast to go from Vancouver to Toronto, as from Vancouver to Duncan but, if we were to equalize the time, I'm certain that Vancouverites would prefer to go to Duncan.

To make this all happen, with this second-century transportation policy, we are going to have to recover the E & N right-of-way. I think a use agreement might be reached but I would be prepared to recommend expropriation, if necessary. Under expropriation laws, we won't trample on any little people. The reason I would be willing to go to that length is quite simple. I don't agree with unending subsidies to private companies. If the E & N system couldn't be operated profitably by the CPR for the past two decades, they aren't suddenly going to operate it at a profit. I think we have had ample evidence of the attitude of the CPR at those transportation hearings last fall. What we'd be

doing is relieving them of a losing proposition and I'm sure they would welcome that step. We must face the fact that, while the evolution of an integrated and rationalized transportation complex serving the Island and lower mainland has to be a matter of high priority, we can't kid ourselves that the system is going to pay for itself at the start. It won't. But we've got to be prepared to subsidize the system. After all, Mr. Speaker, we subsidize the PGE, we subsidize the CPR, we subsidize the CNR and we subsidized the B.C. Hydro system. Well, if we subsidize the transport of coal, if we subsidize the transport of cattle and lumber on the PGE, and we do, I think we ought to be able to manage equal treatment for people. If we can subsidize coal and cattle, surely, we can subsidize the movement of people.

If only one or two parts of the Province have reasonable transportation, then, only those one or two centres will grow adequately. Communication and transportation are nearly as important today as the presence of resources in terms of industrial and commercial growth. Would the Member from Yale-Lillooet deny that? He knows what Merritt and Lillooet and some of these communities are that are left out of the transportation scheme. They have done well at Cowichan Lake, I suppose, despite the transportation system, but now the new road is going to be completed it's just going to take off that area. They are going to put in a new satellite station. It is going to become a scientific centre up there (*interruption*). It's a transportation wasteland, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and it's been your policies, you know, that should have been providing the transportation system. It's fine travelling over to Vancouver on the ferry and it's an efficient ferry system when it's navigating correctly through Active Pass. That isn't going to do, forever, into the future.

I'll say this, you can't win the freeway race. Sooner or later, alternatives have to be developed and that's part of the second-century transportation policy.

Now, there are a lot of features of this third Liberal Budget that I don't want to go into in detail but I do want to press on with some of the highlights. I notice the Minister of Agriculture is in his seat and the third Liberal Budget proposes that the spending be \$10,914,000, one million greater than the Social Credit Budget. This additional money is for the commencement of the agricultural research programme which is problem-oriented and industry-oriented. Isn't this what was called for by the Provincial Government in its brief to Ottawa last September? Isn't this what the Minister of Agriculture asked for to be provided by someone else, of course, in the Throne Speech that he gave to this Assembly? Well, here it is. We'll give you the million dollars. Let's get the research programme in agriculture going. After all, you know, you didn't have much difficulty setting up a \$5 million fund a few years ago and there's adequate money if we follow the procedures that I have been advocating to be able to provide for agricultural research.

The Attorney-General's estimates, Mr. Speaker, in our Liberal Budget, give the Attorney-General \$3 million more. Mr. Attorney-General, once more, this money is for three purposes. One, an ombudsman; two, a system of legal aid; and three, the establishment of a victims' indemnity fund for violent crimes. There it is in your Budget, Mr. Attorney-General, and if you had a more forward-looking Minister of Finance, you'd be able to do your job better.

You are talking to the Minister of Commercial Transport and I'm Sorry to have to tell him that once more we've provided a zero budget for that department because we think it should be eliminated and the weighing scales put in with the Department of Highways.

The Education Budget, I see the Minister of Education is there. We've given you \$40 million more, as last year, but the purpose, and I want to make this very clear, is so that you'll build some facilities. I put forward a little prediction for the coming year. I said that you wouldn't be receiving any honorary degrees from any educational institutions this year. I know that the former Minister of Education did and the Minister of Finance did but, I think, until you get on with building some of these badly needed facilities, you are not going to get any of these honorary degrees.

I called for a \$30 million increase in the budget for the Minister of Health and I know that he would want to spend this extra money, first, in providing a hospital at Clearwater. He and the Member from that area, I know, have been having discussions and, even today, they were talking about the advisability of getting that hospital started at Clearwater, even today. So, Mr. Minister, our Budget provides the money for it. Secondly, it provides money to

commence the University of British Columbia Teaching and Research Hospital. The Ministers without Portfolio should know that the Budget contains money to commence a child psychiatry unit at the University, a proposed Centennial project. The Member from Alberni will be pleased, as will the Member from Oak Bay, that it also makes generous provisions for expansion in medical research.

