

The following electronic version is for informational purposes only.
The printed version remains the official version.

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1975

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 9](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

Oral questions

BCR boxcar shortage. Mr. Bennett — [9](#)

Leasing of cars by BCR. Mr. Curtis — [10](#)

Extra funding for reduction of pupil-teacher ratio.

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [10](#)

Discrimination against pregnant employees. Mr. Wallace — [10](#)

Secret Hydro committee on Columbia River treaty.

Mr. L.A. Williams — [11](#)

Status of BCR railcars. Mr. Phillips — [11](#)

Employees for railcar plant. Mr. McClelland — [11](#)

Progress of public service union negotiations. Mr. Gibson — [11](#)

Amount of BCR rolling stock out of service. Mr. Curtis — [12](#)

Possible design problem with new ferries. Mr. Wallace — [12](#)

Necessity of special warrant for BCR. Mr. Fraser — [12](#)

Accuracy of Forest Service cost estimates. Mr. D.A. Anderson — [12](#)

Reason for BCR special warrant. Mr. Smith — [12](#)

Throne speech debate

Mr. Skelly — [13](#)

Mr. Rolston — [20](#)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1975

The House met at 3 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. C. D'ARCY (Rossland-Trail): Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to welcome the Stanley Humphries High School Doukhobor Choir from Castlegar, who are here today along with Mr. Peter Samoyloff, of Ootischenia, and Mr. Leonard Voykin, of Pass Creek, British Columbia.

MR. R.E. SKELLY (Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a class of students who are here today from Alberni District Secondary School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Ranson.

I would also like to introduce Alderman Walter Behn, from the City of Port Alberni, who is also here today.

MS. K. SANFORD (Comox): Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to welcome today a constituent from Comox riding — namely Mr. Tom Barnett, former MP.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to report to the House that since this is Brotherhood Week, the Member for North Peace (Mr. Smith) and myself attended the ninth annual inter-faith dinner last night in Vancouver; and I'd like to report that one of British Columbia's finest persons, the Hon. Mr. Justice Angelo Branca, was named man of the year at that meeting. I'd like this House to extend our congratulations to Mr. Justice Branca.

Oral questions.

BCR BOXCAR SHORTAGE

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, to the Premier as president of the B.C. Railway: because of the depressed economy of the north and the interior and the unemployment rate that's over 10 per cent — and it's now being compounded by an alarming shortage of cars of the BCR — could the Premier advise the House on what action is being taken to alleviate this shortage?

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate is 7.1 per cent.

MR. BENNETT: Not in the interior.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, Mr. Member, you can define statistics if you want. We trust in the federal government statistics....

MR. BENNETT: They said that it was over 10 per cent in the interior.

HON. MR. BARRETT: It's not often that we trust in the federal government, but in the area of statistics we'll give them a break.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Yes, I'll answer the speech, Mr. Speaker. In the past we were not in a position to provide cars for ourselves. Shortly after we came in the House, on a question from the Member for Vancouver–Point Grey, who's not present today, about the question of supplying ourselves with cars, we took immediate action and had a study done to see whether or not it was feasible for us to build our own cars.

I'm happy to say that by late March we will begin producing our own railcars here in the Province of British Columbia, employing a number of people who are....

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): That plant was started before you even....

HON. MR. BARRETT: There was no car plant even being considered by the railway before we were elected, Mr. Member, and I want to say that they didn't even make good cabooses.

The question, then, of unemployment will be relieved by that.

We've also had an interesting inquiry from a private railway interested in purchasing some of our cars.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, because I never did find out how we were going to get cars on the railway immediately to alleviate the alarming shortage. The car plant, of course, was to open on January 1, 1974, and then it was going to be July 1, 1974....

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, is the Hon. Member launching into a speech?

MR. BENNETT: I'm asking a supplementary question of the Premier as to whether this delay has compounded this problem and if he can guarantee to the House that the March date he gave of the opening of this plant will lead to the production facilities of 83 cars per month.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I don't know what kind of cars the Member is speaking of, but if he has any knowledge of the exact kind of cars that are short.... The only knowledge I have is that there is a shortage of coal cars used by the CPR on their unit

[[Page 10](#)]

trains from Revelstoke down to Roberts Bank.

MR. PHILLIPS: You don't know anything about your railroad.

MR. BENNETT: Now that we have a chance to advise the president of the railway of the shortage of the cars on the railway that he should know about, it's on lumber cars. And there are specific cases, Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Member answering questions or asking them?

MR. BENNETT: I have advised the president of the railway, the Premier, that on Monday alone one lumber company, John Ernst Lumber Co. Ltd. of Quesnel, applied for 20 cars and there were none. All interior lumber manufacturers ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT:...are on quota. Could the Premier please advise when the car shortage will be alleviated?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I take notice of that question. I was under the impression that those Members were saying that all the mills were closed down. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, order, please! It is becoming a debate. I would appreciate it if somebody else could have the floor on this first question period.

Interjections.

MR. BENNETT: And the fact that the president of the railway cannot answer the question....

HON. MR. BARRETT: I take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

LEASING OF CARS
BY BCR

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): To the Premier and president of the railway, I wonder if he could indicate how many cars are now leased by BCR.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will take it as notice, giving the exact number.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have covered a lot of time on one question and I would like some other Members to be recognized on other subjects.

EXTRA FUNDING FOR REDUCTION OF PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): To the Minister of Education. May I ask her what extra funding is to be available to help school boards and local taxpayers meet the extra costs of the 2,000 teachers hired last year in line with the government's policy of reducing the pupil-teacher ratio?

HON. E.E. DAILLY (Minister of Education): I don't think the intention of the question period is to have the Member who is being questioned go into a speech. I think I would suggest that you wait until the budget speech and my own speech, and then you will have a complete answer to that question. Otherwise I can take up the rest of the question period.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PREGNANT EMPLOYEES

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): To the Minister of Labour: is the Minister of Labour aware of any instances where there has been dismissal or layoff of a female employee because of pregnancy?

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of any specific incidence of a female being dismissed for the sole reason of pregnancy.

MR. WALLACE: Is it, then, in light of the Minister's public statement, the policy of the department to regard dismissal because of pregnancy to be a breach of human rights at all stages of pregnancy and in all types of employment?

HON. MR. KING: Yes, the Human Rights Code clearly prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, religion and colour, and it provides also that reasonable cause must be provided to discriminate against anyone during the course of employment or in terms of making available public accommodation and so on.

In my view the grounds of being pregnant would not be reasonable cause for dismissal from employment, and I offered that view when questioned on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out to the Hon. Members that they are really verging on asking opinions on questions of law.

[[Page 11](#)]

SECRET HYDRO COMMITTEE ON COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver-Howe Sound): A question to the Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources in his capacity as a director of British Columbia Hydro. Last Sunday evening there was a television programme ("The Reckoning") shown in British Columbia dealing with the Columbia River treaty projects. I have a copy of the transcript and the commentator said, in part:

"In the B.C. Hydro building a secret committee was put together to unload costs into other departments. Highways, Forest

Service and others were tapped for funds and the public knew nothing about it."

My question is: in his capacity as a director of B.C. Hydro, has the Minister evidence of such a committee existing in B.C. Hydro?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am personally unaware of such a committee. However, the matter is most serious and it is one which I would like to answer at a later stage to the House once I have further information.

STATUS OF BCR RAILCARS

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier and president of the British Columbia Railway. Some time ago the railway had on order several hundred cars from Hawker-Siddeley of Nova Scotia. I'd like to ask the president of the railway if these cars were purchased as in the original agreement or, if not, any of them were leased. Were they purchased in total?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Member, I will give you a report tomorrow of all of the cars we have leased, and all we have purchased.

MR. PHILLIPS: Of the cars that were leased, were any of the cars leased through American leasing firms?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh, yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: Was the money obtained from the United States, and what was the interest rate?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Member, I'll take it as notice.

EMPLOYEES FOR RAILCAR PLANT

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, it's on the same subject with regard to the British Columbia Railway Co. I wonder if the Premier, as president of the railway, could advise the House whether or not there have been employees at full pay waiting to go on stream at this car plant whenever it becomes operational. If so, how many, and are they at the management level or at the labourers' level?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, at the works level, not to my knowledge is there anyone waiting on stream. There certainly is management; as is the case with all start-up, there must be management people ready. They are now, as I understand, interviewing people to take on the trade skills in the plant itself.

MR. McCLELLAND: Would the Premier confirm, Mr. Speaker, on the same supplementary, that some of these people are in the \$20,000-per-year range and have been working for as long as two years for B.C. Rail?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, we hired people to set up the plant; it couldn't come out of thin air. They have been on as soon as we gave the go-ahead....

MR. McCLELLAND: January, '74.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if they want the answers or not, but the plant cannot come out of thin air. We hired people to bring the plant into being.

PROGRESS OF PUBLIC SERVICE UNION NEGOTIATIONS

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Provincial Secretary. I wonder if the Provincial Secretary could forecast to the House when negotiations might be completed with the public service unions and when the figures for the settlements already arrived at might be made public.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): I have no idea when all the components will be finalized. I think we're in the region of nine down and three to go. I'll advise the Members of the House of some opportunity I may have as to when they will be complete. But they're going along very well indeed.

MR. GIBSON: On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Provincial Secretary could release some of those figures before the budget, or in connection with the budget, because it will help us in assessing the projections.

[[Page 12](#)]

HON. MR. HALL: I'll take that under advisement.