The Industrial Development Budget, Mr. Minister, we are going to press even harder this year by saying that the Budget should be \$23,235,000. The money to be used, again, for the establishment of an economic council, the commencement of a Science City on the University endowment lands and, most importantly, an incentive fund for secondary industry to be

[[Page 280](#)]

developed in the Province. Mr. Minister, I can't encourage you too strongly to get on with some of these programmes in the limited time that you have left in that Portfolio.

I want to go on to highways for a moment. I don't need to remind honourable Members of all the thorns that are in our sides, due to inadequate highways. The Member from Cariboo, well, almost all Members in this House, stand up with a gripe about highways. The Highway Budget is inadequate. We proposed, last year, \$20 million more than is being provided this year and, when unemployment levels have reached such staggering proportions in the Province, no more appropriate thing could be done than to get on with all the highway building that's been delayed. We need to provide some blacktop. You are getting bald over there.

We've left expenditures in Labour, and Lands and Forests, Mines and Resources, and the Provincial Secretary's Department all unchanged from the Social Credit Budget. We are satisfied that you've all been treated well.

What we have done, Mr. Speaker, is eliminate Public Works again this year. We've got a zero Budget there because our policy is to eliminate anachronisms. "What's that?" says the Member from Dewdney. You know, I think, if you'd had that blind date with the monkey in Ceylon, the orang-outang, the monkey would have said, "To heck with the Darwin theory. They are not going to make a man out of me." But we propose that Public Works be combined with Municipal Affairs and that the Budget be increased to \$90,204,000. That's a double job for the Minister of Municipal Affairs but he likes work. Next to talking, he likes work.

Now, I'm sorry to have to say this, Mr. Speaker, but the proposed Liberal Budget eliminates the Ministers without Portfolio. Now I proposed this a year ago and I have noted the progress of the Ministers without Portfolio in the ensuing year with great interest. In light of their accomplishments during this past year, I am convinced of the soundness of the decision to eliminate those Portfolios a year ago. The money has been transferred to a new Department of Auditor-General, with a provision of \$50,000.

The new Department of Environmental Control, of course, will have a \$10 million budget. We are going to get busy cleaning up the mess that's been left around.

The Department of Recreation and Conservation we've provided an extra million again this year, Mr. Minister, for a second try to get started on making Cypress Bowl into a proper Provincial Park. It's a start. I apologize. We've done badly by you, and we should provide more (*interruption*). Three and one half million, all right. At least we can make a start and I think if you were willing to get back some of the money the Minister of Lands and Forests got from all that beautiful stand of timber that was taken out and stumpage paid to the Provincial Government, as well as an allowance for the road which has written off expenses against that company that ducked out from British Columbia, maybe you wouldn't need more than a million from your Parks and Recreation Budget.

But we have reduced one other department, Mr. Speaker, and this is important, and it's the only one we have really reduced substantially. That's the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation. We have provided \$30 million less in this Portfolio because we are convinced that the progressive programmes of Provincial development that we have put forward will provide jobs for the people of British Columbia and will eliminate the waste and tragedy that is the consequence of bad Social Credit Budgets and bad Social Credit policies. The welfare savings will

be reflected, also, in savings to cities and municipalities, which will have less of a burden to bear. Our total budget is \$1,400 million — \$100 million greater than that proposed by Social Credit. It, nevertheless, will be completely balanced and without any increase in taxes. Now, as honourable Members will see a year from now, unless disasters and stupid policies are pursued by the Provincial Government for a second straight year, this Budget will easily be balanced without the additional revenues provided for by the cigarette tax, the motel tax and the gasoline tax. I'm not against the cigarette tax. I am merely saying that this Budget, \$100 million greater than that proposed by the Premier, can be balanced even without these taxes.

I'm going to create one additional fund from tax surplus, and that's a Centennial municipal fund and this would be drawn on by the cities and municipalities for public works throughout the Province during Centennial Year. It would be a way of using the tax surplus to stimulate works projects around the Province. Unemployment is high and, if full employment were reached, then a cut-off would be applied on these funds so that public works projects would not compete for the available labour supply as was the case during the mid- and late 1960's.

Now I want to talk, Mr. Speaker, about Crown corporations, boards, commissions and agencies. Honourable Members will note that, in my Budget Speech this year, as in previous years, I've made no provisions for perpetual funds. The perpetual funds have got to be recognized for what they are, not devices for helping out people who are in need, but devices for hiding surpluses for the benefit of Crown corporations.

I want you to consider the latest proposal in the Budget Address of the Premier and this is to provide a \$25 million fund for education against the abuses of alcohol, drugs and tobacco. I want to say this — is the formation of this fund so valuable that it necessitates the tax increases that were introduced in this Budget? The income from the proposed motel room tax will be about \$2.5 million a year. The income from the gasoline tax increase will be about \$14 million a year. These taxes, in a year, will not provide the income necessary to establish this ridiculous fund. Are these tax increases justified in order to create such a fund? I say, "No," and I say that the creation of these funds is ridiculous. If you want to give something for alcohol, give it out of estimates. Don't take \$25 million and then have a tax increase to provide it. That's stupid.

Well, I've provided data to the honourable Members which demonstrates clearly that the main purpose of these funds is to provide quick cash for the B.C. Hydro, as well as the PGE. I've got a table here showing that the trust accounts are choked with B.C. Hydro bonds. As of a year ago, the trust accounts totalled \$1,508 million of which \$915 million was in B.C. Hydro bonds alone. Our proposal, now, as it has been in the past, is that if the Crown corporations are as valuable as the Premier states they are on the floor of the House each year, then those Crown corporations should compete for development funds on the open market.

I note that the B.C. Telephone Company has prepared a pretty comprehensive prospectus. It's a thoroughly documented case asking for an increase. Look what we got last year. We didn't get a book thoroughly documenting the financial position of the B.C. Hydro. We got this insult here: a three-page letter from Chairman Shrum. I'm in favour of this kind of a financial presentation so that people can study it and realize what the true financial picture of a Crown

[[Page 281](#)]

corporation or a monopoly is. The telephone company is going to have to compete for its development funds on the open market to increase the telephone service to British Columbia. Had the B.C. Hydro been a public corporation, instead of a Crown corporation, it would have done the same and we wouldn't have this albatross around our necks.

I'm not going to dwell on the holdings of the pension funds now. I'll do that, later. But I want to say that teachers and other owners of these pension funds have become restless, as well as everyone else, over the voracious way in which the B.C. Hydro has gobbled up these funds. I want to read from the December 30 issue of the *Vancouver Province*. It says, "B.C. Issues New Bonds." This puts the finger on the real problems in British Columbia. "The Provincial Cabinet on Tuesday announced it has approved the issue and sale of a total of \$30 million in bonds of B.C. Hydro Power Authority and the PGE. The Cabinet approved the bonds, which will bear interest of 7.54 per cent. Denominations will be in 1,000, 5,000, 25,000 and 100,000. Bond dealers in Vancouver, Tuesday, said they had not been offered any of the bonds, and assumed they had been purchased by Government accounts, such as

pension funds and the workmens' compensation fund." That's true. Now listen to the next quote: "'With a 7.5 per cent yield they wouldn't be attractive to the market,' said a dealer." The issue is apparently taken care of by internal juggling. It's the internal juggling which is the financial curse of this Province. This is where the tax surpluses go. This is where the pension funds go. This is why there isn't an adequate pension for the teachers of the Province and all the others who depend on the income from these bonds, because they are below the market. This is why there isn't enough money for schools and hospitals, and highways, or any other projects except the Crown corporations. Because all the money that is available from Government sources gets taken up by the Crown corporations. The Crown corporations don't go out for money on to the open market, because they won't compete for open market funds. Pension funds must be in Government guaranteed bonds, like hospitals, like schools, like municipal bonds, like they used to be in British Columbia, Mr. Member, like they used to be when we had enough money for some development around this Province, besides the Crown corporations. Had the B.C. Hydro been in the position that the B.C. Telephone is, we wouldn't have to debate this kind of thing in the Legislature because it would be private savings that would be going into these corporations at market rate. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that now get gobbled up by those corporations would be available for the kind of budgets that I'm presenting to the House today. We could have industrial development, municipal winter works, parks and recreation facilities, schools, hospitals, all these other things we are starving for in British Columbia, if we could get these Crown corporations off our backs. What deserves discussion in this debate is the whole shadowy world of financing of these Crown corporations, the Crown boards and the Crown agencies. Financial dealings are always shadowy when there is no system of accountability built into them. Inevitably, when this occurs when a shaft of light comes down, it reveals ugly sights. Public corporations have to have annual meetings, where the chairman and the board of directors present themselves to answer questions to individual shareholders about their policies and their finances. A public corporation which didn't do this would be put out of business. Who ever heard of a public meeting of the B.C. Hydro? Who ever heard of the chairman and board of directors being questioned by the shareholders, who are the people? Who ever heard of the Liquor Control Board of B.C. holding a public meeting, where the shareholders, that is the people, question the statements and policies of that board? There is no accountability in these Crown agencies at all, except to the Cabinet, which keeps its own dealings secret. I say accountability to the Cabinet isn't true accountability. The Cabinet is chosen, not elected. The Government formed after an election is not formed on the basis of performance of individual Crown agencies or boards. The outstanding performance of one agency might offset the scandals of another. As all Members know, an election is a stew of issues and individual mismanagement of an isolated border agency might not contaminate the pot sufficiently to lead to the defeat of a Government. The only way each board or agency can be properly accountable is through regular and sustained public questioning of its practices. The only way this can be done, at the present time, is through the Public Accounts Committee of this House.