AMOUNT OF BCR ROLLING STOCK OUT OF SERVICE

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, to the president of B.C. Railway, the Premier: I wonder if the Premier could tell the House how many cars and locomotives of the railway are now out of service as a result of derailments, deteriorated conditions, and delays in servicing and repairs of those locomotives and cars.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, since the Members want these questions in detail, I suggest they put them on the order paper so I can give the complete return.

AN HON. MEMBER: You've got *Hansard*.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he has taken it as notice but he has made a suggestion: when a question is so complicated that it should not be asked in question period, the proper way is to ask for the filing of a return.

Interjection.

POSSIBLE DESIGN PROBLEM WITH NEW FERRIES

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation and Communications with regard to the two ferries at present under construction by Burrard Drydock Co. Ltd. Has the unconventional design led to problems with the shaft?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): No, no problems. (Laughter.)

NECESSITY OF SPECIAL WARRANT FOR BCR

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, another question to the Premier as president of the railroad. I would like to know whether he can assure the House that the \$15 million special warrant issued in favour of the British Columbia Railway on January 16 would not have been necessary at all if there had not been a strike on the railroad in November, December and early January.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. The money will be repaid by the railroad, but I will have a most interesting, detailed report to give to the House on the railroad's operations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hurray!

MR. PHILLIPS: When?

ACCURACY OF FOREST SERVICE COST ESTIMATES

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. May I ask him whether his inquiries into the contract between Can-Cel and Twin Valley Timber in northern B.C. have indicated that the cost estimates done by the Forest Service, which he quoted earlier as being the basis for this contract being profitable, have indeed turned out to be incorrect?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I think we have information regarding three cutting permits, and the prices on all three cutting permits vary, so there are differences between them. Some, if my memory serves me correctly, are as indicated; others are somewhat different. As I indicated in public statements earlier, however, Canadian Cellulose bore additional costs. But I do find the question difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was a contract between two parties in the free enterprise system that the Member supports.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister: in view of the fact that this is not the first company which has had difficulties of this kind, and in view of the criticisms and requests by the northern interior producers to have the whole question of Can-Cel contractors and independent suppliers looked into, and in view of the fact the Minister indicated there were some errors in previous statements on costs, would he now accede to the request to have the whole matter looked into?

This may well have been a private contract as he has indicated, but failures to pay bills to suppliers could be very serious to towns such as Stewart and other communities in northern British Columbia.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I would simply say that I am satisfied that the actions taken by Canadian Cellulose were satisfactory and that it's a matter between the parties and not a matter of direct action, as we see it, for the government.

REASON FOR BCR SPECIAL WARRANT

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): My question is to the Premier, as president of the B.C. Railway. The Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) addressed a question to the Premier. It was suggested the question was hypothetical — concerning a \$15 million order-in-council. It's not a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker. The order-in-council states explicitly:

[[Page 13](#)]

"Whereas the Minister of Finance has reported that as a result of certain employees of the British Columbia Railway Co. having withheld their services over an extended period of time and the consequent curtailment of operating revenue, it is in the public interest to grant the sum of \$15 million to the company." Mr. Premier, was the total of \$15 million required, as suggested in the order-in-council, to cover for losses as a result of that railway strike?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the money is a short-term loan to the railroad to make up for the loss of revenue during the period of the work stoppage plus other smaller items as detailed. The order-in-council covers that and the money will be repaid.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. R.E. SKELLY (Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to have been selected by my colleagues in the government caucus to move the following motion, seconded by the Hon. Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston):

That the following address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly in session assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us at the opening of the present session.

Mr. Speaker, this must be the longest throne speech ever presented by a government in this province, and the record of achievement it outlines is fantastic. In fact, if anything, it understates the accomplishments of the New Democratic Party government in the Province of British Columbia.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): I didn't hear anything about the high unemployment rate.

MR. SKELLY: In the space of 30 short months we have totally transformed this province...

MR. PHILLIPS: Down the welfare well.

MR. SKELLY: ...and its social and economic institutions, and we have done so in the face of the most irrational, irresponsible and doctrinaire opposition.

Just going over some of the items in the throne speech — take the example of the Land Commission Act, which is the key to the most successful, long-term agricultural policy in North America.

By first taking steps to preserve the resource base of the industry, then following through with legislation to assure that farming and food processing would be profitable occupations, we have again made agriculture an attractive vocation for our young people, and I believe that we have restored the viability of rural life in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the past the rural ridings of this province voted strongly in favour of the Social Credit government in spite of the fact that Socred policy, or the lack of it, resulted in a loss of a large amount of our best farmland, the closure of food processing plants in the Fraser Valley, and a decline in the viability of the family farm unit in this province. But now the reverse is true.

I would just like to read a section from the January *Farmers' Institute News* that confirms this point.

MR. PHILLIPS: Which one of your PR men wrote that?

MR. SKELLY: I think it was the B.C. Federation of Agriculture.

"It is with interest to note that needed dairy production in British Columbia is increasing, as opposed to other provinces and Washington state where it is dropping, indicating that the object of stabilizing the dairy industry in British Columbia is being achieved and is reflected in the increased total production."

This is a direct result, Mr. Speaker, of a well-planned food resources policy confidently administered by an NDP Minister. And the key to the whole policy is the preservation and enhancement of our agricultural land resource base.

But I ask you to cast your mind back a short time to the spring of 1973 when this bill was first presented in the House, when the opposition stormed about the province waving copies of the bill and proclaiming that this was the first step in the establishment of a communist state in western Canada. We were subjected in this House to a 20-hour filibuster, including readings from Karl Marx.

Interjection.

MR. SKELLY: That was the most watered-down 20-hour speech I've ever heard in my life — including readings from Karl Marx and descriptions of collective farms in Russia. It was an incredible display. But the worst display I've ever seen in this House, although I've only been here 30 months — and you're really starting anew today

— was the comments of the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder), the Member for the floodplains, when he predicted bloodshed in the streets. He called this legislation the kind of legislation that serves to

[[Page 14](#)]

inflame and incite rebellion.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I've only been here for 30 months, but I've never seen, never heard, irresponsible criticism of the type that that Member started in this House. But in spite of their dogmatic response to the bill, and in spite of their attempts to generate fear and terror throughout this province, this bill is now a respectable statute. Legislators in other areas, including Washington state, are now using this statute as a model for land-use control in that state.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm glad the opposition forced you to amend that bill.

MR. SKELLY: Hogwash! Hogwash! Not a single proposal for amendments came from that side of the House. As the Minister pointed out during that debate, there was not a single proposal for amendment from that side of the House. They all came from the government side. Check the record.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, the bill is now a respectable statute. Even legislators in Washington state are looking at that bill as the model for their land-use legislation. They're taking courage from the determination of our government, and particularly our Ministers, to protect and preserve the agricultural land base of this province.

I know that I speak for all Members of the House, and for the farmers in the Alberni riding particularly, when I say that I'm proud of this government's legislation and its record of administration in the field of agriculture in British Columbia. We look forward to the new proposals to expand that agricultural policy during the present session, as outlined in the throne speech.

MR. PHILLIPS: Live in the past; it'll soon be history.

MR. SKELLY: Another achievement of the New Democratic Party that's cited in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is Autoplan. I believe that the Minister responsible for this plan also deserves congratulations. In less than a year — in the short space of 216 days — this Minister put together the largest insurance corporation in the country, with the lowest and best rate structure of any insurance company operating in Canada.

When Autoplan was in the process of being established, in 1973 and 1974, that Minister was subjected to the most vicious and vitriolic criticism imaginable. The opposition told us it couldn't be done. They said that the NDP didn't have the business acumen to set up an automobile insurance plan. I don't know where you get that business acumen — maybe by trading your house in for a motel or something. But we showed that we could do it. The Liberal leader (Mr. D.A. Anderson) called ICBC — and he's not here today, I see — an entry into the private field where traditionally and historically governments haven't succeeded.

But his memory is short and his vision restricted. Just three provinces away, he seems to forget, the Liberal Party, when they ran Saskatchewan into the ground for eight years, maintained that automobile insurance plan they have in Saskatchewan, and even boasted of it as a good policy.

MR. PHILLIPS: The losses stay in B.C.

MR. SKELLY: But despite the smokescreen, Mr. Speaker, and their threats of gloom and doom, Autoplan is now functioning smoothly, offering the best coverage, and at the lowest rates in the country. At the same time insurance companies in other provinces are raising their premiums by 16 and 18 per cent; our company has reduced rates and taken steps to equalize them throughout the province.

We have demonstrated that government involvement in the insurance business can succeed, that premium dollars which formerly left the province to be invested at the discretion of company directors in Zurich and Hartford,

Connecticut, and in Britain, are now being invested in this province at the discretion of people who are running an insurance company right here in this province, an insurance company owned by the people of British Columbia.

We have demonstrated that the corporation can be more responsive to the complaints and inquiries of clients when they arise than the private companies who previously operated from outside the province. When my constituents call me with an insurance problem or an inquiry, I can redirect it immediately to management in Vancouver and solutions come back within 24 hours. But I remember when the private insurance companies were doing business in this province, if you wanted an answer to a question you had to call Toronto to talk to the Canadian branch manager of some foreign U.S. company.

MR. PHILLIPS: Where do you borrow your money?

MR. SKELLY: We lost \$600,000 on the Columbia River treaty; we've got to borrow it back from some place.