Unfortunately, the Public Accounts Committee has become, under Social Credit, a Private Accounts Committee. The philosophy is not to look into the accounts of the Province, but to hide them. The purpose is not to uncover wrongdoing if it exists, but to find ways of hiding it. It's not for the purpose of accountability, it is for the purpose of preventing accountability. The Comptroller-General of the Province is a civil servant who must operate under orders of the Cabinet. Disobedience to these orders could result in his dismissal. It's bad enough having a Public Accounts Committee as the only watchdog over such a potentially dangerous situation, but to have a Public Accounts Committee that is as completely emasculated, as is our present Public Accounts Committee in British Columbia, is, in itself, a scandal of major proportions.

I have stated before and I state it again, the appointment of an Auditor-General to British Columbia is essential. The failure to appoint such an Auditor-General is evidence itself that the Government, after all these years of secrecy does not wish to be exposed. It is too comfortable a boat as it is, today, and one that's too creaky to stand the kind of rocking that would occur if its nature were to be exposed.

Last year, the Social Credit majority of this Legislature and the Social Credit Members of the Public Accounts Committee saw to it that I was unable to examine the accounts of the B.C. Hydro and the Liquor Control Board. I was unable to call the responsible officials from these organizations before the Committee to explain their policies. But the necessity for doing this should, by now, be obvious to the public if not to the Members of the Legislature.

Let me start with the Liquor Control Board. The report of the British Columbia Liquor Enquiry Commission under Judge Morrow fairly bristles with evidence demanding an investigation of its financial practices. Page 80 makes the fairly innocent-sounding recommendation, "that shelf space in liquor control board stores bears some reasonable relationship to volume of sales". Let me translate that for you. If you play ball with the Government and if you are a good friend, then your liquor gets pushed by unwarranted shelf space, regardless of the quality of that liquor and the public demand for it. You may remember that the Liquor Commission asked the liquor company representatives if they were forced to contribute to Social Credit. They said no, they were not forced. But who needs to force a friend? The Commissioners thought it improper to ask how friendly they

[[Page 282](#)]

really were. On page 37, the Commission adds another recommendation, "that the fixed price of beer be considered the ceiling price in order that the law of supply and demand may take effect." Let me translate that for you. That says that the Commission made it clear enough that price fixing in beer sales takes place. Uncle Ben Ginter blew the whistle on the Liquor Control Board on that one, presumably, because he is now big enough to afford the consequences. And they have been extreme. The letter the Member from North Vancouver–Seymour read out to this Legislature last week testifies to that. The Liquor Control Board engages in price fixing. It engages in practices of rewarding its friends and punishing its enemies. It defies the laws of supply and demand and it thumbs its nose at the public and the Legislature, by sitting in the lap of the Social Credit Government. Not since 1947 has the Liquor Control Board been held accountable to the Public Accounts Committee of the Province. This is a soft nest of privilege, with all the evils that have grown up over the years. It's got to be exposed to public scrutiny and I will not rest until I am able to do that.

The world of B.C. Hydro is somewhat different. Aggressive policies laid down by the Provincial Cabinet have been pursued by management of that corporation with results that do not require detailed description. Some have been good, others have been disastrous. But what has been hidden from the public is the financial operation of the B.C. Hydro. The B.C. Hydro is the beneficiary of the Province's trust fund, something which does not come under discussion in the estimates. Yet, the amounts of money involved are absolutely staggering, almost a billion dollars of trust funds invested in the B.C. Hydro. The transit policies of that corporation have been a complete and utter failure. Management of the corporation, like the key Ministers in the Government, were absent during the critical days of the bus strike. The public was held in contempt both by Hydro and by the Government as the bus shut-down wore through the coldest days of winter. The Hydro claims it loses money on the bus system. Undoubtedly, it does. But if you were bargaining for the union, Mr. Speaker, would you be influenced by such claims? I don't think so. All that Hydro did to justify its electricity and bus rate increases a year ago, was to send that insulting slip of paper to the Legislature and to Premier Bennett. That was all that was needed to bring a rate increase and the Social Credit Members here prostrated themselves before that Crown corporation and accepted all of this, without question.

How would it be handled elsewhere? Look at this kind of documentation. It's standard for a utility company. Compare this with the kind of thing that the B.C. Hydro sends us — an insulting three-page letter.

AN HON. MEMBER: The telephone is not noted for low rates.

MR. McGEER: Well, nor is B.C. Hydro, with the highest electricity rates, almost, on the continent. We don't have any cheap hydro. Oh, yes. You compare the rates (*interruption*).

Well, it's very interesting that the Members of the Legislature are not aware of the comparative hydro rates in different major centres in North America. But we'll bring them in during the estimates of the Premier. We'll describe what these rates are, so that you will realize that we don't have the benefit of low electricity rates in British Columbia.