MR. PHILLIPS: From the Arabs.

MR. SKELLY: It's often difficult to see how successfully the government insurance can be run because of the emotional fog that surrounds the insurance question in this province, an emotional fog created by that opposition over there.

MR. PHILLIPS: And political hot air from that

[[Page 15](#)]

side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the Hon. Member for South Peace River would restrain himself until his own speech in which he has 40 minutes.

MR. SKELLY: Then you'll really see some political hot air, Mr. Speaker.

But it's always good to get kind of an objective view of government insurance by travelling outside the province to see what's happening elsewhere. A few months ago, Mr. Speaker, I visited the State of Queensland, Australia. While I was in Queensland, I visited the head office of that state's government insurance which was established many years ago, by the way, by a Labour government, and that insurance office is now being maintained by the National Party in Queensland.

Interjection.

MR. SKELLY: No, that was at my own expense.

That insurance company is now being maintained by the National Party of Queensland; it's a little bit to the left of Social Credit but a little bit to the right of Mussolini. (Laughter.) Even that party has kept state government insurance in operation and is performing very successfully indeed.

I met with the general manager, Mr. Colin Douglas, and the manager of the workers' compensation section of that state government insurance office. They gave me an hour and a half of their time to explain how their system works, and it works very successfully indeed — they do almost \$0.5 billion in business each year. At the time I was in Brisbane they had several large office buildings under construction in the downtown area of Brisbane. At that time they were the second largest property owner in the state and one of the largest property taxpayers.

The vast majority of government insurance office revenues are invested in the State of Queensland, in public as well as private securities, and the corporation even makes a policy of investing and supporting local artists by buying their works and displaying them in public buildings. This is the type of responsibility we can expect from companies such as Autoplan who have the interest of the province and the people of the province at heart.

Mr. Douglas admits that these are poor times for the insurance companies operating in the world. He points out that SGIO Queensland has had to take over the business of private firms that were unable to compete in the present economic conditions and have either gone bankrupt or left the state. But he says that in poor economic situations, the government insurance corporation is better able to weather the storm, better than private concerns, and they even improve their services during these economic problems.

Mr. Speaker, as the throne speech indicates, Autoplan is one of the major success stories of the NDP government. It is a personal success story for the Minister of Transportation and I suspect that this legislation also will become a model for other provinces and other states to follow.

The throne speech also alludes to severe economic conditions in the forest sector and I am pleased to note that the government is taking steps to cushion the effect of the market slump by proposing an employment programme in the forests which, I understand, will involve a debris cleanup programme and a more intensive management of the public forests.

Government forest management in the past has been a subject of criticism, particularly from respected foresters such as Professor John Walters of UBC. Much of this criticism has been justifiable. We do not manage our forest resources as well as is the case in Europe or the Scandinavian countries, or even as well as lands held in private ownership by some of the larger multinational corporations.

One of the reasons for this is the fact that the previous government did not provide the staff or funds to manage the forests intensively. The former Minister even said that he kept the Forest Service staff purposely small so that the industry would police itself. We know the results of that. He obviously did not take resource management seriously, even though it was accepted as a government responsibility in the public sustained-yield units.

As a result of the forest employment policy announced in the throne speech, I look forward to a more intensive approach to forest management in planting, thinning, spacing and fertilizing some of the stands in our prime growing areas. This will have the result, I think, of increasing productivity in those areas so that a greater volume of timber may be obtained from a smaller growing area, and that way we can eliminate some of the areas where there is resource conflict, such as in alpine areas and stream bank areas. We can eliminate those from forest production without reducing the total productivity of the province.

But if the government can be faulted for its activities in the management of public forests, I don't think they can be faulted at all for the way they have managed the processing sector of the industry. As the throne speech points out, the government's interest in the forest industry has been extremely profitable over the past years. Canada Cellulose has achieved the best ratio of net income to capital invested of any company reporting in 1974, and they have the second best profit picture in dollar terms of any company operating in British Columbia in the same year. They have achieved this without laying off a single

[[Page 16](#)]

employee. This is good management, Mr. Speaker, and it's socialist management. Can-Cel might have improved its profit picture by getting rid of employees, as other companies have done, or by cutting down on production in certain less profitable areas, as other companies have done. But the NDP has consistently demanded that management operate with conscience in the forest industry and this government, through its companies, has kept their people working.

I wonder what Social Credit would have done under the same situation. Remember when we had economic restraints back in the '50s and '60s? What did Social Credit do? The first thing they did was sack civil servants. Civil servants, social workers included, they put on the welfare rolls because at that time there was no unemployment insurance for government employees. When there was an economic cutback you guys sacked civil servants. That was the policy of Social Credit.

I wonder what the Liberals would have done under the same situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): They'd do the right thing.

MR. SKELLY: They would have permitted an American company to purchase Columbia Cellulose, shut down the Prince Rupert operation, write off their losses and continue to operate in the Kootenays. That's Liberal policy; it's been Liberal policy under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for years.

The Liberals attacked the government for acquiring Columbia Cellulose. They compared it to buying the Titanic before it hit the iceberg. Some Titanic, Mr. Speaker! The only Titanic that's in danger of sinking in this province is the Liberal Party, and I hear that the skipper is going down without his hands.

Interjections.

MR. SKELLY: Mr. Speaker, this government has been able to operate in the forest industry under severe economic conditions with a record of success that private companies haven't been able to equal. And we've provided a degree of certainty to employees of government-controlled concerns that other companies haven't been bothered or haven't been willing to provide. We don't espouse the philosophy that people are to be sacrificed for profit, and Can-Cel is a good example.

Our responsibility of keeping these people working during severe economic conditions and to keep the economy going has a multiplier effect that benefits communities, every community where Can-Cel is operating. It protects small businessmen, protects suppliers and contractors. This is hardly a record of a government that, according to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett), has set out to destroy the economy of this province. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the record of private industry is in the forest products sector. I think we should take a look at that record, especially the record of those companies that boast of their good corporate citizenship because of the fact that they live here, and companies that spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax-deductible advertising funds publishing brochures about their environmental concern and their concern for the great outdoors — complete with veiled threats that if they're forced to do a better job, they're going to move elsewhere.

Of course, the company I'm referring to is MacMillan Bloedel. But I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are hundreds of cases I can cite where MacMillan Bloedel has been a good corporate citizen. They have maintained employment in the Alberni Valley, and the company has contributed a great deal to the recreational and cultural opportunities of the people who live in the communities where it works. The Premier was down in Port Alberni a few days ago to open the Mount Arrowsmith Ski Society in the regional park out there. MacMillan Bloedel contributed 1,250 acres of that park for the purpose of that ski club. But there are also disturbing aspects of MacMillan Bloedel's operation that are characteristic of every multinational corporation.

In spite of its public relations campaign, its operations aren't always competently managed. The Cypre River division, north of Tofino, is the perfect example. That's old Gibson territory up there. At the same time that MacMillan Bloedel was publishing its brochures to tell us how much they value the outdoors and what a fine job they're doing in managing the forests of British Columbia, they shut down the Cypre River division, shut it down and left 12 million board feet of timber lying on the ground. They didn't clean it up, no yarding, didn't remove the timber. They left 12 million feet lying on the ground, and they announced that they were closing down indefinitely and pulling out their equipment.

At the same time, they were distributing the brochures to those readers of *Maclean's* magazine and *Weekend* magazine and *Time* magazine — that Canadian news magazine — saying they had plans underway to move to Brazil, in partnership with Brascan, and to develop a 250,000-acre tree farm down there with two pulp mills. They're going to employ 5,000 to 7,000 Brazilians down there. Why Brazil? The vice-president of MacMillan Bloedel, vice-president of resources, says that the government is stable, the economy is a fast-growing one and the trees grow rapidly there.

How is the stability of Brazil achieved as opposed

to the uncertainty said to be rampant in British Columbia? What characteristics does Brazil have that favour the establishment of multinationals, whereas we are told that capital is fleeing this province? It's simple, really.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

Brazil has a military dictatorship that exerts a high degree of control over political and economic life. It does this by the regular means employed by political dictatorships and by military dictatorships: bullets, torture, arbitrary imprisonment, and repressive legislation that suppresses trade unions, keeps wages low and outlaws strikes and any other legitimate expression of discontent.

As a result, in Brazil the poorest 40 per cent of the people receive only 3 per cent of the national income, while the richest 5 per cent take more than a third.

Is this the type of political climate that causes multinationals to grow and flourish? Is British Columbia, under the New Democratic Party, where public debate of the issues is regarded as the right, where the process of government is more open than ever, where the philosophy of the ruling party is that all citizens should benefit from the harvest of natural resources...? Is this the type of political climate that multinationals view with suspicion and uncertainty? If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then we should re-examine the priorities of large corporations doing business in this province, and we should demand some assurance that profits from our resources will not be exported during poor market periods and will not be used to buttress the economies of foreign dictatorships and to further oppress the citizens of those countries.

One of the disturbing problems faced by this provincial government is in the field of federal-provincial relations, which is also alluded to in the throne speech. When this government came into office 30 months ago, we promised to improve communications with the federal government, and we demonstrated our intention by participating actively in federal-provincial conferences, which the former government didn't see fit to attend at all.

Previous throne speeches have reported in glowing terms the results of federal-provincial conferences and of the increased rapport with the federal government. I actually believe that under the NDP we have developed closer ties with other regions of Canada. And all British Columbians applauded the symbolic gesture when we symbolically rejoined Confederation by tearing down those old BC-1 signs and replaced them with Trans-Canada Highway signs indicating that we were back in the country.