But my point, Mr. Speaker, is this. No wonder the union correctly concluded that it didn't matter whether the Hydro lost money or not on its bus operations. All it needs to do is have Chairman Shrum write this kind of a letter. That will get the increase. It worked before, a year ago. Why should they believe differently, now? This is the kind of arrogance on the part of management that leads to industrial disputes. I say this, that the day of accountability for

B.C. Hydro, the Crown corporations and all the boards and agencies must come and I do not intend to rest until that day arrives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I presented this Budget and the accompanying estimates for Provincial revenues in the coming fiscal year and I'm aware that the estimates that I have brought in for revenues haven't always been accurate (*interruption*). Yes. Well, in my forecast for revenue in 1968-69, I was \$21 million out. In fiscal 1969-70 I was \$49 million. Last year, I was \$16 million out. That's an average error of \$28.6 million. "What's a million," asks the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. McGEER: Well, I'd like to ask "What's a hundred million?" Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, who presented his Budget to us on Friday, made a \$102 million miscalculation for fiscal 1968-69, another \$155 million miscalculation for fiscal 1969-70, and it appears he has miscalculated by \$135 million for fiscal 1970-71. That's an error that averages over \$130 million per year. The present Finance Minister's estimates are worse than mine by an average of \$102 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, better forecasting permits better Budgets. Perhaps, that's why our Liberal Budgets have had so much more to offer in recent years. We Liberals, Mr. Speaker, are not thinking of the nineteen years of the past. We enter a new century in 1971. Our eyes are cast to that great future which lies ahead. The new vigour and new ideas which can come from returning a Liberal Government and implementing our dynamic and forward-looking policies will provide a launching pad for our second century. The important thing now, Mr. Speaker, is to close out our past century. We don't want to close it out just in terms of time, but in terms of the people who represent that century. That means giving Social Credit its long deserved rest and placing the hands of Government under the Liberals for this second century.

On the motion of the Honourable R.R. Loffmark, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The House proceeded to the Order, "Motions and Adjourned Debates on Motions."

Motion number 3 — That all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between the Government of the Province of British Columbia and the Honourable J. Marchand, representing the Government of Canada, relative to proposals for the application of regional disparity programmes for those areas known as Northern Vancouver Island and Northern British Columbia, be tabled with this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for North Peace River.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member from South Peace River, motion number 3 standing to my name on the Order Paper.

[[Page 283](#)]

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member may proceed.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion, I think that the point we want to make here is that the Federal Government has to take some responsibility for programmes which involve regional disparities not only in eastern Canada, but also in western Canada, particularly the Province of British Columbia.

I was very hopeful this past year that we had some Members of the Federal Government and, particularly, some of the Cabinet Ministers very interested in the problems of the growth areas of British Columbia. As a matter of fact, they did make a trip out and looked at the northern part of Vancouver Island and flew through the northern section of the Province of British Columbia to look at the growth areas, with Members from our own Provincial Cabinet. I thought that from that would come a determination on their part that they would participate in a programme, not because these growth areas are poor, but because these growth areas have the potential, Mr. Speaker, to provide the jobs that the Members of this Legislature like to talk about, but have not really come up with any ideas

on that side of the House as to where the jobs will be created. We have a potential in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, for a great many more jobs than we presently have. We have communities that are growing beyond all reason, in comparison with other areas of Canada. We have in those communities, as I have said before and I'm saying again this afternoon, the social problems of growth. They have to be financed and we have to encompass or put into practice and put into the areas of growth the type of social development that other areas have taken 20, 30 and 40 years to obtain. We have to do this in five or ten years. I'd like to say to the Members opposite, particularly the Members of the Liberal Party, that if they are, as their Leader suggested a while ago, interested in something that would create Jobs, they had better vote in favour of motion number 3 and let us table, in this House, the correspondence that has taken place between the Provincial Government and the Honourable Minister representing the Government of Canada, so we can see just where they do stand on the Federal basis on regional disparities, and what type of programmes they are prepared to introduce that will help these growth areas in the Province.

I have before me a list of grants which the Federal Government made and the list was used by the Honourable Member from Dewdney when he spoke on the floor of this House. While I don't intend to give the whole list, again, I do intend to give some of the figures because I think they bear reiterating.

If we can, in Canada, through the wisdom of the Federal Government, provide a Cape Breton development corporation with \$33 million, the National Harbour Board with \$14 million, the Atomic Energy Commission with \$411 million and go on down the list and find that, in recent years, a total of \$644 million has been provided to corporations, some of which provided jobs for people in British Columbia, but not many of which provided the type of development that I am talking about — the type that brings new people into new communities and the type that has to be financed...No one in these new development areas of British Columbia is asking for something for nothing. All they are asking is that the Government of Canada, which, incidentally, collected millions of dollars on the B.C. Hydro power project at Portage Mountain in income tax alone — I haven't got a current figure on it, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that two years ago the wages alone on that project were something in the neighbourhood of \$200 million all of which was taxable and some of which should have come back into those areas to help provide programmes for the people who live there...This is the thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am talking about in moving this motion. We do have a great capacity and if northern Vancouver Island and northern British Columbia are to become the job-baskets of this Province, then let's have a little cooperation from the Federal Government on a regional disparity basis to provide some of the development capital that's required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for South Peace River, who seconded the motion.

MR. D.A. MARSHALL (South Peace River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In seconding this motion, I would like to point out that, unknown to many people, the northern area of our Province was visited by Mr. Tom Kent, the Regional Co-ordinator for the Federal Department in Ottawa, and a study was made last fall giving the reasons for the area designation — north of the 52nd parallel in the northern part of our Province. Earlier this year, in the month of February, the Special Area Designation Act was not given any favourable consideration by the Federal Government, and, unknown to many people, there was a new Act, the Special Areas Incentive Act. Consequently, a survey was made in the northern half of our Province by Mr. Tom Kent, several of his representatives and also Members of our Cabinet.

Naturally, I am particularly concerned that we look at this Act through the broad concept of our Provincial concern. We have suggested that the most effective area would be the total area north of the 52nd parallel. All the necessary prerequisites, such as highways and growth figures and presentations, have been made to the committees, providing the proper planning, and we have not, to this date, been informed as to Mr. Marchand's decision in this committee. I think we must realize that to develop the north in the manner prescribed by the pioneers of this day is of far greater importance than it ever was before, and inasmuch as amenities are more demanding and there is no way that an instant town can be set up on the demanding basis that our society dictates, on a pay-as-you-go basis, I think that these services must be provided by our Federal Government.

I am, perhaps, a little prejudiced, but I think we can say, and say it justifiably, that the northern area of our Province offers more in resource development and this can probably give us the greatest rate of return and least outlay in this investment. Just quoting from the *Globe and Mail*, dated Friday, January 22, it states that: "Proctor and

Gamble of Canada Ltd. this week awarded the general contract for construction, starting in the spring, of an \$80 million pulp mill at Grande Prairie. Completion is scheduled for mid-1973. The company will receive an \$11.7 million incentive grant from the Federal Department of Regional Expansion, under terms of the agreement, and the company will import no more than 5 per cent of its operating work force." The reason they give for this, is that the designating of this area for Federal assistance is the need to provide off-farm employment in the Peace River region, which is at a competitive disadvantage relative to other farming areas in the rest of Canada. I would like to ask, in seconding this motion, why the Peace River, or the B.C. side of the Peace River block, cannot enjoy the same privileges?

[[Page 284](#)]

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

MR. D. BARRETT (Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, we intend to support this motion, but it comes, after hearing the speeches of the two Members, as a tacit admission that you have to ask for Ottawa's help to bail you out of the lack of planning in the northern part of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Fraser Lake, for example, where there is a major mine development, the Endako Mine. I visited that town. I made some enquiries about the planning by this Government. I found that in the housing developments, sponsored by the mine, they were making proposals to sell the houses to the workers. Very low down payment — \$250 down payment to get into the house. I toured the mine. I said, "How long are you planning to operate?" "Oh, we plan to operate 25 years at the Endako Mine." I said, "Do you have enough back up?" "Oh, yes, that was at our original proposed production rate of 10,000 tons per day. Now we are at 25,000 tons per day." I said, "Doesn't that cut down on your production time?" "Yes, we are looking for new ore bodies." "Have you found any yet?" "No."

It's a typical small boom town, based on resources that belong to the people of this Province, creamed by outside promoters, with a short-term life that has not been announced to the people in that town and will probably end up like other mining areas, where people... Ghost towns like Greenwood and other areas of this Province. Trail and Kimberley? They are not at all like Trail and Kimberley. There are secondary industries related to those primary resources.

I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it is a failure on the part of this Government, and an admission through the speeches of those Members, that they have not done the kind of planning for the north that has been necessary.

The Member talks very highly about Hudson Hope. You want something to happen. You had a huge dam built up there and you go into Hudson Hope now and that town is dying. Rows and rows of empty trailer spaces with weeds growing up between them. Nothing happening in that town after the first burst of expenditures on the dam was gone. Where is the planning? I say we need to plan the development of secondary industry in this Province, my friend, by this Government. You are asking Ottawa to bail you out of the mess that you have created. Mr. Speaker, if this Government would lay on the table its proposals for vast housing projects in cooperation with the Federal Government for the people of the north, if this Government would lay on the table the kind of legislation that Ontario has introduced that would require raw materials to have the application of secondary label before it leaves that Province, if you would do some planning of your own instead of crying to Ottawa about not doing anything, and then when you've got a problem say, "Please help us..." You are bankrupt in ideas, Mr. Speaker. We support this motion, but we hope this Government will come up with some plans of its own.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. D.R.J. CAMPBELL (Comox): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give an undertaking that the Government will certainly endeavour to get the approval of the Minister concerned, Mr. Marchand. I have sent him a wire requesting that all the documentation of the case on the part of British Columbia, involving quite a number of Government departments here will be laid on the table as far as the Government is concerned. But I can't help indicating to the House that it's not very helpful sometimes when there's been a very deliberate and well-thought through case made, to have the same thing happen in this Legislature as happened in the Federal House.