But any hopes that we may have generated for continued improvement of our relationship with the federal government were extinguished during the last federal election. Relying on its large base of support in central Canada, the Liberal Party took a majority of seats in the House of Commons, and they proceeded to retaliate against the western provinces for the fact that 75 per cent of the people in the western provinces voted against them.

How did the Liberals do in western Canada? Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall a time in Canadian history....

AN HON. MEMBER: How did the NDP do in B.C.?

MR. SKELLY: How did the Social Credit do in B.C.?

Interjection.

MR. SKELLY: You elected one, but he changed his coat. But they change their coats over there so often you don't know which side they're on.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, at least we didn't have to go around and hire them up when they were defeated.

MR. SKELLY: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall a time in Canadian history, except possibly during the Riel Rebellion, when relationships between Canada and the western provinces were more strained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SKELLY: The provisions of the recent Turner budget....

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): That's pretty harsh language.

MR. SKELLY: The provisions of the recent Turner budget were purposely designed to undermine the revenue base and to subvert the economic development strategies employed in the western provinces. The announcement that royalties imposed on natural resources would be no longer deductible for federal tax purposes was a direct attack on this province in particular, as we had just passed the Mineral Royalties Act when the announcement came down.

The federal government was aware that the impact of this announcement in Ontario and Quebec, where the major Liberal support base lies, would be minimal, because these provinces have refined the practice to a high art of giving away their resources with very little return to the people. For example — and the most recent examples I have from the Canada Year Book are 1969, unfortunately, but I believe the same proportion exists today — during that year the gross natural resource revenue for the Province of Ontario was \$54 million, while the gross revenue for

[[Page 18](#)]

Quebec from natural resources was \$66 million. In British Columbia gross revenue from natural resources during the same period was \$127 million, more than both those provinces combined.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well certainly, that's a good policy.

MR. SKELLY: And they have more resources, more mineral reserves. Direct revenues from natural resources, formerly a small percentage of the gross revenue of those eastern provinces, are 2 per cent in the case of Quebec and 1.6 per cent in the case of Ontario. But direct natural resource revenues in British Columbia are 12 per cent of our gross income and increasing.

So any move by the federal Liberal government is a direct attack on this province's ability to pay its own way and to provide services that we as a government have committed ourselves to provide. I'm speaking of services such as ambulance coverage, Mincome, Pharmacare and community recreation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the federal government to destroy the economy of this province and to turn us into a have-not province out of political revenge. I congratulate the Premier for his stand on the natural gas issue, and I hope he will continue his firm stand against federal Liberal inroads to ruin our resource base.

The municipalities of my constituency are also in support of this position. They welcome the Premier's proposal to share the increase in revenue resources that will come from the natural gas tax. This province has developed a unique policy with regard to sharing resource revenues with municipalities. As the throne speech indicates, we are putting in a municipal tree farm in Smithers and Burns Lake. Other municipal tree farms that are underway will provide additional shares of resource revenues for those municipalities. They also are fully behind the Premier's proposal to share the natural gas revenues with the municipalities.

The other disturbing announcement made recently by the federal Liberals is that they are planning to eliminate the tax-exempt status of provincial Crown corporations. Again, this is a direct attempt to subvert an important economic development strategy of the western provinces which have traditionally relied upon Crown corporations as a means of capital investment in the absence of any serious federal attempt to reduce regional disparities and to establish secondary industry in western Canada.

The Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) is doing an excellent job in maintaining pressure on the federal Liberals to increase investment programmes and incentives here. I believe the Minister can take personal credit for the elimination of the lower limit on Export Development Corp. loans which allow smaller companies such as the type we have in Western Canada to take advantage of long-term export development corporation financing.

But the process of convincing the federal Liberals that there is potential for secondary industry is a difficult

one. After all, their main source of support is in the industrial area of central Canada. They have admitted that the major part of their party revenues is provided by large corporations in central Canada. The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Mr. Trudeau) has admitted that because of the contributions they receive from that area and from the multinational corporations, those people speak with louder voices.

Anyone who doesn't believe in the reality of this statement should occasionally read the *Hansard* of the committee hearings held last year on the bill to raise the ceiling for Export Development Corp. loans. It was reported that the major recipients of EDC benefits were large multinationals with headquarters in the Liberal hinterland. The two Canadian companies who received the major benefit of EDC financing were held by prominent eastern Liberals like Paul Martin Jr. and the Simard family of Quebec.

This type of regional and political pork-barrelling is more likely to continue under the present Liberal majority government, and the disparity in economic development between central Canada and the west is likely to become more and more acute.

It was possible in the past, when the Liberal policy was simply to neglect regions outside of Ontario and Quebec, for the western provinces to grow by exploiting resource revenues and public investment through Crown corporations. But the policy has now turned from one of neglect to a direct attack on the economic foundations of the west.

There used to be talk of western separatism in this country, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think in this case we are talking about western separatism; we are talking about a conscious effort on the part of the federal government to sabotage Confederation by reducing the west again to colonial status, and by reducing its people to hewers of wood and drawers of water.

I call upon the Premier and this government to combat this movement with all the resources, to work toward a state of Confederation where all provinces can be equal partners and where different political philosophies and economic strategies can co-exist to the benefit of all Canadians.

There is just a final point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, before you call on the Member for Dewdney (Mr. Rolston), and that is in relation to this government's commitment in the throne speech to assist in relieving the suffering of Third World countries. We of the government have attempted to reverse the wastefulness of the lifestyle we enjoy here

[[Page 19](#)]

in North America at the expense of a great majority of people in the world who suffer from diseases and discomforts related to hunger and malnutrition.

MR. PHILLIPS: Sell them some more cheap newsprint.

MR. SKELLY: I know that the people of British Columbia are looking forward to this government for leadership in aiding suffering peoples. We have had some of these people come to visit us. In addition to the people mentioned in the throne speech, we've had delegations from the people in Portuguese Africa who are struggling for liberation from one of the few remaining colonial powers in that area. We've also had representatives from South Vietnam — people who suffered from torture and imprisonment and exile, not because they were Communists, not because they were supporters of North Vietnam, but because they believed in a democratic government representing all political views. We've also received delegations from Chile — again people who have suffered from imprisonment, torture, threats of death, and finally exile from their homeland because they supported a democratically elected government.

Mr. Speaker, these people have high expectations of our government because of our concern for democratic institutions and our support for the aspirations of people throughout the world, for free institutions and for a fair distribution of wealth. I am very pleased to read in the throne speech that we will increase our commitment to help relieve the suffering people throughout the world.

In the past Canada has always contributed to international humanitarian efforts in far greater proportion than her population would suggest. Our contribution to two world wars and peace-keeping forces of the United Nations testify to this effort.

At one time we were considered a leader of smaller nations, a nation of peacemakers, but in the past 10 years we've lost that reputation. Instead, we've become known as the largest merchant of weapons per capita on earth.

I note in the papers that Canada is now aggressively pursuing an arms deal with Turkey, now that the United States has refused military support to that country. The terrible thing about this proposed arms sale, aside from the morality of selling weapons in the first place, is that they could be used against our own soldiers on Cyprus.

But the most terrifying activity of the federal government in international trade is the rush to create nuclear weapon capabilities in some of the most unstable and oppressed countries on earth.

Canada has already sold India a CANDU nuclear power plant that gave that country the potential to develop an atomic bomb. The federal government has also finalized an agreement with Argentina to sell a nuclear reactor to that country. Argentina is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, but they do have an agreement with India to exchange nuclear technology.

If that in itself doesn't concern you, I would like to read some comments in the federal *Hansard* by John Rodriguez, NDP member for Nickle Belt, and also our authority on Latin-American relations in the House of Commons:

"Argentina has not signed or ratified the 1968 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty which pledges non-nuclear nations not to accept or manufacture nuclear arms. Argentina already has an atomic plant. The stability of the country in June, 1973, (to give you a quick rundown) was as follows:

"Hector Campora took over the government from the military. There was bloody rioting, and a general strike in Buenos Aires. Three Ford Motor Co. executives were shot. A million dollars in protection money was paid to terrorist organizations by Ford. Dirk Kloosterman, the secretary-general of the Auto Mechanics' Union, was murdered.

"In July, 1973, Peron came back. There were riots: 34 were dead and 342 wounded. September, 1973, Jose Rucci, head of the General Confederation of Labour, Argentina's largest [labour] union...was murdered. There was a 30-hour general strike in Argentina. In December, 1973, John Swint, general manager of Ford [Motors], was murdered. In 1973, 160 kidnappings; over \$20 million (U.S.) was paid in ransom.

"One Export Development [Corp.] loan for a nuclear reactor was approved in April of 1974.

"In May of 1974, Jorge Quiroga, a judge, was gunned down. The police overthrew the municipal government of Cordoba; several banks were blown up in Buenos Aires. There were May Day riots and over 1,000 were injured. The U.S. Exxon executive, Victor Samuelson, was released by kidnappers after 144 days of captivity and \$14.2 million (U.S.) in ransom. The same day, the U.S. begins personnel pull-out and limited the U.S. Investment [in Argentina]."