I speak, in particular, of the case that was being made at the time Federal officials came here to British Columbia to talk about the possibility of investments in the infrastructure of these newly developing towns, not only in the north end of Vancouver Island, but in the northern part of the Province. This Province made no case for special deals for multimillionaire corporations, which are quite capable, or should be, of making their own way in the financial markets of the world. That's not the case that was made by this Government. We are not interested, in British Columbia, in having special tax deals, special concessions, special hand-outs given to these multimillionaire corporations, who are quite capable of looking after themselves. What we are after was a case to be made for the proposition put by my friend from North Peace River, where, if you are in a developing area such as Mackenzie, or Gold River, or Endako, or Granduc, or any of those communities, you have an immediate call for capital investment in schools, in hospitals, in drainage, in water systems, in sewer systems, far beyond, as the Member said, those that could normally be expected a small community to bear. We were simply saying, on behalf of British Columbia, that that's the kind of treatment that we wanted in these grow the-potential areas.

What happened? In the Federal House, on the very day that the Members of this House were in the northern part of Vancouver Island and in northern British Columbia, we had MP's from British Columbia getting up decrying the proposition on the basis that British Columbia wanted some kind of special hand-outs, that the northern end of Vancouver Island was loosely being called a depressed area. Nothing could be further from the truth. That was not the basis for the case at all. I said, at the time, that the NDP Member for Comox-Alberni should have his head examined for making that pitch when the case was being made here, home in British Columbia. Instead of standing up for once in the House, did one Federal MP, during the course of these discussions here in British Columbia, whether he was an NDP MP or a Liberal MP, did one of them stand in their place in Ottawa talking in favour of this proposition? Not one, not one. So, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very pleased to lay on the table the information that was given to this Federal Minister, who treats one part of Canada differently from what he treats this part.

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

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I listened to the mover and the seconder and the other Members who have taken their place in this debate, I had to reread the motion. As I read it several times before, I thought it was a request that we have documents but, obviously, we are having a debate on the matter of industrial development incentives throughout the Province. We'll support this motion, unhesitatingly. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this motion, unanimously, by this House, will usher in a new era of willingness on the part of the Government of the Province of British Columbia

[[Page 285](#)]

to disclose correspondence on many other matters, with the Federal Government and other Governments. Because it is to be a new era of complete disclosure, we, unhesitatingly, support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce.

HON. W.M. SKILLINGS (Victoria): Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to corroborate what my colleague has said. It goes back, and they say to June 9, 1970, when our unemployed started to go beyond the normal limits. I wired Mr. Marchand...*(interruption)*. Just a moment. I'm just going to explain. I'll only take two minutes, if you'll keep quiet. We listened to you for two hours and a quarter *(interruption)*.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. SKILLINGS: Never mind. I'm not discussing it. I say the unemployment became intolerable in British Columbia. At the last Federal-Provincial Conference on September 8, 9 and 10, our Premier approached Mr. Marchand if he would come out himself and look over the situation because of the very large influx of all types from all of Canada flocking to British Columbia. Mr. Marchand had lunch with the Premier and myself and said that he couldn't come himself but would send a task force, headed by Mr. Tom Kent, Mr. Aqualina and some senior officials.

I may say that I have my correspondence here, all ready to present to the House but I think, in courtesy to the Federal Minister, it would only be courteous for us to wait for him to give his permission to table them. But I intend

to table them all.

The task force came out here on October 6 and, along with my colleagues, the Honourable Ray Williston and the Honourable Dan Campbell, we made the trip by aeroplane as I outlined to you, to the north end of Vancouver Island to Prince Rupert to Prince George and Fort Nelson. We showed them, on the ground, the tremendous development in British Columbia. We only asked, because of the new incentive programme, that British Columbia be given their fair share. That's all. As my colleague, the Minister without Portfolio outlined, about \$200 million is under consideration at the present time — not one dollar for British Columbia (*interruption*). East Kootenay. I'm talking about very, very large projects. There wouldn't be \$100,000 in East Kootenay. I'm talking about — under this specific Act, under this Act, and I can get corroboration from my colleague, as well. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to have a unanimous vote on this special area (*interruption*). You don't even know the correct phraseology or you wouldn't be talking. I ask for unanimity (*interruption*). Just don't argue with me, please. On Wednesday, when I speak, I'll give you some more facts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burnaby-Edmonds.