That's the kind of stable country that the federal government is selling CANDU nuclear reactors to. Even MacMillan Bloedel wouldn't consider that government stable enough to set up a forest plant. Obviously, these comments on the stability of the Argentine political situation did not deter our federal government from proceeding with the sale to Argentina. In fact, they are now negotiating with another military dictatorship in South Korea — another country that hasn't signed that nuclear non-proliferation treaty. And, Mr. Speaker, the rumour is current that our federal government is now negotiating a deal with the Union of South Africa, a country known for its liberal policies.

I intend to present the resolution to the House at this session which calls upon the federal government

[[Page 20](#)]

to recognize its responsibility to preserve the peace and security of the world by calling a halt to sales of CANDU nuclear reactors. I look forward to the support of the House for that resolution.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the throne speech gives an excellent outline of the government's record, a government that is actively pursuing the best interests of the people of this province, a government that is creating institutions that other areas look upon as desirable models. The eyes of many people throughout the world are on focus on us and I don't think that any government on this continent is being watched with higher expectations.

Mr. Speaker, as the record shows, we have gone a long way towards fulfilling these expectations. Thank you.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): A point of order.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.

MR. BENNETT: I rise to offer a motion under standing order 49, namely that this House is of the opinion that because of the environmental damage possible due to today's serious chlorine spill...

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: ...in the Strait of Georgia...

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: ...the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) be permitted to....

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: I'm allowed to read my motion.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! I would just ask the Leader of the Opposition to wait until I've checked the order to see what his point of order is. Would the Hon. Member please state his point of order before he presents any motion to the House?

MR. BENNETT: The motion is self-explanatory. It's a point of order under 49. We have an urgent spill and I would like to invite statement from the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources as contained in my motion. I am asking unanimous leave of the House...

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: ...so the Minister can make a statement under standing order 49.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the House for leave.

Leave not granted.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, leave has to be granted unanimously.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Hon. Member (Mr. Skelly) who has just taken his place, in his remarks moving the motion, indicated that in connection with the Land Commission Act no amendments had been offered by the opposition. I would like the record to show that the afternoon of April 16, 1973, saw such amendments being offered. Indeed, to the credit of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), he accepted three amendments put forward by the opposition.

Interjections.

MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney): Mr. Speaker, it's an honour to represent the people of the very beautiful, far-flung Dewdney constituency on the north side of the Fraser Valley and a rare privilege to second the very helpful speech from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

We're very conscious this afternoon that our beloved friend and counsel, Ned DeBeck, Q.C., has passed to his creator; he is not with us. The Rolston family has had for nearly 60 years a special relationship with Mr. and Mrs. DeBeck. It was my grandmother who went to school with Mrs. DeBeck and who, as an MLA in 1941 and for several sessions, stayed with the DeBecks and played bridge with them. I don't know if she ever learned to turn blocks of wood on the lathe, but she certainly enjoyed his counsel and discussions and many an evening of bridge.

Our Premier, of course, on several occasions has called on us to use the collective wisdom of the senior citizens of this province. There couldn't, for me, be a better illustration than the wisdom and the dignity and the peace of Ned DeBeck.

As a young MLA, I came here and was pretty confused with the procedure. I remember several times going over to chat with him and to gain direction from him.

I suppose all of us, too, had to keep a pretty straight face when, prior to getting our cheques, he looked at us and said: "Mr. Rolston, how many days have you been in the last Legislature?"

[[Page 21](#)]

We send our condolences and certainly appreciate the life and the wisdom of this man.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now talk about education and priorities in education. I feel it's a responsibility of an MLA to go into classrooms and to talk to students, teachers, administrators, the school board people and certainly to the public. This is something I greatly enjoy.

I have two children in school and, like many of you, find education a very immediate thing. We're daily evaluating and hearing what is happening in school. In my constituency often the community gravitates around the school, and it's very, very important to us.

I think it's also fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that we're in a time of very rapid social change, a time when as parents we have difficulty sometimes understanding and disciplining our children. We sometimes have a difficulty understanding what's happening in school with the new math and the new programmes. It's understandable that we sometimes take this out on the teacher or on that school. Maybe our frailty or our inability is sometimes passed on to the school as a scapegoat.

The school, of course, is crucial for all of us. In talking about this, I first of all want to say some things about quality and about purpose.

I as a parent hope that my children learn how to make decisions, that they learn how to solve problems, that they learn self-determination very early. This is vital. This can be inculcated in the day care. We now have universal kindergartens in most parts of the province and also in those formative primary years. I hope that my children learn very early that they have to take risks. Of course, part of learning is taking risks. All of us here have taken risks and we've made some bad mistakes at times in that process of taking risks. I would be the first to admit that. But I feel that's very necessary.

This government is hoping that students take the risk of leaving Mission or Maple Ridge in the summer and get out to the northern parts of British Columbia on our student summer employment programme called STEP, and get out there and see what's happening, and we would say the same thing about school. We hope that it deals with the total child, the effect of training and teaching of the total child, and so therefore we're talking about the rational and the emotional, the spiritual, the aesthetic, the moral and the physical part, which is the whole part of a child's life.

I was fascinated to read some letters — I wonder if they were drummed up by the remnants of the Unity

Party in Pouce Coupe, or South Peace, or somewhere — saying that the NDP government is doing away with religion, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would just remind this House that there is an innocuous section in the Public Schools Act — which has been there for two decades at least — 167, talking about the opening exercises of schools, and this is probably where these writers feel that this government is against religion and doing away with religion.

I find this opening exercise section where you have to listen to the Bible reading, without any explanation, and that you recite the prayer. Often this is a form of just quietening the child down, a parody, Mr. Speaker, on religion. Then, later on, we're told that there is to be no religious dogma inculcated; yet we talk about a liberal arts education and we talk about learning all of life, and religion is certainly part of life. I would ask that legislators look at that section. I have never been happy with that section. I personally don't see why school districts can't make their own minds up about what those opening exercises are.

Also I think that school districts should be encouraged to develop programmes — religion is part of the whole dimension of life — a course on the major religions of the world and the major themes in religion. Certainly, if any government is going to try to do something, it's this government.

It was this government, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that at least allowed ordained clergymen now to teach in school. Mr. Wenman, who once was a backbencher with the Socreds, tried for years with a motion on the order paper to get his government to loosen that up, with no success.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the school, we're talking about the whole aspect of life. I don't presume to think that the school really is the main influence on a child. I think the peer group, television, the home, the community, hopefully the church, and many other influences are significant. We're told that there are 10,000 hours of television watched by a child before he goes into grade 1. So, therefore, I hope and I believe our government is gradually moving towards integrating school with the whole community of life, the wider arena of life, and I hope that teachers become loosened up and gradually gain confidence, become adapted to working with this larger area of life.

I feel maybe the straight academic programme, which I was brought up in, in an academic kind of school, might be still very valid, Mr. Speaker, for many students and for many teachers. But it is similarly valid that we could have students that maybe take a programme in the classroom in the morning, but in the afternoon move out into the job situation, the work situation, maybe the skilled training situation, so that they can relate more to the wider community, to the trade union community, to the management community, to the Indian community. There is a very large Indian population in the Fraser Valley and a community which needs special homemaking skills. I believe that this wider

[[Page 22](#)]

community could help as the department and the school boards decide their purpose.

I might just remind this House that school boards are responsible for developing policy. I'm reassured that School District 75, Mission, and 42 in Maple Ridge are working on policy. I got quite annoyed when I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) recently on television say that this government is emasculating boards in the business of developing policy. That is absolute nonsense and I'd love him to see in print some of the, I think, excellent policy that Maple Ridge, School District 42, is currently working on. In fact, it's published for feedback in the paper. I'm counting on our government....

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Name one policy.

MR. ROLSTON: Name one policy. Venture schools — School District 42 is moving into the venture school. Our government needs to find what the job needs are in British Columbia.

At lunch yesterday I said to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King): "Now what's happening in an inventory of the job needs for the next five years?" Surely that's reasonable. Industry needs to know well in advance in its hiring practices, and I'm hoping that our government will be able — with the help of the federal government, as you

remember, through a programme called the Canada Manpower Assistance Programme — to find those needs.

There's been a phenomenal growth, Mr. Speaker, in the community college. We have a new college called the Fraser Valley College working in five school districts in the Fraser Valley. Although it did take over the night school programme, we already have 3,500 people in night school programmes in that college. We have many people in the full-time programme. In September we anticipate 805 people taking the full-time programme in the Fraser Valley College.

Let's look at that quality. There's been a lot of debate in the press, on the hotlines, about quality. What's happening in schools? What emphasis is being left in schools? We are told by educators that we are in kind of a humanitarian emphasis. Presumably that means an emphasis on relationships, on the total aspect of growing and of growing as a person.

But, Mr. Speaker, the first thing, surely, is the teacher. I think we have to be honest in that sometimes people teach because maybe this is the only thing initially they saw themselves doing. Sometimes maybe they have come into it through a somewhat devious way. But I believe it is the responsibility of the Department of Education to help in the upgrading of those teachers.

There's going to be a debate, no doubt. I don't know if it will be in this session, but we're going to have to face the decision of who decides competency in the teaching profession. Now the BCTF claims that they can develop a committee to do this. I'm not so sure about that. I am not so sure that they are the only people who have that right to decide competency. Other professionals don't. We have other people, lay people, deciding or taking part in that decision. Should it be the principal? Should it be the superintendent or the department or a school committee? I don't know. Certainly there's going to be discussion, because it's a very valid question. It's related to this whole business of upgrading, of professional development. I think that the board should get money from Victoria to help in that upgrading of the professional teacher so that he or she is more competent to deal with this vast changing world, are less threatened by what they feel they are up to.

Now it would be helpful, Mr. Speaker, if some of these highly paid professional teachers were allowed to do more teaching. They complain that they don't have help with the xeroxing and the flash cards and the preparing of bulletins and marking and stencil-making. It could be that more schools should follow the lead and get into hiring paraprofessionals, parateachers, that could do this work so the teacher is paid to do a job of lesson preparation and getting in front of that classroom where the real work is to be done. But, again, I'm saying that they have to decide their self-esteem; they need to decide and have, I think, a very good opinion of themselves, and certainly the department and the boards, I believe, are ready to help in that development of self-esteem and of competency.

I want to remind this House that this government — related to this discussion of quality — has reduced the pupil-teacher ratio by 2.86 in two years. We are presumably going to have better remedial teaching through this, more individual attention, more time for individual learning. I don't see any great panacea in this, but I think it should still be encouraged, and I certainly hope that money will go to the school districts that don't have the mill rate. Vancouver raises nearly \$2 million with one mill rate, and that certainly isn't my experience where I work and live. But as well as looking at this pupil-teacher ratio, which we have made a commitment will go down — and we do need to get money to these poor areas — we also need to look at varieties in education.

Again, this is not new. We have had varieties. I've mentioned the academic variety; I've mentioned the academic model; I've mentioned the Venture School as a model in Maple Ridge, the education for life as an emphasis where the kids spend time on day trips, develop a greater sense of socializing and understanding each other. They do have to learn basic math, basic skills, which, of course, our government will not compromise on.

[[Page 23](#)]

Admittedly, you know, the school is getting some flack on this business of basic skills. But there's a problem of basic skills that might have started with that group in the corner. We've been in business for 2 1/2 years. If you're talking about a 15-year-old having difficulty with language arts, it's very likely that the 15-year-old was short-changed, or there just wasn't the right emphasis, or there was a knee-jerk response by the Sacred Department of

Education probably a decade ago.

So I believe that there are varieties, and teachers are excited about varieties. They are excited about apprenticeship-type schools that I've mentioned. They are excited about relating more immediately to the work situation. The Member for West Vancouver (Mr. L.A. Williams), a lawyer, would like to know that there are lawyers now working in special classes, legal classes, law classes in some of the high schools in the Fraser Valley. I think that's very exciting. I didn't benefit from that, and I certainly should have. Eric Hamber boasts a special humanities programme in grade 11 — an autonomous school within a school — that looks at socials, history, political science, sociology, psychology, takes field trips, and is very confident — and which again, I think, will develop quality and self-esteem in the profession.

I have to admit that I find school threatening still. It's intimidating, even though you go as an MLA to speak sometime, or to meet staff; it's still a school. I guess that that image is left with a lot of people.

I heard a Minister of Education once say that maybe the schools should be a vast community compound. They're sometimes lost. There would be the public health, the resource centres, the public library — like Agassiz, where the public library is in the high school complex — and people would feel they're more a part of a larger community, that a lot of that will rub off and maybe rub off for years to come. But also it will be a little less threatening.

Our government is spending over \$3 million on the Spectrum School, just a few miles from this Legislature, which I think is going to be an exciting illustration of a large, compound type of school. That staff, who have been in very poor temporary facilities for nearly a year, are looking forward to that new school.

Last spring, you know, our government gave authority to develop local curricula, and again this is to complement the three basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic — basic skills which we do require. MLAs, I'm sure, lament some of the letters they receive from people who just don't know how to put things down clearly, how to state their problems. I think I recognize the problem. I think it's valuable to be able to put your thoughts down in writing. Now we want to complement those with local skills that are needed. In my area, it would be different from West Vancouver. We would teach local skills of agriculture, of soils, maybe knowing more about the trade union movement because of its influence in the area, more maybe about corrections, certainly more about basic survival and adventure programmes.

I want to say something about discipline. Does this House realize that the Minister sent out a memo last September to all the principals asking that they discuss with their staff four things: class management, evaluation and testing, communication with parents — which is very important — and the sex and race discrimination thing, and that there were many, many useful discussions and dialogues? In fact, Victoria School District is putting together right now their preliminary draft of their material to be sent to the Minister. This, in a sense, was an in-service programme, dialoguing. In a sense, in a low-profile way, it was able to get a response from the 1,400 teachers, for instance, in Victoria — a very vital thing.

The whole business of discipline and authority surely is a wider issue than just the principal and the senior people. The other teachers, and the response of those more responsible students, who can have a very big peer group influence on the others, and the parents surely should all be encouraged to feed material in on the business of authority in the classroom.

I want to now say something about money. This is going to be a very vital discussion. Our government is committed to progressive funding of education. Our government spent \$554 million in the budget, and that was increased by \$44.2 million in special warrants. Of that, \$16 million went to school districts to help in the pupil-teacher ratio, and I hope that continues. But Victoria at times needs to gain recognition for giving more money per instructional unit, in fact, a 19.4 per cent increase in per-educational unit. That's \$18,250 per instructional unit. That's the maximum amount allowed under the Public Schools Act. Of course, this can be added to. You add your bus; then you bring it up to a little under \$20,000 per instructional unit. You add extra things, like the busing costs and other administrative costs.

I hope we're committed to ultimately paying 100 per cent for the operating costs of community colleges. I hope that will happen. We are now paying 100 per cent of the capital costs of community colleges; we are spending \$91 million in capital programmes for public schools, more than at any other time in history. That's a very big increase.

That means \$2.6 million in Mission alone; \$3.3 million in Maple Ridge. That means a total of 10 schools are being modified. In fact, some new schools are currently being built in Maple Ridge. We were delighted in Mission to hear that additions to three schools came in a little under tender, and it was very gratifying to hear of that.

This is the greatest amount in capital programmes

[[Page 24](#)]

in the history of this province.

One of the legacies of this group in the corner, the Socreds, was that they somehow centralized the already unwieldy educational financial business into Victoria. This became very demoralizing to school boards. They seemed to have to go through all the red tape and more red tape. They seemed to be confused by the Socred blue book of the mid-1950s as to what a school should look like, whether it be A, B, C or D model.

I feel in a sense some of that blue book must still be around because there still seems to be a hurdle to get permission for special warrants on operating. We have a list of these special warrants. Maple Ridge, for instance, needed an \$800 warrant — a small thing, surely, to go through cabinet.

The New Democratic government is trying to encourage school boards to plan for five years. We're in a programme right now of site acquisition in Pitt Meadows and Maple Ridge; we're working with planners and with the municipal council. Surely this is responsible; this is good economics. This was not really possible under Social Credit. You couldn't pick up sites five or six years in advance; you couldn't do planning of large building units like the Burke Mountain project. We feel this is responsible.

We are currently in a very heavy capital programme in school district 42. Admittedly, there is a controversy between municipal and school board people as to who pays for what. I need to have some explanation from the House and from the Minister because there is some confusion in my mind. The mayor of Pitt Meadows will say, "Will, you have to pay all of the impost fee and all of the lineal-foot fee for the storm sewers and water and everything, as if the school was going to use so many building lots." Yet the school board says that if you do that you are going to raise the mill rate a couple of mills, and we can't have that. You are just going to shift the burden onto the taxpayers through school taxation.

Of course, the other thing, too, would be that if Pitt Meadows paid the entire cost of these services, that would have been reflected in their higher general mill.

I think some kind of decision has to be made. It seems to me that developers could pay a big percentage of that servicing cost. Surely when a school goes into a new area, the people developing that area who are counting on it — in fact, who are advertising the area because of the new school — need to pay a bigger percentage of that impost and those direct service costs. The Social Credit group, Mr. Speaker, before we took office, starved this province on that Canada Manpower training programme. Do you realize that, Mr. Speaker? When we took office we went to the federal government and we said, "Look, we have not been getting enough money for skill training and for job training — the BCIT kind of thing — to operate that."

We must give credit to the federal government because they saw the problem; they saw that we were starved and they have come through. Hopefully, we can continue to negotiate a catch-up so that B.C. can catch up to the rest of the provinces in what is being spent on technical training, much of which is subsidized by the federal government.

Now, let's look at agriculture, which is essential to my riding. The dairy farmers are increasingly confident in Dave Stupich, the Minister of Agriculture. If you are a farmer with \$300,000 in a dairy farm and for years have felt it

was time to liquidate that farm and get out of the business and maybe take your chance of subdivision, you are at last guaranteed a decent income, a just income for labour and investment.

The cost of producing milk is nearly \$14 a hundredweight. This has increased about \$3 in my time as an MLA.

The dairymen in Nicomen Island, and Hatzic prairie, and Mission-Pitt Meadows and Maple Ridge are riding high with the income assurance programme, because this is the thing: their costs are around \$13.92; they pay 20 cents into the programme as their premium; they are only given \$11.87 for the quota value of their liquid milk. So there is about a \$2.05 difference which is made up by the programme that our Minister has passed through this House — the dairy income programme. Of course, we know this programme is now available for swine people, for the tomato people and the tree-fruit people.

I think that this is a beginning. Admittedly, it has been kind of a cultural shock for all of us in this income assurance programme, and I confess there was a cultural shock when we looked at the agricultural land reserves, which again were vital to Dewdney riding. I think we all would admit that this was quite an adjustment for the government to say: "Look here. This is too valuable for food producing; this land, according to slope, according to climate, according to soil type, and according to size, must be reserved for agriculture."