MR. G.H. DOWDING (Burnaby-Edmonds): Mr. Speaker, what this resolution calls for are pieces of paper, when the people want incentive programmes in British Columbia. Look at the resolution. Mr. Speaker, you can see that it merely wants the Minister to file correspondence, telegrams, and documents. What's he trying to prove — a case? The fact of the matter is this Legislature should be urging the Federal Government to take a new look at the problem of growth areas in British Columbia. A little imagination, a little action from the Member who proposed the resolution and it would be of more suitable wording than what we have. Why, instead, aren't we urging the Federal Government to consider these areas for growth and incentive programmes? We have them east of the line at Grand Forks and, contrary to what the Honourable the Minister just said, that's where the boundary has been recessed.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are talking about two different programmes.

MR. DOWDING: The point of the matter is there is Federal money available in British Columbia in the east. Well, you see, there is a difficulty with words across the Floor. But there's one... (*Interruption.*) It's true, absolutely. What I'm concerned about is that you want a pious resolution merely to ask for the tabling of documents. Now, of course, you are going to ignore the courtesies that are usually extended between two legislative Governments. I hope...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I merely stated that I discussed with the Minister concerned that we were not going to table them, but we were going to give an undertaking...

MR. DOWDING: But, surely, then, you should table this motion until you find out whether you can comply, because you are going to find yourself in your usual position of, in effect, saying, "Go ahead and pass this resolution, today, and I'll find out whether I can comply." I don't think the ethics of the thing would permit you, without... (*interruption*) I believe in information. I believe that it should be tabled. I believe that this Government should not hide these things under the table all the time.

What I do object to is that all that we are being asked to do is table this correspondence. How about a little more in the way of constructive action to persuade the Federal Government to develop, with their assistance, these incentive areas of the north? The resolution, it seems to me, if we had had more time to debate it and, perhaps, redraw it, should go into a more active field than trying to file a bunch of papers.

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

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver—Point Grey): Mr. Speaker, as the Member for West Vancouver—Howe Sound has stated, we will support this motion and, indeed, any motions that would be put forward from any Party in this House that would try to encourage greater financial support for the Province of British Columbia. I think if there's one subject, where all Members of the House would be unanimous, it would be in gaining as much favourable

treatment and financial support from the Federal Government as we can possibly get. Right now, there is a Federal-Provincial Conference going on, which is a little like a gigantic poker game because every Province in the country wishes to have the kind of Federal support that we would like to have here in British Columbia. In that sense, we compete against all the other Provincial Governments. What we should be doing is

[[Page 286](#)]

using our best strategies to try to further the interests of the Province of British Columbia and its people.

Now, as I said earlier today, I think it was extremely bad strategy that the Minister of Finance should have authorized these advertisements in all the eastern newspapers. I can't think of anything that would undercut our position more. I would hope in supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker, we would come to recognize that more skilful strategies than have been used in the past will be required, if we want to get the kind of support that the Ministers and backbenchers on that side of the House have been demanding for these many years.

The motion was agreed to *nemine contradicente*.

The House proceeded to the Order, "Reading and Receiving Petitions."

Mr. Wolfe presented the petition of The Anglican Theological College of British Columbia for leave to introduce a Private Bill intituled *An Act to Incorporate the Vancouver School of Theology*.

On the motion of Mr. Wolfe the Rules were suspended and the petition of The Anglican Theological College was *Ordered* received.

Mr. Wolfe presented the petition of Central City Mission Limited for leave to introduce a Private Bill intituled *An Act Respecting Central City Mission*.

On the motion of Mr. Wolfe the Rules were suspended and the petition of Central City Mission Limited was *Ordered* received.

Mr. Capozzi presented the petition of the Canadian Institute of Management (British Columbia Branch) for leave to introduce a Private Bill intituled *An Act to Incorporate Canadian Institute of Management (British Columbia Branch)*.

On the motion of Mr. Capozzi the Rules were suspended and the petition of the Canadian Institute of Management (British Columbia Branch) was *Ordered* received.

Mr. Wolfe presented the petition of the City of Vancouver for leave to introduce a Private Bill intituled *An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter*.

On the motion of Mr. Wolfe the Rules were suspended and the petition of the City of Vancouver was *Ordered* received.

Mr. Merilees presented the petition of Seaboard Life Insurance Company for leave to introduce a Private Bill intituled *An Act to Amend the Seaboard Assurance Company Act, 1953*.

On the motion of Mr. Merilees the Rules were suspended and the petition of Seaboard Life Insurance Company was *Ordered* received.

The House adjourned at 5:59 p.m.