I'm happy to report that the farmers again are now content to get on with producing food. That great pot of gold at the end of the rainbow isn't really that real any more for them because they now have a decent and dignified income — they're willing to produce food. They, incidentally, are being very supportive of this and I think they're very content.

Incidentally, you should know that 81.7 percent of Pitt Meadows is in agriculture, 18 per cent of Maple Ridge, and 14 per cent of the district of Mission, but of course much of the riding is electoral area and that is largely in agriculture.

These farmers appreciate the credit programme

[[Page 25](#)]

where \$15 million maximum has been granted by this House to help discount existing agriculture loans and credits, and again this is seeing a new confidence. Farmers are going back to the soil. A kind of new style ranching up in the Cariboo is developing. I only hope they have the ability. They certainly have the enthusiasm — I hope they have the ability and the staying power.

Interjection.

MR. ROLSTON: Oh, I can't give you the precise amount, but I would think a dozen — more up in the Cariboo.

The House has heard our cry for greater help for diking, and last winter the budget removed the 10 per cent local share. We are very happy with that, and this means that Mission is moving ahead with a diking programme, and Pitt Meadows, who weren't able to afford that 10 per cent, they — I hope this winter, or certainly next winter — will be moving ahead with their diking programme.

But, Mr. Speaker, this House should know that in response to my plea for an interim help for floods during the high water of last summer, the Ministers of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) responded and they paid one-half of the losses to cattle, to equipment, to houses, and to personal property totalling \$303 million in Dewdney riding, and not all of the appraisals are in yet. I think this is a pretty practical demonstration to help the farmer in his viability.

The Minister of Agriculture is not here, but he and members of the agriculture committee need to realize that there is a problem in the Fraser Valley with raspberries — there really is. Sugar is much, much more expensive and

raspberries and strawberries largely are sugar-related products. The strawberry stands that you see out on the road might be two, maybe three, per cent of the volume of that business.

There is a real problem in the Fraser Valley because three years ago the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture — three years ago, before we took office — encouraged a greater raspberry production. We have 15 more acres of raspberries in the Fraser Valley than we had. This means that the total production could be eight million pounds of raspberries, and I worry what happens to them. Are they not picked, or are they dumped? Because you need to know, Mr. Speaker, and this House needs to know. We just talked about food, you know, for the poor and the starving world; 600 acres of the 1,600 acres in berries have no commitment, no contract with a canner — no contract at all. That is a real concern.

I think our government, and especially Economic Development and the Department of Agriculture, need to get together. I'd like to meet with them, develop new markets, and develop a new process without using sugar — maybe a new way of freezing. Freezing doesn't use that much sugar anyway. So, with the help of researchers, we can develop a new market. These people must at least get 32.5 cents a pound, the cost of producing these berries.

Of course, you are competing with a lower cost Mexican berry of the everbearing variety, which continues to come into this province. I don't know, we could maybe ask Ottawa to put a tariff on imported strawberries. But I can imagine the Mexicans would put a tariff on our Ontario-built tractors which are worth a lot more money so maybe there is very little likelihood of that.

But, on the brighter side, in the cold-crop vegetable business — broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage — things are really moving. The Fraser Valley has more acreage under production than ever before. York Farms and some of the large companies are leasing thousands of acres. Thanks to the agricultural land reserves now, we are quite content to get on with the business of producing cold vegetable crops.

We're going to have a self-sufficiency. I think the day will come when we'll have self-sufficiency in this — maybe even in lettuce. Dave Stupich reminded a group recently that as companies consolidate their energy needs and eventually look for energy self-sufficiency, maybe we need to look to food self-sufficiency. That's going to be a really tough thing to go after but at least we have the agricultural reserves to help us on the way.

Let's look at the Attorney-General's department and justice. Last spring this House passed the Justice Development Commission. We have eight justice councils in the Fraser Valley, with the help of a co-coordinator working out of Abbotsford. There are 25 people who have been meeting now for two months in the evenings in Maple Ridge and in Mission, looking at justice.

The delivery of a better court system. We've had special worries about the family court in Mission. A better correction system, legal services, and the police.

First of all, a lot of sharing was necessary. There's a lot of very hostile and hysterical reaction regarding juvenile delinquency, police, and courts. But, my goodness, it doesn't hurt for people in a town to listen to what the police go through on a Friday night. Just what is the report of the evening shift of the Mission police detachment? It was pretty helpful to listen to that, and we did. I gained insight and other people are gaining insight. Our police commission is greatly helping on this. Police commissioners have already spent considerable time on the beat with police people.

We, of course, listen to other sharing. The difficulty of understanding the court system. I must confess I didn't realize that the Juvenile Delinquents

Act is a federal Act, going back to 1929. The MPs promise us there will be some revision to this pretty archaic Act. In this province a juvenile or a child is up to the age of 17. It's very rare that he'd be raised to the adult court to face the Criminal Code.

There's been a lot of sharing, a lot of looking at this part, a lot of discussion in a very useful way regarding the whole business of the juvenile, who, Mr. Levi reminds us, is a child. He's a child in the community; he lives in a home; he lives in a family in the community. That community needs to be more responsible in coping with that child.

But this government really hasn't changed the facilities available to the juvenile. Again, I guess I get defensive when I hear people saying we've taken away Brannan Lake. Brannan Lake is there. It's used in a more useful way, though, as a diagnostic centre for young boys and girls on Vancouver Island. We still have in Haney Correctional Institute and in Oakalla a remand capacity. We still place juveniles in the House of Concorde. At Centre Creek we have 38 foster homes. We have the use of the Vancouver Foundation.

We have three times as many group living homes, Mr. Speaker. The Socreds wonder where some of the \$100 million overrun went. Well, it went into useful programmes, Mr. Speaker. It went into a 104 group living homes, which are a lot better than jails. It went into 28 residential treatment centres; 480 children are being evaluated and are residing in these treatment centres. Some of that money went into programmes which we call the alternate school. Many of these children in the alternate school are on probation, but at least they're staying on in some kind of growth-learning situation. I have two of these in my riding. We have 9,000 children in special care in British Columbia.

These justice councils, I think, are very useful. They allow the people to share where they're at. They allow MLAs and aldermen and sergeants of the police and lawyers to share where they're at. But we agree that the children belong to the community. It's not going to be very helpful to take them out of the community. The old solution of "out of sight, out of mind" is an insane way to deal with people. It's not very human. It's not in the long run going to bring very useful results. If you want to keep the welfare rolls large, or if you want to keep illiteracy, or if you want to see that more go into mental institutions, or maybe into jails, you might foster that programme — but not this government.

I think the truth is that legislators need to remember that the children who are sent away become more rebellious. You don't really solve the problem. They often come back in a more desperate state. I can testify to six young boys that I personally worked with that went to the old Brannan Lake. They become more hostile. They become more desperate. We need to be close to these people. We need to develop programmes for these people. We are now starting to manage caseloads in corrections using private agencies. We need to use grandparents to relate more to these young people.

This government is at least allowing access to this discussion through these justice councils, just as I think we've opened up school boards. School board people are now paid more. There's in my area real challenge to get on those school boards. I think we're giving greater access to our community colleges so that the people are consulted. Groups within the community are consulted.

I'm very proud that there are three Indian people — and I'm sure that the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) is proud — on that Fraser Valley College: people who have already proven themselves in this province, respectable leaders, people like Bill Mussle, who is a highly respected person in this province, making his contribution with unique things that he is asking for that are needed in the Fraser Valley in post-secondary education.

We're giving access increasingly through resource boards. This is gradual. I hope we don't rush it, but in some cases we already have the forerunner in community college boards. Again, I think this is allowing people to have access to power and, more important, allowing people to change power. You don't just change individual lives, but you change structures. To use the word "evangelism" is to bring good news — to people, yes, but also to structures and to powers. I think that this is very exciting.

Our government is trying to help the community cope with all ages, and I believe that it's very normal that this be done in the community, that the child be looked after in the community. That's why we spent \$130 million in the Department of Human Resources for children in the community. If we have a juvenile that's having difficulty with the law, he should be dealt with in the community.

In some areas we're starting the work-service programme. If juveniles in Surrey or in Maple Ridge knock

over no-parking signs on the weekend — which has been a fad — they go back, and with a court order they repair those no-parking signs, or they repair the windows or whatever is damaged, so that restitution is done not just to the victim, not just to the municipality or to the house or to the small business; but also they learn responsibility. They go through a bit of a guilt thing as they grow up and as they face their responsibility. I believe communities support that attitude of delivering justice.

Let's face it, a lot of children are abandoned in this province. They might be fed, they might be clothed, they might have a place to stay, but they are emotionally and spiritually abandoned. They're starved. They see their parents run off early in the morning, often both to go to work, and they just

[[Page 27](#)]

don't feel that those parents stand for something. I believe that when you are discussing education and teachers or legislators.... I expect adults to be able to stand up for a value, for what they believe. I think it absolutely doesn't make sense that a teacher or lawyer or minister or MLA doesn't stand for something, or doesn't go in with that value system into this situation. Parents need to have that. Parents need to have something that they stand for, and they need to ask pretty essential spiritual questions about life.

It's interesting that in Surrey a report was leaked to the press before it got into council that admitted that in a big part of the juvenile delinquency there were two parents, often in the middle class. I wonder what kind of parents we are talking about. What kind of example?

Finally, this justice council is trying to help people plan for new programmes. Our group realized that there is a hard-core group of juveniles in the Fraser Valley that need some kind of custody — a hard-core group, maybe not more than two or three in Mission. I'm told that there was one young fellow in Cranbrook: when you took that young fellow out of Cranbrook, he just seemed to allow the school system and the other infrastructure to operate a great deal better. But you know and I know that there can be some pretty difficult kids, and if those kids can be sent in a short-term way, maybe for three months, to cool down in a community remand centre.... I believe that Mr. Berger is saying a somewhat similar thing.

Interjection.

MR. ROLSTON: Well, we're discovering this; we're working on this. You were away when I spoke earlier. But our group recognizes this need, and it's maybe a need to help these people grow, maybe to evaluate, maybe to do some diagnostic work, maybe to use some material that school board psychologists already have, that the police already have, the pastor. A group of other people in the community can feed the stuff in to this local remand centre. I don't know who runs it, whether it's the Attorney-General or Mr. Levi; I just don't know. But I would like to think that this would be looked at creatively. I feel that there has been a chance for the people of my riding to make their suggestions. This is an assignment that they're working on, that they're refining. Incidentally, it's not new. There's a remand centre in Prince George with this kind of involvement.

We have transit services now in the north part of the Fraser. Jim Lorimer (Minister of Municipal Affairs) has been able to help us get buses from the south side that went to Delta and Tsawwassen. They've moved now to the north side of the river. We're now seeing hourly bus service out to Maple Ridge and an increased service out to Mission and across to Abbotsford. It's a much faster service. I believe it's dealing with the dilemma of the highway and the automobile. I believe that I've spoken briefly to the Minister of Municipal Affairs about the fare, which is \$1.40 and rather high for that quick commuting trip in to Vancouver to work, and I'm hoping that when Hydro gets delivery of those buses, which are still held up by strikes in Winnipeg, we will be able to renegotiate that fare.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to turn to these maps. You can see here a picture of a submarine. This is the Trident submarine, a submarine which is presently in construction on the eastern side of the United States. You can see here the Straits of Georgia. You can see where the Gulf Island Trust is managing these beautiful islands here, and you can see here a place called Bangor, down on the Hood Canal on the western side of Puget Sound.

Maybe Mr. Kelly could just put up this picture here, a picture of the munitions dump at Bangor. It's been

around for many years. These subs, these nuclear Trident missile-carrying subs, will be going down the Hood Canal, down here, past Camella Point, past Race Rocks, around Wilson Point and down this narrow place into Bangor in Washington, landing right about there.

This is, I think, a very fearful prospect, Mr. Speaker. This is right on the doorsteps of this province, and it should concern us all. It should concern our survival. It is a concern of many of the MPs. And yet one MP admitted last Saturday that there are some things that you just don't want to talk about. He confessed that Trident was one of the things that people don't want to talk about — even MPs. Even Mr. MacEachen, Mr. Speaker.

I am concerned. This is 60 miles from this Legislature. It is next to British Columbia, where we are trying to develop a whole new programme for people, where we are being concerned about the ecology, about reserving the best agricultural land, about Gulf Islands, about tanker routes, about a better form of taxation, about better programmes in schools and family courts, et cetera, about programmes for senior citizens.

But it seems somewhat incongruous to me that this programme of the Trident, the new programme that is going to be the main military thrust on the Pacific of the United States, should be 60 miles from our borders without consultation and that it should be so close that there will be a great deal of anxiety by us all.

I feel that if we don't proceed and at least object to this, we are going to be somewhat complicit, possibly through our ignorance, Mr. Speaker, in this menace, in this escalation of the arms race.

Some of the MPs, like Stu Leggatt and others, and I, feel that the U.S. is moving away from a deterrent,

[[Page 28](#)]

defensive position, to an offensive position, Mr. Speaker. Since the end of World War II, as you know, both the western powers and the Soviet bloc have operated from the position of deterrent strategy, but the Trident significantly changes the U.S.'s position to a first strike strategy. That's what I am worried about. That's what I confess to you. I think, prophetically, this House should be doing something about it. This surely can only escalate the arms race with the Chinese and with the Russians.

The United States had developed the MIRV, and here is a picture of the MIRV. It's one of 24 nuclear missiles. All 24 are capable of knocking 408 cities or silos in Russia or China or elsewhere. Each is equipped with the MIRV, the Multiple, Independently-targeted, Re-entry Vehicle, each capable of, once well in its trajectory, altering that trajectory or improving on it, and landing precisely in a silo, in what we call a hard weapons situation, in Russia or wherever. This is a much different situation from the old balance of terror, Mr. Speaker. I think that this so-called breakthrough — as well as this MIRV being able to alter its course while in its trajectory, it can go 5,000 miles and land precisely, Mr. Speaker, in a Russian silo where their missiles are housed — should concern you and concern this House. You should be aware that in recent months the United States have spent \$2.5 billion a year in developing a sonar system, as well as the MIRV, which is able to detect underwater submarines any place in the world. Mr. Speaker, if tonight you want to read, or a Member wants to read, please take the time to read the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate. It's very well documented here. You can at least thank the Americans for having the stuff in print.

This sonar detector is capable of finding a submarine in any part of any ocean. You can see the consequences of these so-called breakthroughs. The USSR will not have a deterrent for the Trident system; at least they certainly don't now. The U.S. has a first strike capacity, Mr. Speaker. That's a different ball game, That's a very dangerous nuclear strategy, and we need to be aware of it, we who are 60 miles away from this nerve centre at Bangor. It's a very dangerous situation, in terms of nuclear war, since the development of atomic weapons 35 years ago.

Does our law agree with this danger? Allan MacEachen doesn't seem to. He doesn't seem to mind not being consulted about the Trident. He says:

"I do not consider that it would be in Canada's interest to make representations to the United States authorities concerning the establishment of this base unless a peacetime environmental hazard appears or is likely to develop."

What kind of hazard do we need to wait for, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if in Canada we need to have some kind of a defence against the U.S. defence system, at least against this kind of defence system. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. arsenal already includes 31 Poseidon missile-launching submarines. Each has the capacity of 320 Hiroshimas. We are not talking about 10. Congress has already approved 10 Trident missile-launching subs. Each carries 24 missiles. Each can destroy 408 different cities, or silos, or other submarines.

Bangor, Washington, is a nerve centre and the site of this operation. There will be 10 16,000-ton, 550-ft. submarines passing Victoria, passing Race Rocks — they admit in this documentation — possibly going into Canadian waters.

Isn't that a concern of this Legislature, of a sovereign nation? The territorial imperative is as important to me as it is to you. Surely the United States navy who, after all, are going to be sharing the Straits of Juan de Fuca need to hear our concern. They tell us that they admit that it might be mined, that they might need to shoot their way out — get this, Mr. Speaker — shoot their way out to the Straits of Juan de Fuca. We admit that Russian trawlers will be coming even more frequently past Cape Flattery, Carmella Point and Barkley Sound to monitor these submarines as they move out on their deadly, redundant mission.

I remind this House that radioactive fallout from such an attack on this base or on the straits will undoubtedly land in the southern part of British Columbia. I remind this House that B.C. has evidently, in military language, already been designated as a locale for deflect of other target missiles from the Trident system. In the language of the military, Bangor would become "the primary trade-off target" and the population of B.C. would be written off as "collateral damage in an initial nuclear attack."

In other words, we are the No. 1 target place on the North American continent, Mr. Speaker.

You compound this with our already great concern about oil spills.... I gather that today — I don't know the details of that — the Premier is already concerned about....

Interjection.

MR. ROLSTON: Chlorine, okay....tanker spills coming from supertankers down the west coast. Think of the combination of supertankers and the Trident missile launching submarines!

The Doukhobors came here yesterday and beautifully sang for peace. We work for peace. But peace is not passive, Mr. Speaker. It requires effort; it requires paying attention; it requires doing some work. It requires a sense of justice, of brotherhood,

[[Page 29](#)]

and trusting. I don't believe the Americans should be encouraged to escalate the already fearsome war and arms race. This submarine will cost four times the budget of the United Nations.

I am anxious. I call on this government to formally protest to the United States, through the Canadian government, that on moral, ecological and territorial grounds the construction of this Trident missile base at Bangor, Washington, is a great concern. I call on this government, especially Mr. Williams, the Minister of environment.

My final sentence, Mr. Speaker, is that we release funds for an independent study into the possible connection of our industry and research in British Columbia with the U.S. strategic military operations in Bangor or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, when I began 60 minutes ago, I reminded you of the dignity and the peace and the wisdom and the contribution of Ned DeBeck, 92 years young. I remind you of the life and the generosity and the experience of that man. Some of us would like to share with that. I remind this House that this is the place where some non-violent work can begin. I thank you for the opportunity to express it. Thank you.

Mr. Bennett moves adjournment of the debate,

Motion approved.

MR. SPEAKER: May I point out to the Hon. Member that if you rise at any time before you intend to speak in your formal debate, you may lose your place on the floor if anyone objected. In this case I'm sure no one would object.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly presented the 103rd report of the Department of Education.

Hon. R.A. Williams presented the report of the secretariat of the Environment and Land Use Committee of the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Cocke presented the 101st annual report of the vital statistics branch for 1972 and the annual report for the year ended March 31, 1974, for the Medical Services Commission of B.C.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

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